# Reading Tips and Study Questions: Session 16
# Multi-level planning—November 7th

**Required reading:**

1. Pp. 333-338 in **Catherine Caufield**, *Masters of Illusion: The World Bank and the Poverty of Nations* (New York: Henry Holt, 1996).

2. **Balakrishnan Rajagopal**, "The Role of Law in Counter-Hegemonic Globalization and Global Legal Pluralism: Lessons from the Narmada Valley struggle in India," Vol.18, No.3, 1 *Leiden Journal of International Law* (2005).

3. *Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making* (**The Report of the World Commission on Dams**, Nov. 2000), chapter 7, available at www.dams.org.

**Further reading (not required)**

Harsh Sethi, *Survival and Democracy: Ecological Struggles in India* in Poona Wignaraja ed., *New Social Movements in the South* (1993) at 122-148.

**Tips and questions**

The planning decisions in the Narmada case have been taken not only by government and civil society groups (as a simple dichotomy) but by myriad distinct actors: multiple levels of government, multiple government jurisdictions that the project traverses, influential international agencies (The World Bank, International Labor Organization, United Nations Development Program, and bilateral funders), local social movement organizations, and local and national and "transnational" advocacy groups and networks of same. This is "multi-level planning."

1. **Caufield** concludes her critique of the World Bank's fifty-year history with a look at why the Bank needs to continue lending and how this gives the Bank leverage over the laws, development aims, project decisions, and more of borrower nations. This brief reading is useful background for the decision memo; it brings the Bank's role to the forefront.

2. According to **Rajagopal**, why did the mobilization begin in the Valley at first, what forms did it take and who was responsible for initiating it? Could the planners of the project have anticipated the mobilization and done anything to address it? Don't let the legal theory terminology dissuade you, especially if it's unfamiliar: Look past the specialized terms to the main ideas. You will NOT be asked to write about legal theory.

3. What concrete forms did the mobilization take locally versus globally, and how would you judge its effectiveness?  Does formal democracy constrain or enable social mobilization as a form of planning? In light of the **World Commission** report and the specifics of the Narmada case, is mobilization simply a critique—a *reaction* against traditional forms of development planning—or might it be an articulation of real *alternatives* to development planning practice?