Globally Connected, Locally Developed

Amanda Trepanier

The world we live in, as Americans, is much different from how the rest of the world lives, economically and culturally. Although regions are globally connected, they are not all globally equal. By the twenty first century, many people are taught that there is no more slavery or inequality, that there is equal opportunity for everyone, and that just by working hard anyone can make it in life. But how true are all these ideas? In reality, when one looks at the world outside of America, this picture may be somewhat incorrect. Today, officials have created the politically correct terms of "developed" nations and "less developed" nations to describe the different regions of the world. The richer countries are generally the "developed" countries and the poor countries, mostly located in the southern hemisphere, are categorized as "less developed." After colonialism, the world was changed, but the effects of colonialism never fully disappeared. Globalization was positively seen as something that could turn things around, and balance the world. Then development agencies became the organizations that would help achieve this equalizing. However, development projects in "less developed" nations became a popular trend that had alternative hidden political purposes, and possibly had other hidden intentions that will be discussed later. Lastly, government funding, and development projects would greatly impact public health campaigns, but the success of these campaigns would be determined by the presentation, and how well plans on paper are implemented in the real world. It will be shown how globalization, colonialism, and current development work actually connect full circle, in that each is affected by the previous, and the cause of the next.

While globalization contributes positive and negative aspects to the world, it is now one of the most debated issues on an international scale. Among the debate is the question of whether or not market and democracy go hand-in-hand. Depending on which side of the hemisphere one is referring to, globalization may be very beneficial, but the benefits of economic globalization play favoritism. Amy Chua, author of *World on Fire* agrees by arguing that "the spread of global markets in recent decades has unambiguously widened the gap between developed and underdeveloped countries," thus showing which side of the hemisphere globalization favors[1]. Economic globalization uses the free-market as a tool of exploitation in which the profits are put into the pockets of only a handful of individuals, who keep the system working in their favor, and do not address the needs of the majority. Chua points out that there is a noticeable relationship between ethnic violence and free market democracy, a negative relationship that has developed from globalization. The violence is borne from the rise of market dominant minorities. These minorities grow wealthy, educated, and live a good life while the ethnic majority struggles with poverty, illiteracy, and humiliation. The situation almost always results in bloody confrontations, but very little changes are being made to try to solve this problem.

In places around the world, including many countries in Eastern Europe, Africa, the Middle East, South America, and Asia, a minority ethnic group controls the majority of the economy. In the case of China and its ethnically Filipino minority, 60 percent of the private economy is owned by Chinese Filipinos, equaling one percent of the population[2]. The situation is not unfamiliar around the world, "whites are a market-dominant minority in South Africa… Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala. Lebanese are a market-dominant minority in West Africa… Croats were a market-dominant minority in the former Yugoslavia. And Jews are almost certainly a market-dominant minority in post-Communist Russia"[3]. In these areas, the majority ethnic groups suffer from ranging levels of poverty, lacking education systems, and do not always have electricity, heat, or access to clean water and food. With insufficient options these majority ethnic groups turn to violence. The violence is targeted at the ethnic minority groups who control all the wealth, but it not only is a fight against the group, but also a rebellion against the market. Politicians quickly feed on the fury of the majority; a prime example is the President of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe. Zimbabwe's land is responsible for most of the wealth that comes into the country. However, seventy percent of the best land, "largely in the form of highly productive three-thousand-acre tobacco and sugar farms," has been owned for generations by just one percent of the population[4]. Every election President Mugabe promises to take land away from the foreigners and redistribute it to the real Zimbabweans: the ethnic majority. For years now, Mugabe has been the enthusiast advocating land seizures of "10 million acres of white-owned commercial farmland," which elucidates another phenomenon of globalization. The simultaneous implementation of market and democracy creates unstable, and often combustible, conditions. In cases of market-dominant minorities, the majority of the wealth and power goes to the minority ethnic group. Once the ethnic majority tires of their misfortunes, they search for outlets to solve the problems. Thus, democratically, they elect a politician who will give them what they want. Clearly this is a formula of disaster in which the economy becomes suspect and the political system corrupt. Surely economic globalization has not equally benefited all the people who contribute to the market in these countries. In fact, in most cases a very small percentage of people actually receive enough wealth to prosper in life. Amy Chua theorizes that Americans have become the market-dominant minority of the world, cautioning that if American's do not practice "tolerance" there will be uproar from the rest of the world.

As a country established by immigrants, America has become the world's leading hyperpower thanks to its resourceful agricultural land, raw materials, free market democracy, and most importantly its human capital[5]. The United States was able to collect valuable human capital by practicing religious tolerance. People would come to America to escape prosecution and injustices. The influx of great scientists, engineers, businessmen and lawmakers from all over the world are responsible for the extraordinary success America has profited from. However, when one looks at the accumulation of wealth in America, it is clear that not all Americans benefit from economic globalization. Bill Gates is a multibillionaire, owning as much as "40 percent of the American population put together"[6]. If Bill Gates wasn't a white American however, more Americans would not be satisfied about this detail, but since he is, Gates does not get bothered too much. In another light however, this shows how economic globalization favors the few over many. The unequal distribution of wealth is a major flaw to the current system. Conclusively, the sole fact that America remains the superpower of the world shows that economic globalization has not benefited everyone in the world, including Americans. The other flaw to economic globalization is found within the environment, which supplies important raw materials needed to make products.

International trade has existed throughout history, centuries before globalization became a cliché in everyone's vocabulary. After the Industrial Revolution, America was searching for a mass quantity of raw materials to produce their products. The countries dubbed "developing" experienced this effect first hand. Alexander Hamilton explains the error in this trade arrangement by stating "producers of natural resources might get trapped… thereby delaying or blocking the improvements in industry necessary for economic development"[7]. Given the name "dynamic Dutch Disease," it occurs when a country exports one natural resource, or specialized trade, inhibiting the ability to develop other economic outlets. There is a "long-term loss of growth coming from the specialization in primary goods rather than manufactured products," which makes these countries uncompetitive in manufacturing sectors[8]. Therefore, the trade arrangement between "developed" countries and "developing" countries leaves one economy on top, and keeps the other on the bottom, dependent on the latter. In this way, economic globalization does not benefit the "developing" countries. While it may improve some conditions for workers and regular civilians in these parts of the world, economic globalization oddly can inhibit the continued advancement of living conditions, and job opportunities. Some of the more unfortunate countries are trapped in a vicious cycle defying the assumption that globalization eliminates poverty. For instance, in a few countries in Africa, a worker has the choice of either starving or surviving by being exploited and barely making enough to satisfy basic needs. While America is a country built by the arms of many ethnicities, it has visibly manipulated the system and taken advantage of the developing world and its ethnic majorities.

There is one last defect found within economic globalization in that it erodes at societal traditions, and then begins to diminish cultural diversity. All the available easy-access information, global transportation options, mass media, and communicational outlets has not only allowed for businesses to prosper but has introduced alien values and beliefs to societies with different cultures. As indicated by Peter Berger, "if there is economic globalization, there is also cultural globalization," which has become more and more evident with each passing year[9]. Right from the beginning, as products are being made and sold to places that have never before used or needed that product, the country unknowingly adopts a part of another culture. Generally, the global culture is the "western" culture. America also passes along its values and agenda onto the international world, for example, the entire anti-smoking campaign. While it was relevant to Americans, other countries would have benefitted more if the World Health Organization had offered support to address other serious health issues. Lastly, along with the spread of multiculturalism, cultural globalization causes there to be clashes between generations. This also leads many youths to find themselves in an identity crisis, producing more frustration and conflict within the community. Even though the severity of these results are not as serious as the other effects of economic globalization, still the struggle with multiculturalism, and the pains of disappearing language, traditions, and cultures linger in the minds of civilians.

Globalization is a force in motion that doesn't seem to be slowing down. These market-dominant minorities control much of the economic means in their respectable regions. On the global scale America has become the market-dominant minority, but colonialism played a powerful role in placing America in its position. Granted there are other events throughout history that unfolded to secure America's global dominance, but amid colonialism, colonial powers took what they wanted without regards to the people, created cash crop societies, and suffocated economic options that could have benefited the colony. To show the impact of colonialism, the story of the Congo narrates the negative effects very well. It has become clearer that the "third" and "second" world countries have been forced into a vicious cycle by a system that strategically keeps them "less developed."

During the age of exploration, the Europeans found many desirable resources in the African continent, but they also came across a different kind of functional civilization, one that they labeled as "savage." Even still, it did not deter them from viewing Africa as a "magnificent piece of cake" for Europe to consume[10]. In the Congo specifically, the Belgian King Leopold saw the region as his chance for major power and wealth. First he fooled the other major powers into thinking his presence was for humanitarian aid, religious missions, and to introduce more trade to the international world. The "issues" that were laid out by foreign powers were not only ignorant of other cultures, but also were not entirely true, and racism played a major factor in designing the list of problems. The initial profitable export from the Congo was ivory. The following cash crop came to be rubber, which had to be extracted from vines in the forests. With the exportation of these resources, the Congo became engaged in the economic capitalist system of globalization. Quickly the Congo's economy developed into a cash crop society which proved problematic for the population. The Congo had no options to export other products and instead was stuck with exporting natural resources, in which they became specialized. The problem with specialization in one trade is reliance on the market demand, and over time it becomes the only crop people know how to produce. Besides the unquestionable brutal barbarianism practiced by the Belgians and the Force Publique, a police unit of Africans meant to enforce policies, there was also a lack of education options for young Africans. In his book, Hochschild hints that the Belgians intentionally withheld schooling from the Congo in order to keep them producing rubber, thus keeping them dependent on the colonial power. It is obvious that, along with becoming a cash crop society, the lack of educational outlets contributed to the stunt in advancement. The people of the Congo were able to rebel against King Leopold's rule with the help of reports and personal accounts of the slavery, and brutality taking place against the Congo people. Unfortunately when the new government was established, nobody in the country had the know-how to run a country successfully. Without the knowledge to govern, and lack of money to support political changes, the Congo and other countries in similar scenarios were forced to succumb to capitalism. Gaining independence was an accomplishment to be proud of; however political independence was not enough to gain total freedom from the colonial powers who maintained control over the economies.

There are few countries in Africa today that are not labeled "underdeveloped," and it is evident that their economies are unable to support the population. Other troubles exist that stem from insufficient funds, such as poverty, violence, and corruption. Interestingly, one theory that exists suggests that people who live in tropical areas are lazier than others, and that explains why countries in the southern hemisphere are less developed. Author of *The Three Worlds*, Peter Worsley, disagrees with this theory, and argues that it "makes it difficult to explain why the great civilizations of the ancient world – Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, or later Mayan and Chinese Empires all flourished in mainly tropical regions which are now the most underdeveloped parts of the globe."[11] However, it is more likely that the underdevelopment of these countries is due to colonialism, which created cash crop societies, robbed the country of their natural resources, and exploited labor forces. In other words the former colonies "are underdeveloped in relation to the 'advanced,' industrialized countries" that created a system that destabilized functioning societies[12]. Instead of realizing the truth, other people are apt to believe "less developed" countries are that way because of inferior values and traditions. Sadly the solution to help "less developed" countries has been to industrialize. Evidently, industrialization keeps developing countries dependent on the West for technology and manufactured goods. As the West modernizes these countries, they impose Western ideals, values, and culture, but it is clear that industrializing does not address the initial problem: those developing countries remain dependent on the West for economic means. With control over income, the foreign powers hold control over many aspects of living, all of which require money. Lastly, there have been few legitimate efforts to improve domestic conditions, rather than economic and market assets. Modern colonialism seeps its way into humanitarian organizations, foreign aid, and projects of awareness, such as HIV/AIDS prevention.

Organizations, like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, assess conditions in other countries to determine the amount of aid needed, and what form it comes in. Direct Foreign Aid Investments are prime examples of Neocolonialism. They prove that developing countries do not have control over their own economy, and it is because the people who "[own] the mines, the plantations, the factories and the banks [are] not even in the country, but outside it: in the First World."[13] A problem that arises with foreign aid is that, more often than not, the aid is for an issue that is not relevant to the country; however, a government will not turn down the money. Also, multinational companies who claim to help conditions manipulate and "exploit internal divisions in the Third World," which creates violence between ethnicities.[14] Today, there are Common Wealth States, like Puerto Rico, which are independent states who are economically tied to another, wealthier, "advanced," country. While humanitarian projects and foreign aid investments could be helpful and useful to developing countries, the way that missions are carried out does not do much to improve circumstances. Instead, these programs do not actually amend problems facing the countries, and sometimes do not address the serious issues at hand. Additionally, foreign aid keeps developing countries dependent on the "First World."

Since people still suffer from extreme poverty, hunger, exploitation, lack of education, and disease, it is obvious that colonialism did not help these countries, but rather underdeveloped them. After the separate worlds were constructed from colonialism, development work, ironically, became the next step in the process of "underdevelopment." Certain views commonly followed in the West created the discourse of development agencies, which seemingly were proven to be self-serving, but harmful to the countries who housed their development projects. By looking at the specific case of Lesotho, one can begin to imagine how development work in other countries can actually be unconstructive due to false assumptions and ignorance of cultural differences.

The tiny landlocked country in the heart of South Africa hints to the many problems that can originate during developmental work programs. Between the years of 1974 and 1985 Lesotho was receiving assistance from twenty seven countries, and over forty other international organizations. These numbers are strikingly disproportionate for the, then, populated country of just 1.3 million. In retrospect, when one now looks at the attempted development projects in Lesotho, it is clear that many things attributed to their downfall. However the main cause of failure is because development institutions came in assuming that the country was "backwards" and "primitive," so they generated their own ideas of understanding Lesotho's situation then constructed their analysis of Lesotho's problems. The projects were created from the agencies' own discourses instead of consulting the Lesotho community, and therefore rarely succeeded. James Ferguson, author of *The Anti-Politics Machine*, evaluates the development work in Lesotho. In his book it is evident that Lesotho is an example for future development programs to learn from. It serves as a model that explains why development projects fail. In the case of the Thaba-Tseka region in Lesotho the first complications emerged when program directors claimed that agriculture could be transformed into means of significant profit for a society that makes most income from migrant labor in mines located in South Africa.

Lesotho is a region with unique terrain and climate. Most of the country is highlands, with mountains, and some plateaus. Roughly 10% of the land is arable, and its greatest, and only true, natural resource is water[15]. Intriguingly enough, agriculture was the first area that the Canadian International Development Agency, or CIDA, pursued for development. The project started in the lowlands, but the first thing to be done was road construction due to the belief that people "have never had the opportunity" to access "the wider market economy"[16]. Program workers believed that once Lesotho's farmers could travel easier to markets a light bulb would turn on and they would realize they could sell their surplus of crops for a subsistent profit. Road construction, however, did not address the real problem and in fact ended up doing the opposite of its initial intentions. The arable land in Lesotho is very limited, and it has suffered from soil erosion, therefore, no surplus of crops existed. Also, the roads allowed for easier access to cheaper goods produced in South Africa, and Lesotho became "the market" instead of the producers[17]. It is evident that the goals of this project were not accomplished, but instead of changing the project CIDA just changed the location; to a less likely agricultural domain up in the highlands. Ferguson explains that "the mission considered the unexploited mountain areas to be rich agricultural resources" but again they concluded development scarce because of poor access to markets. It is curious as to why the development agency believed that success could be reached in the highlands when the project failed in the lowlands. There seems to be a self-serving scheme by the development program because after "extreme pressure on the land, deteriorating soil, and declining agricultural yields… many able-bodied men were forced from the land in search of means to support their families," which lead about 60% of these men to become migrant workers in South Africa[18]. Since the mine wages are controlled by the South African government the development agency could not develop the migrant labor economy, and instead by following their own discourse that all the Basotho are farmers, made the problem something they could fix: agriculture and market infrastructure. The most expensive parts of the project would be those concerned with roads and infrastructure, but to the agency they were also viewed as the most important for mountain development[19]. Again, however, the development projects were based on the assumption that a surplus of crops existed when in actuality there was a deficiency in food production. Ergo this form of development was unsuccessful.

Following roads and infrastructure, another important component was in reference to livestock and range management, but this was confronted with social pressures that would guarantee another failure. Raising herding animals in Lesotho is very common among the people. Cattle have multiple uses in Lesotho, including labor and bridewealth payment, but the social status and implications go beyond what the development agency could picture. The social benefits of owning cattle discouraged the Basotho from selling their livestock. This is why when the agency began the push to commercialize livestock it was doomed to fail. One of the issues that CIDA recognized in Thaba-Tseka was overgrazing, which is why range management became crucial to mountain development. In order to control overgrazing, they experimented with a sectioned off area of grazing land, allowing farmers with "improved" stock, who followed recommended management practices, to bring their cattle on these sites[20]. Each person, however, was to pool their herds into a single unit. This was something that most people felt uncomfortable doing because cattle serve as stored income, only to be sold under certain circumstances, for instance when there was a "serious need for money which cannot be raised any other way"[21]. Culturally, the men own the herding animals, and the wages he makes at the mines, or elsewhere, are spread amongst the family. The men will spend money buying more cattle because it acts as their retirement fund, which his wife and family cannot squander[22]. Cattle can also serve as a sense of pride. A man who owns many cattle in Lesotho has a social status because he can help the rest of the community, for example, by lending out his cattle to less fortunate families. Men with a lot of money, however, are viewed as selfish. With these social standards in mind, it is easy to see why commercializing livestock was a difficult task for CIDA to accomplish. The development team went into this project without the knowledge of the social connotations attached to cattle and they could not realize that "livestock and cash are not freely interconvertible" in the society[23]. There are other aspects of the project that also caused its downfall, mainly that the "improved" stock couldn't survive in the conditions of the environment, including the lack of grazing lands. Also the fodder that was needed to feed the "improved" stock was expensive and would take up the land that people were using to grow their own food. So it would seem that the Basotho people, who were experienced cattle raisers, had more knowledge and knew better than to follow along with the recommendations of the project. A cycle began as the development agency realized that the land was being exhausted through use and overgrazing, but that people were not going to sell their cattle. So they would again retry to develop agriculture and would only become more frustrated as programs suffered from lack of support from the community and failed. Unfortunately, their own discourse kept them from changing their development program, and the true issues in Lesotho remained unaddressed. As CIDA wasted money on agriculture and livestock development, they saw the government as another possible mean of transformation.

Traditional politics in Lesotho were centralized under rule of a chief. The development agency's plan was simple: to de-centralize Lesotho's government in order to create a "neutral" state apparatus[24]. Creating a neutral state government would prove to be an impossible task since a particular government party is going to do whatever benefits them the most and keep them in charge. In the case of Lesotho, being so closely tied with South Africa, the National Party was not popular among the majority of Basotho. Development projects became a mechanism used by the National Party to propagate policies and inflict fear in those who opposed them. The government was corrupt and would favor party supporters in different aspects of society. Then CIDA created a slightly complicated system of department chairman, ministries, and committees to oversee certain districts. The idea was to be able to deal with matters in Thaba-Tseka "without having to go through the bureaucratic tangle in Maseru," which created hassle for the local government due to frequent delays[25]. By the time the program grew to full size, little support existed within the Basotho community. The process of decentralization, Ferguson explains, "was couched in the idiom of resistance to 'the Canadians' and 'their project,' seen as trying to 'push everyone else around'"[26]. Eventually CIDA directors became frustrated with the lack of "effort" and "support" of the community, and decided to leave as elegantly and swiftly as possible. Their ministries already in place came under the power of the government. The Basotho came to their own realization that "politics is nowadays nicknamed 'development,'" thus explaining why people would vandalize as well as ignore advice and recommendations made by the Canadian development agency[27]. The built-up frustration of the Thaba-Tseka community, due to the many project failures and the increased of power given to a biased government, ultimately caused the development projects' fail.

Ferguson expresses in his book that "development projects in Lesotho do not generally bring about any significant reduction in poverty, but neither do they characteristically introduce any new relations of production, or bring about significant economic transformations," which is essentially arguing that not only is there no development occurring, but also that the society is neither "backwards," or "primitive"[28]. The principle reason for CIDA's failures in agricultural development, commercializing livestock, and de-centralization is so simple, but rarely observed. It set itself up for disaster in the beginning by creating its own dissertation instead of discussing with the Lesotho community about their actual problems and needs. The lack of knowledge over Lesotho's environmental conditions, political system, and social standards contributed greatly to the failure of many development projects. The same problems that arose during the development projects in Lesotho found their way into HIV/AIDS awareness throughout Africa in the 1980's and 1990's. By seeping into health development, arguably the most deadly disease has continued to spread throughout "less developed" countries with no avail; but somehow, in "developed" countries the spread has been relatively silenced.

Most Western HIV/AIDs programs fail because of simple mistakes that materialize from the Western view and the discourse of program directors. When HIV/AIDs programs are set up throughout Africa, the culture and social practices are ignored which ultimately leads to the failure of these projects. Also, it seems that many health clinics that take their studies to Africa treat Africans like test subjects rather than real human beings, counting on them as statistics for their "numbers-driven" reports. Relying on the quantitative results lets companies mask the reality of their programs' quality and actual affect on HIV/AIDs victims. This tactic allows many innocent-minded, sympathetic Americans to donate their money that ends up mostly serving as a salary for directors and other employees. Interestingly, not all HIV/AIDs programs are doomed to fail. In fact, programs and organizations created by Africans, who understand their culture, practices, and the average person's reaction to AIDS information, have built successful HIV/AIDs projects. Unfortunately the successes of these projects were not long-winded because soon these organizations succumbed to the influence of Western money. The biggest problems that faced Western HIV/AIDs programs in Africa was that their western influenced goals could not successfully address the African people, even though on paper the ideas seemed on point, and the targets seemed legitimate. By looking in depth at certain HIV/AIDs institutions, the emphasis of ABC's, the presentation of condoms, and analyzing why AIDs programs in Uganda were successful over programs in Botswana, Helen Epstein explains in her book *The Invisible Cure*, why the fight against AIDS in Africa is shamefully being lost.

The AIDS virus is one of the most efficient viruses in the world, it is perfectly deadly. Variations of the virus exist, and scientists have divided them into subtypes A, B, C, and D. In the United States, most people with AIDS have the subtype B variation, and in the 1990's health organizations were being encouraged to find a cure for subtype B because it would be a major breakthrough. Much of the medicine trials were taken to Africa, in countries with high rates of HIV/AIDs, such as Uganda, Botswana, Mozambique, and South Africa. While it was already suspect that these medicine testing trials were not even attempted in the United States, Epstein discovered another issue with these tests. After testing almost two hundred blood samples from Uganda she quickly began to realize that HIV patients in the area were victims of subtypes A, C, and D, and most even had antibodies to protect them from subtype B[29]. For Epstein, this would mean that the subtype B based vaccine "would have to be redesigned if it was to be tested in Uganda. It would have to include a cocktail of HIV strains, including A, C, D," and her comment points to something some people may overlook[30]. Essentially these trials were not actually going to help the local people, and it became evident that the HIV vaccine was being created solely for profit, and only for Americans who could buy them. Ugandans, and just about everybody else infected with AIDS in Africa, would not have the funds to buy the medicine. So the first reason as to why AIDS programs failed is because "health development" was geared towards profit, and not meant to help people living in Africa.

The Community Health Initiative to Prevent Sexually Transmitted Diseases, or CHIPS, was meant to treat patients with STDs and promote condom usage in order to decrease the spread of HIV/AIDS. Millions of dollars was given to CHIPS in order to accomplish these goals, but eventually the program was shut down because its clinic was hardly being used, and it is likely that the directors lost interest[31]. It is odd that $1.5 million was given to CHIPS and they decided to refurbish one clinic instead of putting some money towards "cheap drugs for malaria and other infections" that were prominent in Uganda[32]. It is shameful that the money was carelessly wasted when many could have benefited from those cheap drugs. Programs like LoveLife, formed by public health experts sponsored by a U.S.-based foundation, took another approach to the AIDS crisis in South Africa[33]. The experts realized that HIV/AIDS information was so depressing and upsetting to Africans that most would not stay around to hear about AIDS information. Thus, they decided to have LoveLife approach the crisis in a positive light. By cheerfully showing what AIDS does to people, they promoted abstinence, fidelity, and the use of condoms. This may seem good on paper, but internationally both abstinence and fidelity propaganda fail to influence people. Condoms are beneficial in the process of stopping the spread of AIDS however they cannot stop it alone. But it will be discussed later how the presentation of condoms, unfortunately, ruined the chance they had at positively impacting communities. While LoveLife was directed at young people, the positive manner in which they discussed AIDS ended up, actually, denying its existence. Since the disease was presented as something that resulted from immoral behavior, it was shameful to admit that someone close had AIDS, and furthermore, deterred youths from seeking health treatments and talking about personal issues related to HIV/AIDS. CHIPS and LoveLife are just a few examples of organizations established by the West to raise awareness of HIV/AIDS, but all of the West's institutions fall under the same spectrum of arrogance.

The economy in South Africa is heavily reliant on migrant labor in mines, which comes from many regions of Africa. People noticed that along the paths to the mines, towns began to see an increase in the prevalence of HIV/AIDS. Westerners predicted that it was due to the erotic sexual behavior of migrant laborers and prostitutes, despite that "the HIV rate was just as high among migrants as among nonmigrants," but this belief has developed from the old stereotype that Africans are promiscuous people[34]. Even though this assumption is false, it did not stop the way that the organization would present HIV/AIDS to migrant laborers and communities along the way. Health advisers would recommend that men not visit prostitutes while they were away from their families, but if they did, advisers recommended that they use condoms with the prostitutes. In this way, AIDS was presented as a disease of prostitutes and promiscuity which made it a disease of certain immoral behaviors, but not a disease of everyone. Another dilemma was that the purpose of condoms was obscured, and they started to gain negative connotations. Condoms were then seen as something only to be used with prostitutes; therefore men would not use them with their wives or girlfriends. Relationships in most of Africa are different from the United States, where there are monogamous relationships, and multiple throughout life. In many communities in Africa, the relationships are concurrent, in that a man and woman may have a few relationships at one time. As one can see, this was a major flaw in the presentation of both HIV/AIDS and the use of condoms, but it was tainted by the West's own view of life and culture, and the ignorance of other cultures. Not to mention, the haphazard effort by organizers of National Condom Week, "during which free condoms [were] stapled" to brochures, just echoes the negligence that was common throughout most HIV/AIDS campaigns[35].

Throughout the failures of Western organizations, there are few success stories that came from Uganda. The major reason that these programs worked is that Ugandans created the institution the projects would be built on, and obviously they understood their own culture and social structures which helped them greatly to reduce the rate that HIV was spreading. President Museveni of Uganda took charge by initiating AIDS awareness propaganda on the radio which had a traditional African drumming pattern that signified a "warning." Upon hearing the drum beat, it is known that caution should be taken. This on top of a policy cleverly titled, "Zero Grazing" which effectively promoted faithfulness among concurrent relationships, helped reduce the amount of partners. Most importantly the idea of "collective efficacy" truly encouraged the community to help each other. Collective efficacy made Ugandans realize that HIV/AIDS could affect all people, and not just certain people who did promiscuous things. This was something that the West could not master, and even though the rate of HIV/AIDS was declining in Uganda "officials from the WHO, USAID, and other development agencies largely dismissed Uganda's AIDs program" because it was not targeting "high-risk" groups, such as prostitutes and migrant laborers[36]. Uganda was able to successfully address the entire spectrum of HIV/AIDS by talking about it in multiple forms. By not stressing the so called "high risk" groups Uganda was able to get everyone on the same page. An interesting comparison to Uganda's success is Botswana's failure. Uganda is a much poorer region than Botswana, but they were not fortunate to have the same results. The West had many programs and public health campaigns in Botswana promoting abstinence, fidelity, and condoms. Ultimately however, these campaigns could not produce the same results as Uganda because their programs never stirred the conscience of Batswana people. West campaigns presented HIV as a disease of certain people and not everyone. By identifying these "high risk" groups, programs were able to provide a technical solution to these conceived technical problems, and eventually resulted in major failure. As a country struggling with poverty as well, Uganda was quick to accept the money donated by the United States. Once the West stepped into Uganda and imposed its morals and values, the HIV/AIDS rate began to increase again, but Epstein points out that "there may be other reasons why Zero Grazing had not been revived. For one thing, there was no multimillion-dollar bureaucracy to support it"[37].

George Bush received $15 billion from Congress in 2003 to fight AIDS in developing countries, and $1 billion of that money would be managed by PEPFAR, which stands for President's Emergency Plan for HIV/AIDS Relief[38]. The organizations that were contracted by PEPFAR were right-winged, church affiliated organizations, and their campaigns would proclaim that the solution to AIDS was abstinence. Even though abstinence would almost guarantee that one would not get AIDS, as stated earlier, abstinence campaigns consistently fail around the world. There are obvious reasons as to why former President Bush would donate the money to PEPFAR, mainly because the money would end up in the hands of his own supporters, who would in return, support him for the next reelection. While Bush has been praised for the money he donated to AIDS, Epstein challenges the acclaim by noting that "at least 60% of U.S. foreign-aid funding never leaves the United States, but is instead spent on overhead, travel… and other equipment, as well as salary-and-benefit packages," and observes that much of the money is "wasted on ill-conceived projects"[39]. So if this is true, of the $1 billion donated, only $400 million would be dispersed among the many "ill-conceived projects" throughout Africa, meant to help the hundreds of millions of people affected by AIDS, 12 million of which are orphans[40]. All the institutions that were fighting AIDS, such as UNAID, PEPFAR and its churches, began to disagree on certain procedures, and ended up confusing Africans and worsening their situation. UNAID was promoting condoms, and while it has been said that condoms are not the sole solution to AIDS, it is proven that they directly impact the rise or decline of HIV/AIDS. PEPFAR was preaching abstinence while UNAID was promoting condoms, but the churches that PEPFAR supplied were all denouncing condoms. For their own religious beliefs, these churches, by condemning condoms, caused unnecessary deaths, and "threatened to derail what little progress had been made" in fighting AIDS[41]. Another reason why these organizations were not producing the desirable results is because of the emphasis on meeting target goals. The United States has always placed a lot of value on statistical information, believing it to be an easy way to evaluate success or failure. Throughout history people have started to learn, not necessarily in America, that results cannot always be measured in stats, or quantitative figures. Meeting target goals does put stress on organizations, which is proving detrimental on U.S. funded AIDS programs because "in order to receive ongoing funding from PEPFAR, organizations… must meet their targets - however superficial"[42]. For men, women, and children, including orphans, this is not good news because they are just being viewed as a number, and depersonalizing their situation will not result in the real help that they need.

To conclude, there are many cases in Africa that can be seen as the direct result of colonialism, globalization, and imposed cultural views through development work. Curiously, it does not seem coincidental that globalization, colonialism, and development all fit together; market-dominant minorities, neocolonialism, and development projects are all pieces of the puzzle that have formed the world as it is today. Each piece is essential for the future, development projects and all. Even when a "less developed" nation boasts a rise in their economy, things need to be evaluated from a much grander scale. For example, Epstein observes that although "South Africa's powerhouse economy, based on gold, diamonds, commercial farming, and services, is growing rapidly, it produces very small numbers of highly skilled jobs," and this captures the big issue at hand[43]. "Developing" countries around the world are told that if they follow the example of the West in one sector of economy, and another sector of cultural values, they will prosper like Americans. Somehow, though, these countries resources are exhausted, the money by-passes people who need it, and America remains on top of a material world. Poverty is not a natural occurrence, but the result of exploitation, greed, and carelessness. Development work is supposed to make globalization more possible and more positive. But what it is doing in actuality is serving as an entity that keeps countries "less developed" because of the way development agencies go about their implementation, whether or not the discourse and arrogance is intentional. The only true way development projects can actually be successful is if they are managed locally, or by people who know and understand the social and cultural norms of the region. It seems now that development projects, although they could be useful, are being used as a mask, covering the evil face of the real neocolonialism that is occurring on the global scale. A face that remains in control of the money, and ultimately the system that keeps some people dependent, and "less developed." Global equality is lacking in the world economy, but nothing is changing except that the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer, and the sick are, inexcusably, dying.

Bibliography

Chua, Amy. *World on Fire: how exporting free market democracy breeds ethnic hatred and global instability*. New York: Anchor Books, 2003.

Chua, Amy. *Day of Empire: how hyperpowers rise to global dominance--and why they fall*. New York: Anchor Books, 2007.

Epstein, Helen. *The Invisible Cure*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.

Ferguson, James. *Anti Politics Machine: development, depoliticization and bureaucratic power in Lesotho*. London: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost*. New York: First Mariner Books, 1999.

O'Meara, Patrick, Howard Mehlinger, and Matthew Krain. *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost*. New York: First Mariner Books, 1999.

Worsley, Peter. *The Three Worlds: culture and world development*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1984.

Endnotes

[1] Chua, Amy. *World on Fire* (New York: Anchor Books, 2003), 245.

[2] Ibid., 3.

[3] Ibid., 6.

[4] Ibid., 11.

[5] Ibid., 234

[6] Ibid., 11.

[7] Sachs, Jeffrey. "The New Global Economy" in *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century,* ed. by Patrick O'Meara, Howard Mehlinger, Matthew Krain. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 221.

[8] Ibid., 221.

[9] Berger, Peter. "An Emerging Global Culture¿" in *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century,* ed. by Patrick O'Meara, Howard Mehlinger, Matthew Krain (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 419 .

[10] Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost*, (New York: First Mariner Books, 1999), 58.

[11] Worsley, Peter. *The Three Worlds*, (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1984), 1.

[12] Ibid., 3.

[13] Ibid., 316.

[14] Ibid., 304.

[15] www.cia.gov/worldfactbook

[16] Ferguson, James. *Anti Politics Machine*, (London: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), pg 57.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.,31.

[19] Ibid., 77.

[20] Ibid., 78.

[21] Ibid., 147.

[22] Ibid., 158.

[23] Ibid., 146.

[24] Ibid., 194.

[25] Ibid., 199.

[26] Ibid., 203.

[27] Ibid., 247.

[28] Ibid., 16.

[29] Epstein, Helen. *The Invisible Cure*. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), 31-4.

[30] Ibid., 35.

[31] Ibid., 24.

[32] Ibid., 26.

[33] Ibid., 127.

[34] Ibid., 90.

[35] Ibid., 110.

[36] Ibid., 167.

[37] Ibid.,197.

[38] Ibid., 186.

[39] Ibid., 215.

[40] Ibid., 213.

[41] Ibid., 187.

[42] Ibid., 221-2.

[43] Ibid., 224.