

The Future of Development Assistance – Do We Need a New „Marshall Plan“?

Pavel Nováček // Pavel.Novacek@upol.cz,

Department of Development Studies, Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic

Abstract

We have studied the present situation and the history of development assistance, but until now we have neglected one fundamental approach – looking into the future. While it is necessary to study the history of development assistance to learn from past mistakes, it is not enough. The past can be studied, but it can never be changed. In contrast, there are many alternative (potential) futures that can be influenced by our choices.

By the year 2015 the Millennium Development Goals should have been achieved, yet it is clear today that they will not be. How should we proceed after the year 2015? An example from the past could become an inspiration for the future – the Marshall Plan. The idea of a new, global Marshall Plan was revived in the 1990s by Albert Gore.

The new (global) Marshall Plan, if implemented, has the potential to become the catalyst for far-reaching positive changes. The requirement is that it is not just the sum of its many component activities and projects, but a complex, coordinated, and future-oriented plan. It must be a plan with definable, measurable, and achievable goals.

The New Marshall Plan should consist of two phases. The first, short-term phase should assist a country (or region) to emerge from a crisis and stabilize the situation. The second, longer-term phase should help the country become a medium developed country.

For development assistance to be effective, however, we need public support, both in developed and developing countries. We need to win not only their minds, but even more importantly, their hearts.

Key words: Marshall Plan, Sustainable development, Foresight, post-MDGs

Introduction

Development assistance/aid¹ aims to eradicate, or at least alleviate, poverty in the world, mainly in so-called Third World countries. Historically, poor people have always existed in every society. In terms of sustainable development², however, the highly unequal distribution of wealth among developed and developing countries is particularly unacceptable as well as the extremely unequal distribution of wealth among people in developing countries. The global threshold of absolute (extreme) poverty is calculated by the World Bank as an income of US \$ 1.25 per capita per day. The world economic product (the world economic performance) is now around US \$ 70 000 billion; an average of US \$ 10 000 for each person living on the Earth.

Why are we not able to combat extreme poverty effectively? Why are some nations rich and others poor? There is no easy solution at hand; development studies professionals have been searching in vain for an answer to these questions for over half a century. On a practical level, development assistance and development cooperation have been fighting poverty for that length of time; the results are inconsistent.

Czech journalist Daniel Deyl says that the answer to the question of why some countries develop fast while others remain backward is, to an economist, the same as the „theory of everything“ is to a physicist, or the secret of transforming iron into gold is to an alchemist: it is almost within sight but at the very last minute it always slips through the unfortunate scholar’s fingers.

We have intensively studied the present situation and the history of development assistance, but until now we have neglected one fundamental approach – looking into the future. As early as 1978 the report to the Club of Rome, „No Limits to Learning“ (Botkin, Elmandjra, Malitza, 1978) called for „anticipatory learning“, i.e. learning from possible future situations and not only from the past.

While it is necessary to study the history of development assistance to learn from past mistakes, it is not enough. The past can be studied, and various interpretations can be made, but it can never be changed. In contrast, the future is not predetermined (cannot be known), but it can be influenced by our choices. There are thousands of history departments at universities and other academic institutions, but there are not many of such groups focused on exploring alternative futures and future opportunities, as well as threats.

According to Roy Amara (1981) the future is not predictable. But the future is also not predetermined, people have freedom of choice. As the future is not predetermined and we have freedom of choice, it can be influenced by our choices (even if only slightly sometimes). As the future can be influenced by the choices we make, it makes sense to study and see the future in all its diversity, and to try to affect it in a desirable way. This also applies to development assistance/cooperation. We need to know the history and the present, but above all, the possible futures.

Nobel Prize Winner in Economics, Amartya Sen, who has devoted himself to the relations between poverty and development, is of the view that poverty is not a lack of income, but the inability to live fully because of the lack of economic means. To put it differently, one cannot develop one’s creative potential³ (Sen, 1999).

Lessons From History

First we will have a look at how, in the second half of the 20th century, people explained the fact that some nations were rich and others poor, and why development assistance had not lifted developing countries out of the poverty trap. There are three guidelines that seek explanation:

Dependency theory (theory of core and periphery)

The roots of dependency theory go back to the early 20th century, when John A. Hobson defined imperialism as the colonial expansion of Western capitalist states, which in this way, seek new markets and expand the outlets for their products⁴.

The most influential advocate of dependency theory was the Argentine economist, Raúl Prebisch (1950, 1959), who considered the world economy as a hierarchical system where the „centre“ creates a dependent „periphery“. Ivo Budil (in: Waisová et al., 2005), pondering the popularity of dependency theory, offers a psychological explanation. If people find out that things are not going well, they may ask why this is so in two ways. Firstly: „What are we doing wrong?“ Secondly: „Who is to blame?“ Looking for an external enemy, thus trying to answer the second question, seems to be psychologically more bearable.

The influence of geographical and environmental factors

Jared Diamond (1997, 2005) and Jeffrey Sachs (2005, 2008) point to geographical location (for example, access to the sea) and the state of the environment⁵ as key factors for development and prosperity. With the exception of countries exporting oil and natural gas, there are only two states in the tropics that can be considered as developed and rich – Hong Kong⁶ and Singapore.

On the other hand, it is clear that geographical factors cannot explain everything. A textbook example is the huge difference in the development and wealth of the Dominican Republic and Haiti. Both states lie on the island of Hispaniola in the Caribbean Sea. While the Dominican Republic is a developing but stable country, Haiti has for decades been unable to escape from political instability and economic backwardness, with a degraded environment which is like nowhere else in the world (98 % of the land is deforested for example). However, Haiti, now the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, was, as a French colony in the late 18th century, by far the wealthiest Caribbean island (albeit in a slave society in which this wealth was distributed in an extremely unfair and disproportionate manner).

Cultural determinism

The Culturological approach asserts that „human resources“ are a decisive factor for prosperity. The roots of this „cultural determinism“ can be found in the classic work of the sociologist Max Weber (1950) from the beginning of the 20th Century, entitled „The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism“. Weber compared families of Protestant and Catholic denominations in Baden (Germany). He found that Protestants had, on average, higher incomes than Catholics. This led him to the well-known thesis on the interdependence of the Calvinist belief in predestination and a people focused on the future, asceticism, hard work and entrepreneurship, which are the essential pre-conditions for economic prosperity.

In 1985, Lawrence E. Harrison published a groundbreaking book entitled „Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind – The Latin American Case“. The culture is notably understood as a set of local values and norms shared by a particular community, which affects the degree of its prosperity. Harrison formulated four major factors that enable a society to achieve economic efficiency and prosperity. They are; the measure of social trust, the severity of the ethical system, the performance of the authorities (today we would probably use the term „good governance“) and a focus on continuous work, innovation, savings, and profit.

The Current Situation

One way to help developing countries finance their development is through development assistance, or more precisely, development cooperation⁷. The term development assistance first appeared after the Second World War, and after former colonies gained independence it became clear that the world was divided, not only into the capitalist „West“ and socialist „East“, but also into the developed „North“ and the poor and developing „South“. At the end of the 20th century, Western countries (traditional donors) were suffering from donor fatigue. For several decades they had been supplying developing (often highly corrupted) countries of the South with extensive financial and material aid, without any adequate results. Around that time, Central and Eastern European countries freed themselves from totalitarian communist regimes and emerged as new donors of development assistance. The citizens of these countries, however, needed and still need to be convinced that development assistance/cooperation is necessary and that it makes sense to allocate at least 0.1 % GDP per year to these activities.

1. The main reasons developed countries should provide development assistance is defined in some sort of „Ten Commandments“ by Michal Kaplan, director of the Czech Development Agency (in Nováček, 2011):
2. Religious and ethical reasons (it is morally right to help those who find themselves in need).
3. Prevention of armed conflicts and terrorism.
4. Prevention of illegal migration and organized crime.
5. Environmental protection and globally significant ecosystems protection.
6. Stabilization of the world economy, the emergence and development of new markets.
7. Application of the products and technologies of the assistance provider on the territory and markets of the beneficiary country.
8. Promotion of employment, particularly among young people (if they are abroad, then also their better professional and language skills as well as experience with a different culture).

9. Improved diplomatic relations with recipient countries.
10. Greater prestige and influence on the international political scene.
11. Promotion of our values and culture (of course not in an aggressive and arrogant way, but rather by example).
12. Nowadays, all economically developed countries, including ex-Soviet ones, provide foreign assistance. That is why we need to think hard about the future of development assistance/aid.

Future Challenges

Let us return once again to our fundamental question – why are the poor poor and the rich rich? The answer might lie somewhere other than in the known theories of development. Or rather, every development theory has some truth in itself, but what we need is to attempt to create some inventive synthesis. Here is a proposal for three main building blocks for such a synthesis:

Future-oriented thinking

Future-oriented thinking is perhaps the main key to prosperity and success. Max Weber pointed to the Protestant ethic and its influence on the development of capitalism in Europe and North America. The ability to postpone current consumption, together with savings, investment and hard work, and with the vision of God's salvation after this life are typical examples of future-oriented thinking which determines our current behaviour and actions. The opposite is the attitude of a person or a whole community who live only for the day without caring about the future. It would therefore be desirable to formulate a Future Oriented Thinking Index (FOTI), which would complement such indexes as Gross Domestic Product, the Human Development Index, and others.

Public space and its maintenance

Public space and its maintenance is a good indicator of a society's material and moral maturity. There are communities and entire countries where people take care of their common areas, especially through various civic initiatives, associations, and organizations. In such a space you can feel comfortable and safe. On the other hand, there are communities and countries where, inside their private space, people live in comfortable and decent conditions, but a few metres from their home a „no man's land“ begins that resembles a junkyard, with medieval hygienic conditions, and it is neither safe nor comfortable.

Education

Education itself cannot guarantee prosperity, but it develops the creative potential of an individual to work, if motivated and willing, towards their own as well as their community's prosperity. The two above mentioned factors are conditioned by education.

An illiterate person will not normally think in the long term, but will more likely live from day to day. An educated person will more likely have at heart, not only his own good and that of his immediate family, but also the good of the community (although this is not always the case⁸).

Do We Need a New „Marshall Plan“?

By the year 2015 the Millennium Development Goals should have been achieved, and it is clear today that they will not be. Certainly, all eight major goals will not be achieved, (the situation is particularly pitiful in Sub-Saharan Africa). Therefore we are already seeking to answer the questions: „How should we proceed after the year 2015? What should replace the Millennium Development Goals?⁹ What vision can be credible and feasible?“

There is example from the past which could become an inspiration for the future – the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan, or the „European Recovery Program“ was announced by the U.S. Secretary of State, George Marshall on June 5th, 1947. He was, along with the U.S. President Harry S. Truman, the creator and initiator of the plan. The European Recovery Program was approved by the United States Congress on April 3rd, 1948. Under this plan, between 1948 and 1952 the United States provided aid amounting to US \$ 13.3 billion, equivalent to more than US \$ 100 billion today¹⁰. This plan included, not excluded, the main enemy of the war, Germany. The cooperation laid the foundation for the future progressive unification of the countries of Europe and also a close Atlantic partnership¹¹.

The idea of the Global Marshall Plan was revived in the 1990s by the American senator and later, Vice-President, Albert Gore (1992). For Al Gore the Global Marshall Plan was a gradual realization of strategic goals, focused mainly on environmental issues. The integrating goal of the plan should be the establishment of the social and political conditions that would most contribute to the emergence of a sustainable society. The idea of a new „Marshall Plan“ in various regional and sectoral variations was supported by many celebrities, such as the South African President and Nobel Peace Prize winner, Frederik Willem de Klerk (he proposed a „Marshall Plan for Africa“), the German President Horst Köhler, the Austrian President Heinz Fischer, and the President of the Club of Rome, Prince El-Hassan bin Talaal of Jordan.

There are also „variations“ on the Global Marshall Plan, such as the „Global Green Deal“ by Mark Hertsgaard (1998). Hertsgaard was inspired by President Franklin D. Roosevelt´s New Deal from the 1930s, which was designed to propel the American economy out of a prolonged economic crisis. In May 2003, a group of academics, politicians, media representatives and people dealing with international development assembled for discussion. They agreed to establish the „Global Marshall Plan Initiative¹². The initiative is particularly valuable thanks to the relatively sophisticated suggestions concerning how to finance the Global Marshall Plan without burdening the budgets of individual countries (see below).

Financing the new Marshall Plan according to the Global Marshall Plan Initiative

The Zedillo Report¹³ published by the UN in 2001, calculated that the amount of financial provision needed to reach the Millennium Development Goals was US \$ 50 billion per year. In addition to these funds, another US \$ 100 billion per year would be needed to implement the Global Marshall Plan.

International development aid is currently slightly over US \$ 100 billion, representing approximately 0.3 % of the GDP of the donor countries. With the implementation of the Global Marshall Plan, the figure would rise to 0.5 – 0.6 % of GDP. It would still be below 0.7 % of GDP, the target adopted by the international community in the 1970s.

The model for the Global Marshall Plan is the assistance which, after the Second World War, was provided to Europe by the United States through the Marshall Plan. It was financed by the United States over a period of four years, with an investment of 1.3 % of its GDP. A similar amount, 1 % GDP of the member states, is the budget of the European Union.

The experience shows that it is rather unlikely that the funds needed to implement the Global Marshall Plan could be obtained from the budgets of the member states. Therefore, the Global Marshall Plan Initiative came up with an unconventional and innovative way of raising funds which is partly based on the input of the former British Finance Minister and later Prime Minister, Gordon Brown and the financier, George Soros.

Special Drawing Rights of the International Monetary Fund

The financier, George Soros, proposed the use of the Special Drawing Rights of the IMF to finance the development. Special Drawing Rights are loans that are available to a specific country in times of need of an amount proportional to its contribution to the IMF. One advantage is that a developing country pays into the fund in its own, often weak currency, but gets access to loans in a strong currency. George Soros suggested that in future the authorization to draw from the fund be approved annually. This would mean that the surplus amount of US \$ 10 billion would be used in poor countries to implement development projects. Moreover, rich countries should allow the use of their share, around US \$ 18 billion, to finance the development. The Global Marshall Plan Initiative proposes an allocation to the poor countries of the South of US \$ 30 – 40 billion every year via the Special Drawing Rights.

Financial transaction tax

The proposal is based on various modifications to the Tobin tax¹⁴, a tax on global financial operations, and the revenues would be used to finance the global development goals. The proposal is based on a very low tax rate which would only be used to solve problems at the global level. The implementation of at least a minimal charge on all global financial transactions of 0.01 % should be considered. If it worked, the tax could be increased

to a final value of 0.02 %. The minimal variation (0.01 %) of the Tobin tax would raise, according to the estimates of the „Global Marshall Plan Initiative“, around US \$ 30 – 40 billion annually for the implementation of the Global Marshall Plan.

Terra tax on world trade

Another financial instrument could be the implementation of a world tax on trade. The tax on trade would be in accord with the principles of „Fair Trade“. Economic sectors and businesses have significantly globalized. Multinational (global) corporations are able to avoid taxation at the national level as well as standards (environmental and social) that apply in developed countries.

In this way, they gain an immense comparative advantage over other businesses that are subject to national taxation and other standards. It has led to the situation where the turnover of the 15 largest multinational corporations is higher than the overall economic performance of the 60 poorest countries. States then have to compensate for the loss of tax revenue by raising taxes on citizens and on small and medium-sized businesses that are tightly bound to a given country.

Therefore the third factor to take into account when financing the Global Marshall Plan is the introduction of a „terra tax“ on world trade, amounting to 0.35 – 0.5 %. The taxation should be the same for all areas of international trade. Given the current level of world trade, the tax would provide an income of around US \$ 30 – 40 billion each year. (Radermacher, J., 2004; www.globalmarshallplan.org)

The Global Marshall Plan, if implemented, has the potential to become the catalyst for far-reaching positive changes. The requirement is that it is not just the sum of its many component activities and projects (as happens to various „development partnerships“, including MDG´s), but a complex, coordinated, and future-oriented plan. Furthermore, it must be a plan with definable, measurable, and achievable goals.

In 1999, as a member of the Millennium Project Planning Committee, I proposed that a study „Global Partnership for Development“ be undertaken to further elaborate the idea of a new Marshall Plan¹⁵. The study consisted of a two-round questionnaire followed by interviews with politicians, representatives of non-governmental organizations, academics, and other personalities. The aim of the study was to explore the possibilities for effective policies and assess their possible implementation.

The two-rounds of questionnaires and interviews with experts were carried out with 80 people from 20 countries. Progress towards the sustainable development of all regions is one of the leading global issues. In the same way the Marshall Plan helped in the middle of the 20th century to restore a war-stricken Europe, a similar plan, conducted at the global level, might help the developing countries move more quickly toward sustainable development.

The countries that were rebuilt after the Second World War had an entrepreneurial and industrial tradition, and therefore the financial and technical assistance significantly helped these countries over a very short time. Much of the developing world does not have this tradition today. Therefore, the efforts will have to be much greater and more complex than the original Marshall Plan.

If the funds were available, the most desirable long-term goal would be to eradicate extreme poverty and the most dangerous diseases, and to integrate ecological and economic development. The most important and feasible projects for such a partnership are primarily: ecologically oriented agriculture that would reduce water and energy consumption, international cultural, educational, and scientific exchanges, access to information technologies (especially the Internet), and immunization programs.

The key preconditions for the successful implementation of the new Marshall Plan include:

- Projects that are long enough and intensive enough to contribute to a substantial change (ranked highest according to the criteria of importance and likelihood of implementation).
- Respect for human rights and international laws in the recipient countries (rated most important but with the lowest likelihood of implementation).

It is important to show the success of similar projects and initiatives to help persuade politicians to implement a new, global Marshall Plan. For example:

- The original Marshall Plan showed for the first time that a broad-scale international development project could be successful; this project was so different from the numerous „partnerships“, which are often announced today but prove to be ineffective.
- The initiatives of the World Health Organization (successful eradication of smallpox) and Rotary Club International at a nongovernmental level (polio vaccination).
- Earth Day launched a global movement. Earth Day epitomizes the transformation of a vague concept into local, specific activities around the world.

There are goals that can be understood as essential and acceptable across cultural barriers. These goals are: the elimination of violence against women, the promotion of primary education and the development of crafts, the eradication of some diseases (leprosy, child polio, etc.) and the elimination of other contagious diseases, as well as access to safe water.

Other important development objectives include the construction of infrastructure (transport, telecommunications), effective public administration, and the creation of a middle class, which represents a stabilizing element of society. Effective and environmentally friendly technologies and the enhancement of research and development capacities should also be mentioned among crucial development goals.

The objective of the new Marshall Plan should be to help the recipient country achieve the level necessary to attract private investors and ensure its ability to conduct proper negotiations with foreign investors. Therefore, the priority is to invest in the development of human resources. In other words, it is about sharing information and knowledge in education, public administration, and the development of the civil sector.

The New Marshall Plan should consist of two phases. The first, short-term phase should assist the country (or region) to emerge from a crisis and stabilize the situation. The first phase should last for a limited period of time, about four years, which is the same amount of time the original Marshall Plan lasted.

The second, longer-term phase should help the country become a medium developed country with an annual GDP per capita around US \$ 10,000, where the business environment and entrepreneurial activities are sufficiently developed, and where investments, especially of private capital, can flow into the country. The ultimate objective of the new Marshall Plan should be to reach the threshold of sustainable development that is approximately US \$ 20,000 per capita per year. The entire second phase requires, not only economic changes possibly accompanied by political changes, but also social and cultural changes. Social and cultural changes are long-term tasks that might take an estimated two generations, i.e. about 40 years, to be accomplished.

The coordinating body of the new Marshall Plan (whoever it may be) should closely cooperate with states, non-governmental organizations, private companies, and the academic sphere. It would correspond to a trans-institutional organization, as defined by Jerome C. Glenn, Director of the Millennium Project (see below). These participants could formulate project proposals that would be in accordance with the structure of the Global Marshall Plan. Subsequently, they could obtain resources for their implementation from the coordinating organization, or they could, in cooperation with the coordinating body, seek partners for financing and implementing the projects.

Transinstitutional Organization

According to J. Glenn we need to create a new type of institution, a „transinstitution“. It should have following characteristics:

- It is funded by at least four of the following categories, but none of them finances more than half its budget: government, the business sector, the non-government sector, the UN or other international organizations, foundations, universities, and individuals.
- It has a board of trustees, the members of which represent all the above types of institution, but no institution has an absolute majority of members.
- It employs or hires employees and consultants from all the above types of institutions but no institution has an absolute majority of employees or consultants.

- It provides products or services or other outputs purchased or used by all the above mentioned types of institutions.

The transinstitutional organization could be a special type of non-profit organization. It would cooperate with governments, corporations, universities, NGOs, the UN and other international organizations as well as individuals. When dealing with a government, political conduct is required, when dealing with a for-profit corporation, it is necessary to respect its interests and points of view, when dealing with an academic establishment, the theoretical knowledge must be on a par. When dealing with an NGO, it is important to focus on the ethical issues of the problem, and when dealing with the UN, the global and international aspects of the subject matter must be considered. On a regular basis people or organizations do not pursue these courses of conduct. Their thinking and behaviour tend to be more analytical and specialized, with a focus on a certain section of reality. (Glenn, J., Gordon, T., 2007)

The structure of the coordinating body can be based on the plan for a reformed UN structure as presented by Josef Vavroušek (Vavroušek, J., in Prins, G., editor, 1993).

The proposed structure of the new (global) Marshall Plan coordinating body

Primary structure	Secondary structure GMP system for Africa	Secondary structure GMP system for Europe... (and other regions)	General mission GMP global system
GMP security system	African security	European security... (and other regions)	Global security
GMP social system	African social and cultural development and health care	European social and cultural development and health care... (and other regions)	Global social and cultural development and health care
GMP economic system	African economic development	European economic development... (and other regions)	Global economic development
GMP environmental system	African protection of Nature and renewal of the environment	European protection of Nature and renewal of the environment... (and other regions)	Global protection of Nature and renewal of the environment
General mission (GMP global system)	Sustainable development in Africa	Sustainable development in Europe... (and other regions)	Sustainable planetary development

At the beginning, the new Marshall Plan would coordinate only a limited number of pilot projects, with limited resources. The aim of these first few years would be to learn how to use the funds effectively to produce coordinated and efficient action. The „big money“ would come later, perhaps from the global tax or Tobin tax, or from other financial resources, as proposed by the „Global Marshall Plan Initiative“.

First of all, it is necessary to gain confidence in the New Marshall Plan's abilities to prove that it is able to achieve positive, definable and measurable outcomes.

Conclusion

We can study the past and present of development assistance/cooperation. We can try to describe the future of development assistance and affect it accordingly. This requires, above all, rational thinking and the employment of our intellectual capacities. For development assistance/cooperation to be effective, however, we need public support, both in developed and developing countries. We need to win not only people's minds, but even more importantly, their hearts.

In 1999 when I was lecturing in „Development/Environment Issues“ at the College of the Atlantic in Maine (USA), an Irish student, Mary Raikes, expressed it brilliantly in her essay:

On October 14, 1987 Baby Jessica McClure at 18 months old, fell into a 22 ft. well. A poll taken by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press measuring the coverage of Princess Diana's death reported that in the last decade, only Jessica's rescue compared to the world media coverage of Diana's death. At the time of Jessica's accident, donations to help her totalled nearly \$247,000. After the rescue, gifts such as giant toys, furniture, clothing, and an accumulation of \$ 1 million, to be given to her at the age of 25, were given. ... At the time of Jessica's rescue, 40 000 children under the age of 5 died every day and 500 million people went to bed hungry every night. Why is it that with so many different opportunities to help world hunger, we focus our attention on a single individual? I believe the answer lies deep in our roots, even back to our primate ancestors. Humans can relate to issues close to home. We prefer to deal with issues concerning our own family, town, and country most. Humans generally don't care about issues until they affect them directly.

This is probably the greatest challenge for the future of development assistance: winning people's hearts and inspiring them to feel an affinity for people and communities that are far away both culturally and geographically.

2,000 years ago Seneca said: „I am not born for one corner; the whole world is my native land.“ Rationally, we are well aware of this in our present era of globalization. Nonetheless, we often behave as if we were not part of a global community, because in our hearts we do not feel that way.

This brings us to an important aspect of and precondition for development assistance in relation to global education as well as development education; „learning without borders“. But this would be a whole new topic and essay.

References

- Amara, Roy. 1985. "Hľadanie vymedzenia a hraníc vyzkumu buducnosti" In *Prognosticke informacie 4*. Bratislava: Kabinet teorie vedy a prognoz SAV, (in Slovak).
- Botkin, James, Mahdi Elmandjra and Mircea Malitza. 1978. *No Limits to Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Budil, Ivo. 2005. "Teorie závislosti, kulturní determinismus a prosperita" In *Ve stínu modernity. Perspektivy a problémy rozvoje*, edited by Šárka Waisová et al., 33-49. Plzeň: Vyd. a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk (in Czech).
- Diamond, Jared. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking Books.
- Dušková, Lenka et al. 2011. *Encyklopedie rozvojových studií*. Olomouc: Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého (in Czech).
- Frankl, Viktor. 2006. *Vůle ke smyslu. Vybrane přednášky o logoterapii*. Praha: Cesta (in Czech).
- Glenn, Jerome C., Theodore J. Gordon. 2007. *State of the Future*. Washington, D.C.: The Millennium Project.
- Gore, Al. 1992. *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Harrison, Lawrence E. 1985. *Underdevelopment Is a State of Mind – The Latin American Case*. Landham: The Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
- Hertsgaard, Mark. 1998. *Earth Odyssey. Around the World in Search of Our Environmental Future*. New York: Broadway.
- Hobson, John A. 1965. *Imperialism: A Study*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Nováček, Pavel. 2001a. *Partnership for Sustainable Development* In Glenn, Jerome C., Theodore J. Gordon. 2007. *State of the Future*. Washington, D.C.: The Millennium Project.
- Nováček, Pavel. 2001b. "Do We Need a Global 'Marshall Plan'?" *Futures Research Quarterly*. 17(1): 61-67.
- Nováček, Pavel, Peter Mederly. 2002. *Global Partnership for Development*. Olomouc: Millennium Project, Central European Node.
- Nováček, Pavel. 2003. "A Proposed Global Partnership for Development." *Futures Research Quarterly* 19(3): 63-77.
- Nováček, Pavel, Peter Mederly, Pierre C. Armand. 2008. *Marshall Plan for Haiti. Initial Project of the Global Partnership for Development. Un Plan Marshall Pour Haiti. Un Projet Initial du Partenariat Mondial pour le Développement*. Olomouc: Millennium Project, Central European Node.
- Nováček, Pavel. 2011. *Sustainable Development*. Olomouc: Palacky University Press.
- Prebisch, Raúl. 1950. *The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems*. New York: United Nations.
- Prebisch, Raúl. 1959. "Commercial Policy in the Underdeveloped Countries." *American Economic Review* 49: 251-273.
- Prins, Gwyn, ed. 1993. *Threats Without Enemies. The Global Security Programme*. London: Earthscan.
- Radermacher, Franz J. 2004. *Global Marshall Plan. A Planetary Contract for a Worldwide Eco-Social Market Economy*. Hamburg: Global Marshall Plan Initiative.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. 2005. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. New York: Penguin Press.

Sachs, Jeffrey. 2008. *Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet*. New York: Penguin Press.

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vavroušek, Josef. 1993. "Perspektivy lidských hodnot slučitelných s trvale udržitelným způsobem života" In *Lidské hodnoty a trvale udržitelný způsob života. Sborník přednášek*, edited by Pavel Nováček and Josef Vavroušek, 91-100. Vydavatelství Univerzity Palackého, Olomouc (in Czech).

Weber, Mark. 1950. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner.

Notes

¹ Development assistance/aid, or development cooperation, is an outside intervention in developing countries, designed to introduce a positive social change, most frequently to reduce poverty. Its concept is rooted in the context of the post-World War II period. The former term of „development aid“ has been replaced over the past twenty years by the term „development cooperation“, reflecting the shared responsibility of the donor and the recipient for the efficient and meaningful application of the aid. (Dušková, L., et. al., 2011)

² Sustainable development, or a sustainable lifestyle, aims to achieve the ideals of humanism and harmonious relationships between human beings and nature. It is a way of life that searches for a balance between the freedom and rights of each individual and his or her responsibility to other people and nature as a whole, including responsibility to future generations. (Vavroušek, 1993)

³ Amartya Sen emphasizes human capabilities and their development. In his view, human development can be understood as the process of enlarging people's choices. These potential choices may be unlimited and change over time.

⁴ The theory was formulated by John A. Hobson (1965) in his book „Imperialism“, first published in 1902.

⁵ Among environmental factors the most important are: deforestation and habitat destruction, soil problems (erosion, salinity and decline of soil fertility), difficulty in managing water resources, excessive hunting, overfishing, the effects of imported species on native species, and human population growth with its increasing impact on the environment. Currently we should add also climate change caused by humans, the accumulation of toxic substances in the environment, energy shortages and the full utilization of the photosynthetic capacity of the Earth. (Diamond, 2005)

⁶ It is a city-state, a former colony of Great Britain, which has been part of China since 1999.

⁷ Domestic resources are the primary source of financing development policies (mainly through taxation and duties). Among significant external resources are, in addition to programs and projects of development cooperation, revenues from exports, foreign direct investment, and, more recently, remittances (money sent by immigrants or people working abroad to their loved one's at home).

⁸ You would be tempted to say that European countries are rich and mature, because all three factors are at a higher level than in Africa and the Middle East. So why is it that in these countries individuals and states so outrageously and irresponsibly run into debt? Why is the voter turnout so low (typically about 50 %) in the established democracies, and why can you clearly sense in society an apathy and indifference to public affairs? Why is education insidiously turning into „infotainment“ – the desire to have fun and not bother too much, even at the expense of quality? Maybe natural, cultural, economic or institutional factors, future-oriented thinking, public space and education are not some sort of Gordian knot, but they are, in the words of Viktor Frankl (2006), the will to meaning: „A society of prosperity or a nation of prosperity is basically able to meet all the needs of man, while the consumer society only creates individual needs. Unfortunately one need remains unsatisfied – the will to meaning – the need to find a meaning in one's life, or better still in every life situation – and to devote oneself to it, to fulfil it!“

⁹ Millennium Development Goals will almost certainly be replaced by „Sustainable Development Goals“ in 2015 which will probably be even more ambitious than MDGs.

¹⁰ <http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall>

¹¹ <http://lcweb.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/m41.html>

¹² The project was initiated by the Club of Rome, The Ecosocial Forum Europe, the Global Contract Foundation, and the Club of Budapest.

¹³ Ernesto Zedillo, former President of Mexico, chaired a group of experts („High-Level Panel on Financing for Development“) who presented documents in preparation for the Conference on Financing for Development, held in Monterrey, Mexico, in 2002.

¹⁴ In 1972 economist James Tobin suggested the imposition of a tax on foreign-exchange transactions, so that governments could regain the opportunity to effectively influence macroeconomic and national monetary policies. The Tobin tax would make spot conversions less profitable because transferring large amounts into a country and then quickly withdrawing them again would be more expensive. The tax should be higher for short-term operations and lower for long-term operations linked to foreign trade and direct investment. A 0.25 %, or 0.15 % is being discussed. With a 0.25 % tax, the estimated annual yield would reach US \$ 300 billion.

¹⁵ The outcomes of the study are presented in the following publications: Nováček (2001a), Nováček (2001b), Nováček, Mederly (2002), Nováček (2003), and Nováček, Mederly, Armand (2008).