Aalto University
School of Business

The WTO and ambiguous language of development. A rhetorical analysis of the development discourse of the World Trade Organization.

Finnish Business Communication

Master's thesis

Laura Kangas

2013

Department of Communication
Aalto University
School of Business

AALTO UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ASBTRACT
Communication Master's Thesis
Laura Kangas

The WTO and the ambiguous language of development.
A rhetorical analysis of the development discourse of the World Trade Organization

Objective of the study
This study analyses the development discourse of the WTO by examining the texts of ministerial statements made during the 7th WTO Ministerial Conference. The objective is to discover both how and through what kinds of rhetorical means is development linguistically constructed in WTO's development discourse. The focus lies on three distinctive aspects of the development discourse: on the concept of development, on the relationship between trade and development, and on the roles and power positions of developed and developing countries in tackling development.

Methodology and the Theoretical Framework
Epistemologically, the vantage point of this study is post-structuralism and critical discourse analysis, which bring emphasis into the subjectivity of all interpretations and truth claims and draw focus on how knowledge is produced in discursive structures and signifying practices. Rhetorical analysis, particularly the theories of Chaïm Perelman and Kenneth Burke, are applied as an interpretive framework for the empirical analysis. Thus, the rhetorical means constructing the development discourse are examined; notably, the argumentation techniques, premises of the argumentation, rhetoric process of identification and symbolism. Whereas rhetorical analysis examines the linguistic construction of the discourse, the content of the development discourse is analysed by drawing from a theoretical framework constructed from diverse conceptualizations of development according to different paradigms of development studies.

Findings and Conclusions
Development as a concept is abstract or focused on the economic, human or structural approach. Development is deemed to be a value judgement that can be a mutual goal only when left undefined. The economic aspect is predominant and the additional references stem from the grand narratives representing a very traditional approach to development. The adherence to neoliberal ideology is the most common premise of the argumentation supplemented by appeals to emotions and sense of moral. The relationship between trade and development is understood in three ways: trade is either beneficial, potentially beneficial or detrimental for development. The benefits of free trade are presented as a belief, a fact or a possibility, but the arguments are not justified. The minority discourse emphasizes disadvantages of free trade and the arguments are supported by presenting causal ties or examples. Colourful and symbolic language is used representing resistance to the assumingly prevailing discourse. Development is seen to concern both developed and developing countries, but additionally, the role of developed countries as enablers of development is emphasized. Also direct accusations are made about the conscious actions of developed countries hindering development. Particularly the traditional view of development and the prevalence of neoliberalism as premise for the argumenatation are interesting findings in comparison to the multifaceted approach of more recent development studies and development co-operation. The abstract nature of development can be seen as problematic for the delivery of measurable results in development.

Key words: WTO, development, international trade, rhetorics, discourse analysis,

AALTO-YLIOPISTON KAUPPAKORKEAKOULU TIIVISTELMÄ
Talouselämän viestinnän pro-gradu tutkielma
Laura Kangas

WTO ja kehityksen monitulkintainen kieli.
Retorinen analyysi Maailman kauppajärjestön kehitysdiskurssista

Tavoitteet
Tutkielma analysoi WTO:n kehitysdiskurssia tarkastelemalla seitsemännessä ministerikokouksessa esitettyjä ministerien puheenvuoroja. Tavoitteena on selvittää miten ja millaisten retoristen keinojen kautta kehitys kielellisesti rakentuu WTO:n kehitysdiskurssissa. Tarkastelu keskittyy kolmeen WTO:n kehitysdiskurssin näkökohtaan: kehityksen käsitteeseen, kaupan ja kehityksen väliseen suhteeseen sekä kehittyneiden ja kehitysmaiden rooleihin ja valta-asemiin kehitykseen puuttumisessa.

Metodologia ja teoreettinen viitekehys
Epistemologisesti tutkielma nojaa poststrukturalismiin ja kriittiseen diskurssianalyysiin, jotka painottavat kaiken tiedon näkökulmasidonnaisuutta ja kiinnittävät huomion siihen, miten tietoa tuotetaan diskurssijärjestyksissä ja merkityksellistämisen käytännöissä. Retorinen analyysi ja erityisesti Chaïm Perelmanin sekä Kennet Burken lähestymistavat rakentavat tulkinnallisen viitekehyksen empiirisen analyysin tarkasteluun. Täten tarkastellaan kehitysdiskurssia rakentavia retorisia keinoja ja erityisesti argumentaatiotekniikoita, argumentaation premissejä, identifikaation retorisuutta sekä symbolismia. Retorisen analyysin avulla tarkastellaan diskurssin kielellistä rakentumista, kun taas diskurssin sisältöä tarkastellaan teoreettisen viitekehyksen kautta, joka muodostuu kehitystutkimuksen paradigmojen eri tavoista käsitteellistää kehitys.

Tulokset
Kehitys on käsitteenä abstrakti tai painottaa kehityksen taloudellista, inhimillistä tai strukturalistista puolta. Kehitys tulkitaan arvoperusteiseksi päätelmäksi, joka voi olla yhteinen tavoite ainoastaan määrittelemättömänä. Taloudellinen näkemys on hallitseva ja suuri osa eri näkökulmista perustuu hyvin perinteistä kehitysnäkemystä edustaviin kehitystutkimuksen pääteorioihin. Neoliberaalin ideologian seuraaminen on yleisin argumentaation premissi, mutta argumentaatio vetoaa myös yleisön tunteisiin ja moraalikäsitykseen. Kaupan ja kehityksen suhde nähdään kolmella eri tavalla: kauppa on hyödyllistä, mahdollisesti hyödyllistä tai haitallista kehitykselle. Vapaan kaupan hyödyt esitetään pääasiassa uskomuksena, faktana tai mahdollisuutena, eikä argumentteja perustella. Vähemmistödiskurssissa taas painotetaan vapaan kaupan haittoja ja argumentit pyritään perustelemaan esimerkiksi kausaalisuhteen osoittamisen tai esimerkkien käyttämisen avulla. Värikästä ja symbolista kieltä käytetään edustettaessa oletettavasti vallitsevan diskurssin vastarintaa. Kehityksen nähdään koskevan sekä kehittyneitä että kehitysmaita, mutta lisäksi painotetaan kehittyneiden maiden roolia kehityksen mahdollistajina. Myös suoria syytöksiä esitetään koskien kehittyneiden maiden tietoisia kehitystä haittaavia toimia. Erityisesti perinteisen kehityskäsityksen painottaminen sekä neoliberalismin vallitsevuus argumentaation premissinä ovat kiinnostavia tuloksia verrattuna viime aikaisen kehitystutkimuksen ja -yhteistyön monipuolisempiin lähestymistapoihin. Kehityksen abstraktisuus voidaan nähdä ongelmallisena kehitysyhteistyön mitattavien tulosten tuottamisen kannalta.

Avainsanat: WTO, kehitys, kansainvälinen kauppa, retoriikka, diskurssianalyysi,

1. Introduction

Development is a concept, which is commonly used, but rarely defined. As a matter of fact, no single phenomenon that could be unambiguously explained by the term development has ever existed. Academics, politicians and development-workers have for decades used the term in reference to approaches and methods that are diverse and even outright contradictory. Few might argue that increase in literacy rate wouldn't count as development, but the group of sceptics grows by a leap when it comes to issues such as increase in liberalization of markets.

Ambiguity is at stake also when countries are designated the endemic titles of developing or developed country. The developed-developing dichotomy, despite being widely used, is an utter simplification impossible to apply to modern world of heterogonous countries. The problematic behind these notions becomes obvious when the two terms are scrutinized more detailed: whereas the dynamic term 'developing' would imply that countries are in continuous process of change, 'developed' countries would seem to have reached an eligible static level of development. If such level exists, how is this defined and by whom? While the term development can be and often is supplemented by acres of words, such as economic, financial, social, human, environmental, ecological or sustainable, it seems worth questioning whether any country can be developed in all aspects. Moreover, in some parts of the world, 'developing' countries are alas in fact better characterized by the absolute lack of development or even reverse development.

This scrutiny returning to the notion of development and the concepts of development studies is necessary especially due to the grave need for more systematic knowledge production for development. In order to response to pressures concerning measuring and showing results, outcomes and impact – activities increasingly required for development work due to trends such as results-based management – there must be an understanding on *what* is being measured.

At least as contentious as the concept of development itself, is the role of international trade in it. The views of different ideologies and theoretical paradigms vary from deeming international trade as the main saviour for developing countries, as the main culprit for

their plight or as something in the middle. However, the link between these two phenomena is generally recognized. Also World Trade Organization (WTO), the keystone of the contemporary legal and institutional multilateral trading system, states that its agreements recognize the link between trade and development and endeavour to support development. The development aspect of the WTO has become topical especially during the last decade, since the latest negotiation round commencing in 2001 was titled Doha Development Agenda (DDA) aiming to place the development concerns at the heart of negotiations.

Nevertheless, WTO and its predecessor GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) bear murky reputation of being undemocratic bodies advocating the interests of rich and powerful members. Critics argue that naming the round Development Agenda has remained as a mere ostensible gesture, especially since the attempt to emphasize the interests of developing countries has resulted in an insurmountable deadlock in the trade negotiations that have lasted already over a decade. The impasse in negotiations is a sum of many complex issues, but, in essence, the negotiations are not advancing as long as the developing countries feel that their developed counterparts are not fulfilling the commitments they made on supporting development.

This setting provides a fruitful background for research in development knowledge. By representing one example of the intricacies of development matters, the context exemplifies how development can be endemically referred to and highlighted but yet prone to engender ambiguity and discrepancy. My thesis seizes upon this problematic by analysing the development discourse of the WTO. My research material, further described in chapter 4, consists of ministerial statements made in the plenary session of the 7th Ministerial Conference held in 30th November to 2nd December in 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. The notions on development included in these statements provide a great example of WTO's development discourse, since being an organization that belongs to its members, the Ministerial Conference is WTO's highest body of authority.

The topic of my thesis is interdisciplinary and touches upon the economic and social research regarding development studies. However, my focus lies on the linguistic construction of these themes; moreover, on what kind of understanding of development is

linguistically constructed in the statements and how. The theoretical vantage point is post structuralism, which brings emphasis into the subjectivity of all interpretations and truth claims. The scrutiny focuses on how knowledge is produced in discursive structures and signifying practices, since the existence of any "absolute truth" behind these structures is deemed irrelevant. This theoretical underpinning legitimates the relevance of examining the linguistic choices made within the development discourse and notably, the examination of what kind of social reality of development the language produces and reproduces.

The purpose of my research is not to provide pragmatic or normative solutions for the insurmountable prevailing development challenges or for the problems concerning the deadlock of the Doha Round, but instead, to follow the perspective of cultural research, which aims to particularize understandings of the social. (Alasuutari, 1990, 371) Qualitative inquiry, such as the one I will conduct, is basically a means of reflection and self-reflection aiming at new insight about the cultural premises of social life.

Because the WTO and the latest trade negotiation round provide the context for my thesis, I briefly introduce them next.

1.1. World Trade Organization and the Doha Development Agenda

World Trade Organization offers a legal and institutional framework for international trade negotiations and is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between the countries. The inauguration of the organization dates back to 1995, when as a result of the Uruguay Round (1986-1994), the WTO was established as a more formal and institutionalized successor for General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. GATT was a flexible forum for trade liberalization founded in 1947 primarily with the purpose of reconstructing the war-torn economies after World War II. Initially largely limited to a tariff agreement, over time, as average tariff levels fell, the GATT came to focus increasingly on nontariff trade policies and domestic policies with an impact on trade. (Hoekman & Kostecki, 2001, 1)

Today, the main activities of the WTO consist of negotiating trade rules, administering and monitoring their application, reviewing trade policies of member states, settling trade disputes, assisting the process of accession of some 30 countries who are not yet members, and building capacity of developing countries in international trade matters. [1] At the core of the organization are the agreements negotiated and signed by the member countries. The underlying philosophy is that open trade, non-discrimination and global competition are vectors for economic growth and national welfare in all countries. (Hoekman & Kostecki, 2001, 1) Hence, the mission is "to open trade for the benefit of all"[2]. However, the liberalization of trade is not always the main goal and in some circumstance the rules support maintaining trade barriers, for example, to protect consumers, prevent the spread of disease or protect the environment.

WTO Agreements deal with vast amount of issues such as agriculture, textiles and clothing, banking, telecommunications, government purchases, industrial standards and product safety, food sanitation regulations, and intellectual property. However, there are basic principles that crosscut all these topics and that therefore consist the foundation of the multilateral trading system. Two of these central aspects of WTO's work are the Most Favoured Nation (MFN) clause and the National Treatment (NT) clause. While the principle of MFN binds members to treat good and services of all members in the same way, NT clause obliges not to discriminate between foreign and domestic products. (Ghafele, 2004, 444)

Despite the obscene benevolence WTO's mission statement and activities encompass, the organization and its operation principles have been widely and vehemently criticized throughout its existence. In fact, the organization is often blamed, alongside the Bretton Woods institutes, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, to embody the unequal world power structures and unjustness brought about by globalization and. This became strikingly apparent in Seattle, in 1999, when during a WTO Ministerial Conference over 30, 000 protestors gathered to demonstrate their denunciation towards the organization and global trade agenda. (Scott & Wilkinson, 2010, 142)

[1]About the WTO — a statement by the Director-General
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/wto_dg_stat_e.htm

[2] About the WTO — a statement by the Director-General
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/wto_dg_stat_e.htm

Probably the most well trodden rationale for criticism stems from WTO's alleged reputation as "Old World's Club" driven mainly by its rich and powerful members. Many low-income members do not have the resources to establish a diplomatic representation in Geneva, where the WTO is headquartered, and those low-income countries that have this, lack adequate human resources and technical infrastructure to have real impact on the WTO agenda. While most economically strong countries send an important number of trade experts to Geneva to deal exclusively with WTO issues, many low-income countries have couple of diplomats who cover all the UN agencies and activities in Geneva. As Ghafele (2004, 445) points out, this is why, for example, the Dispute Settlement Mechanism has never been made use of any sub-Saharan African country. Due to these asymmetries, the developed countries are generally criticised for dictating the trade rules. (see e.g. Stiglitz, 2002, 438)

In an attempt to response to these considerations, the WTO has devoted its latest round of trade negotiations to improving trading prospects of developing countries and thus, to supporting development. A unique feature of the Doha Round is the recognition that negotiations on market access and trade policy disciplines must be complemented by measures to assist developing country exporters, notably aid for trade. (Hoekman & Nicita, 2010, 67) Doha Round includes altogether 20 negotiation areas that include, for example, agriculture, market access for non-agricultural products (NAMA), services, trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS), trade facilitation, technical barriers to trade (TBT), dispute settlement understanding (DSU) and regional trade agreements. The negotiations are described as a "single undertaking", which means they form a single package to be signed by each country with a single signature without any option to pick and choose between different subjects. [3]

The Doha Development Round has been widely researched among scholars of economics, social sciences and law. For example, Andersson & Martin (2005) and Hoekman & Nicita (2010) plead for urgent completion of the Round due to its alleged substantial gains for developing countries. However, as already mentioned, the conclusion of the round has

[3] Doha Development Agenda - Subjects treated under the Doha Development Agenda http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dohasubjects_e.htm

proven particularly challenging. The negotiations have collapsed repeatedly and although the first deadline was in 2005 and has since been repeatedly postponed, the round hasn't reached its conclusion yet today. Among the negotiation areas there are some that have small disagreements while others have enormous. Especially trade in agriculture, which covers less than 8% of the world trade, is a sensitive area of negotiations for both developing and developed countries. (Das, 2008, 295) Historically, it has been an area of major discord, which created serious negotiation blockages in the Uruguay Round and kept the Doha Round agenda off track. It has been widely discussed that there has been a bias in the multilateral trade regime against developing countries trade in agriculture, and that it must be addressed forthwith. As Das (2008, 295) mentions, the question at stake here is in essence the elimination of huge subsidies and high tariffs by developed countries.

Another strain of critique claims that the topics and proposals consisting the Round's agenda are as a matter of fact of little relevance to the development context (see e.g. Jensen & Gibbon, 2007). Thus, naming the Round "Development Agenda" would have been nothing but a shallow attempt to mollify the opponents. For example, the disengagement with agricultural issues due to their sensitiveness has resulted in a situation, in which a plausible conclusion of the Doha Round would not mean relevant changes in trade in agriculture and, for example, Scott and Wilkinson (2010, 147) argue that without addressing the heated questions of agriculture, the Round could by no means be called Development Round. While the Round has been subject of a large number of economic analysis examining the size and distribution of benefits, the general opinion among scholars has developed more critical towards the benefits a plausible conclusion of the Development Round would have for developing countries. In addition, some argue that the modest gains the round would create, would be highly unevenly distributed with a few large developing countries, primarily China, India and Brazil, accounting for most of the benefits, while many areas, notably Sub-Saharan Africa, are likely to be left worse off. (Scott & Wilkison, 2010, 146)

Furthermore, the fact, whether the WTO can and should pursue development objectives, is also controversial. As Evenett and Hoekman (2005, 1-2) point out, some are of the view that WTO's focus should be limited to increasing market access opportunities and trade liberalization. While global liberalization can promote development prospects, much

depends on whether governments pursue complementary policies to enhance the ability of local people to benefit from it. Therefore, promoting the adoption of such policies would be the task of national governments and not the WTO.

While the WTO and the Doha Round have been widely researched, also my focus on the language in the context of WTO and especially the language of development in different contexts have been the object of numerous research. I present some of this research next.

1.2. Previous research

Textual and linguistic analysis have been somewhat, but not widely, conducted in the context of the WTO. For example, the argumentative procedures of the Dispute Settlement System have been examined by applying Jürgen Habermas' discursive theory by Ceva and Fracasso (2010). Also the content and deployment of the crisis discourse framing the negotiations during the Doha Round has been analysed (Wilkinson, 2009). Moreover, metaphors of globalization and trade have been examined by Ghafele (2004), who analysed interviews of WTO staff and trade diplomats of low-income African countries.

The main subject of my rhetorical analysis, development, has been generally recognized as a lingual phenomenon and rather extensively analysed especially after the 1980s by the so-called post-development school. This research has generally focused on the ideological aspects of the development discourse by critically examining the ideological features embedded in the language and vocabulary of development (see e.g. Sachs, 1992; Escobar, 1995). I introduce and describe more detailed the approach of post-development in chapter 2.1, but it is noteworthy that I share the viewpoint of post-development in my research by critically scrutinizing the notions of development instead of taking them for granted.

To my knowledge, the concept of development in ministerial statements or in any WTO documents during the Doha Development Round has so far not been examined. Due to the topical nature of the immense problematic regarding the conclusion of negotiations, I argue that such analysis is relevant. Furthermore, due to the thorny nature of WTO's

development aspect, the scrutiny of the concept of development in particular is of importance.

1.3. Research method and questions

The concepts of development and trade are the two linchpins at the core of my thesis. The theoretical framework is provided by the multifaceted discussion the different historical and contemporary paradigms in development studies encompass on how development and its linkages with trade are understood. The chapter 2 introduces these viewpoints on development and trade, and the table 2 recapitulates the different contemporary theoretical approaches to development. Through this framework I examine the content of WTO's development discourse and recognize elements of the paradigms in my research material.

As a tool for scrutinizing the language I apply rhetorical analysis, which provides me with means to analyse the underpinning connotations and representations that are linguistically embedded. While the chapter 2 gives me the framework to recognize elements consisting the development discourse of the WTO, the chapter 3 introduces the methodology, rhetorical analysis, which I use as a interpretive framework for approaching the empricial analysi and examining through what rhetorical means the discourse is constructed. In the methodology part, I introduce and discuss rhetorical analysis as a tool for analysing the language, and in addition, present critical discourse analysis, which is the theoretical vantage point for my research. The chapter introduces elements and history of rhetorical analysis, but in particular focuses on the theories of new rhetorists Chaïm Perelman and Kenneth Burke. In designing the method best suited for my analytical purposes, I draw in particular from the theories of these two.

My research questions are

1) How is the concept of development linguistically constructed in the development discourse of the WTO?

2) How is the relationship between trade and development linguistically constructed in the development discourse of the WTO?

3) How are the roles and power positions of developed and developing countries in tackling development linguistically constructed in the development discourse of the WTO?

The focus of my analysis is both the content of WTO's development discourse and its linguistic construction particularly through rhetorical means in the ministerial statements of the 7th WTO Ministerial Conference. My research material naturally represents only one sample of a much wider development discourse within the WTO, but nevertheless, it participates in producing the 'language of development' of the organization. Questions in particular of my interest are, for example, is development seen merely as an economic process; is the content of development defined; how is a certain understanding of development justified; what are the unstated premises of the argumentation; are the benefits of trade for development questioned or regarded as a fact; and is development brought to developing countries from the outside or do developing countries claim agency in the process, i.e. who is in charge of the process of development.

These questions are discussed in chapter 4, which is divided into three parts as per my research questions. In addition, in the beginning of chapter 4, I describe the context of the 7th Ministerial Conference and the ministerial statements as material for my research. In chapter 5, I discuss the key findings of my research and provide suggestions for future research.

2. Development now and before

Any discussion on development must be premised on defining the concept itself. Therefore, in this chapter I focus on elaborating how and through what kind of language different paradigms conceptualize what is meant by development. From the basis of these ideological and theoretical reckonings, I, furthermore, present different viewpoints on the role of trade in development studies. This provides me with a framework to approach my research material and examine the conceptualizations of development embedded in it.

Development is by no means an unequivocal concept. The term, widely used in several fields, is relatively value-free, but first and foremost dynamic, because as Lindberg (2004, 87) notes, it encompasses a certain perception of change, progress and evolution. According to Esteva (1992, 8), development, in common parlance, describes a "process through which the potentialities of an object or organism are released, until it reaches its natural, complete full-fledged form." However, the terms developed and underdeveloped are embedded with strong evaluative connotations. Esteva (1992, 8) suggests that development occupies the centre of an incredibly powerful semantic constellation, but at the same time, very few words are as feeble, as fragile and as incapable of giving substance and meaning to thought and behaviour.

Sachs (1992, 2) argues that the inauguration of the age of development discussions in its current form in international relations was in 1949, when Harry S. Truman declared the Southern hemisphere for the first time as underdeveloped area. Later, the term 'underdeveloped countries' was replaced by allegedly less dismissive 'developing countries'. This definition is, however, also highly problematic. Have countries not defined as 'developing' reached a certain eligible level and halted development? Is development a means to reach this level or an end in itself? If the former applies, how is this ideal defined and by whom? Development encompasses always change, but can this change also be for worse?

What is actually meant by development varies greatly according to the paradigm, political doctrine or ideological perception in question. As Thomas (2000, 29) notes, development can be either a vision, depiction of a historical process of change or a target-oriented action

aiming to improve the status quo. In addition, development is generally perceived as a process or as a condition. The different paradigms have great influence on the visions and practice of development politics, and shifts in ways to conceive development are both historical and cyclic. (Servaes, 1999, 8) While different notions coexist and overlap, they can anyhow lead into strikingly different emphases in terms of tools applied in development work. Perspectives vary from stressing the importance to liberalize markets and increase investment to promoting literacy and improving sanitation and hygiene conditions. As Simon (1997, 184) notes, it is evident that there has never been consensus or unanimity about the meaning or content of development.

According to various scholars, the general opinion among academics and politics has changed from narrow-minded emphasis on the economic aspects to greatly wider and more multifaceted conceptions of development (e.g. Servaes, 1999; Desai & Potter, 2008). This has been exemplified by changes in measuring development: for example, when the mere GDP calculator has been supplemented by the Human Development Index. I discuss briefly the history of development studies and the changes taken place in viewpoints for development next.

2.1. From modernization theory to post-development

The classical discourse of development studies, modernization theory, originates from the 1950s. (Hettne, 2001, 28) The war-torn Europe provided a model for state-directed modernization of the `new nations´, and development implied bridging the gap by means of an imitative process, in which the less developed countries gradually assumed the qualities of the developed. The problem of underdevelopment was stated to be solved by a somewhat mechanical application of the economic and political system in the West to the countries of the Third World. (Servaes, 1999, 5) This mainly economic-oriented view characterized by endogenism and evolutionism was exemplified in Rostow's (1960) celebratory "Stages of economic growth: a non-communist manifesto". Within the framework of the cold war, Rostow ranked countries based on their stage of development, USA being presented as an ideal at the highest stage. More sociologist approach to modernization was applied by, for example, Talcott Parsons, who conceived societal

change through naturalistic concepts such as organic evolution or differentiation. (Eyerman, 1984) However, whether the vantage point was economic or sociological, modernization theory perceived modern industrial society as the end point.

From the 1960s, modernization theory was challenged by the dependency school. Dependency theory originates from the Latin American scholars criticizing the development strategies followed particularly in their native continent, but was later applied wider and brought to the notice of development studies in North America and Europe especially by André Gunder Frank. (Conway & Heynen, 2008, 92-93) The focus of the theory was on articulating the weak structural position of the Third World countries in the world system. Underdevelopment was deemed as an unavoidable outcome of development, because the way the poor countries are integrated to the world system results in the 'core' of the world being enriched at the expense of the 'periphery'. (Hettne, 2001, 28)

The two classical paradigms in development studies, modernization and dependency school, exemplified the discussion in the field until the 1980s. According to Schuurman, (2000, 7) these two contradictory schools of thought, however in dialogue, shared three presumptions, the questioning of which finally led to a general impasse being struck in the field. Firstly, the Third World and its inhabitants were essentialized as homogeneous entities. Secondly, an unconditional belief in progress and the makeability of the society prevailed. Thirdly, the (nation) state was used as analytical frame of reference, and there was political and scientific confidence in the role of the state in realising progress. From the mid-1980s onwards these presumptions lost their hegemony status and both modernization and dependency theory seemed to be losing out in terms of their explanatory powers. Modernization theory was generally critiqued for its western ethnocentrism and blind reliance on economic growth. On the other hand, the critical dependency school didn't seem to be providing much of answers how the development could be enabled. (Schuurman, 2008, 13)

The development pessimism set in when it was realized that the gap between poor and rich countries continued to widen. The classical discourse and development strategies seemed to be producing the opposite of their promises, i.e. massive underdevelopment,

impoverishment, untold exploitation and repression. (Escobar, 1995, 4) Furthermore, where economic growth had occurred it had catastrophic effects on the environment, and the end of real-existing socialism had removed socialist-inspired development trajectories from the academic and political agendas. (Schuurman, 2000, 9) According to Dodds (2008, 4), the end of the cold war exemplified the field also in a more concrete way, since during the war, the Third World was above all coined to refer to an unallied territory, where both the western and communist world supported development strictly for their own geopolitical purposes seeking to promulgate their ideology and exploit trading opportunities.

During the same decade, the postmodernist critique struck the social sciences in general, and development studies in particular due to its normative characteristics. Development theories based on meta-discourse or on the role of a collective emancipatory agency were accused of lacking a sound basis. (Schuurman, 2008, 14) The so-called post-development thinking focuses on the underlying premises and motives of development, but what sets it apart from other critical approaches is that it rejects the concept of development altogether. (Nederveen Pieterse, 2000, 175) This postmodern, even anti-modernist, development thinking was introduced by, for example, Wolfgang Sachs, who argues that history has proven development doesn't work and has grown obsolete. (Sachs, 1992, 1) Therefore, referring to the prevailing development concept, Sachs states that "it is time to dismantle this mental structure". The postmodern method of deconstruction revealed that the notion of development contained a number of hidden and unwarranted evolutionist, universalist and reductionist dimensions, and any western scholar aiming to work in the field was warned of having a false consciousness. (Schuurman, 2000, 10) While as Escobar (1995, 4) notes, development has created a "space" in which only certain elements are said or even imagined, the post-development literature teaches not to take this "space" for granted. The influence of Foucault has also shaped the paradigm, since the notions on power and knowledge have been brought on the agenda also in development studies, notably the perception that who defines development, controls development. (Brigg, 2002, 421)

These critical stances challenging the classical paradigms of development studies have led to a situation where at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the whole existence of the

field of study was questioned. According to Schuurman (2000,13), pessimists were ready to call the end of the millennium the end of development studies, and its proposed replacement, global studies, was already beckoning. The main approaches, since the establishment of the field, are recapitulated in the following table (applied from Willis, 2005).

Table 1. Main approaches to development

1950s	Modernization theories Structuralist theories
1960s	Modernization theories Dependency theories
1970s	Dependency theories Basic need approaches Neo-Malthusian theories Women and development
1980s	Neo-liberalism Grassroots approaches Sustainable development Gender and development
1990s	Neo-liberalism Post-development Sustainable development Culture and development
2000s	Neo-liberalism Sustainable development Post-development Grassroots approaches

In the next part, I categorize and elaborate more on contemporary approaches to development, which are, however, premised on these historical paradigms discussed above. I presume the contemporary approaches to be relevant in the context of the development discourse of the WTO and the reflection, thus, provides me with a framework to approach my research material.

2.2. Contemporary approaches to development

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the field of development studies has gone through massive reconstitution. Hettne (2008, 11) argues that the field has changed in everything except in its normative concern with emancipation from inequality and poverty, and the grand narratives and theories have been somewhat replaced by partly descriptive, partly heuristic notions. This has given rise to a range of new perceptions among the so-called "postist-stances", including post-development, anti-development or beyond development. Some (e.g. Desai & Potter, 2008, 1) argue that these positions should, however, not be seen as new, but rather joining critiques of the status quo of development already expressed by the Marxist and feminists. Also Hettne (2008, 8) mentions that alternative perceptions were introduced already in the 1970s by Nerfin, who coined the term "another development" to mean need-oriented, endogenous, self-reliant and ecologically sound development. At the same time, vestiges of classical theories, modernization and dependency, can still be found today in development discourses.

For the purpose of my research, I have categorized the contemporary approaches to development into three different categories: economic-centred view, human-centred view, and structuralist view. This categorization is by no means unequivocal or all-encompassing, but rather a rough and simplified division, which I presuppose to offer me a suitable framework to approach my research material.

2.2.1. Economic-centred approaches - neoliberalism vs. developmental state

The neoliberal agenda often gains the status of hegemonic discourse in the discussion on development politics today. Thomas (2004, 458) argues that despite different perspectives

on development have been introduced and have ostensibly established their position, they nevertheless haven't succeeded in actually changing the agenda in the discussion. While mentions of human or sustainable development are nowadays common in discussions the core message eulogizing economic growth still prevails. Also Simon (1997, 4) and Fine (2009, 885) argue that neoliberalism has indisputably enjoyed longstanding dominance especially on account of the power of its institutional advocates.

The neoliberal ideology draws squarely on classical economic theories of Adam Smith or David Ricardo: by leaving the job to the invisible hand, the Pareto-optimal outcome will follow and market efficiency will engender development through economic growth. (Chang & Grabel, 2004, 14) The main restriction on an inherent tendency for a free capitalist economy to grow is deemed to be market failure resulting from perverse governmental regulation or other domestic features such as corrupt politicians or rent-seeking bureaucrats. (Hettne, 2008, 9) Major forces such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund were the most vocal proponents of neoliberalism as the best source for economic growth and development all around the world, and in the grounds of this ideology, the highly controversial structural adjustment programmes based on the Washington Consensus, eulogizing free market economy, were introduced in the 1980s to several developing countries.

Neoliberalism inherited many aspects from the modernization school, which is why Simon (1997, 184) refers to it as contemporary incarnation of modernization theory. Ideologically not far from Rostow's (1960) stages of economic growth development is perceived in a top-down linear manner from the western point of view, economic growth given the supreme role in the process. Furthermore, development is deemed as an inherently universal economic process, and the problem of its deficiency is primarily domestic.

The reliance on economic growth benefiting the whole society engenders greatly from the concept of trickle-down effect. Even thought merely the elite would benefit from the growth first hand, the prosperity is believed to "trickle down" also to the lower classes in the society, because markets autonomously engender redistribution of economic growth. (Aghion & Bolton, 1997)

Economic-centred development strategies can also swear by some level of state intervention as a way to realize economic growth. During the post-war period, despite the theory or school of thought in question, development was always perceived to be achieved through variations on Keynesian approaches. (Servaes, 1999, 2) Neoliberalism changed this view strikingly during the 1980s, bringing emphases of market, trade liberalization and minimum state intervention to the public agenda. However, issues such as the relevance of industrial policies are vehemently debated still today. For example, the concept of developmental state is argued by some to be behind the economic success of the so-called East-Asian tigers (see e.g. Woo-Commings, 1999).

Despite whether the economic growth is being led by the invisible hand or state, the process of countries developing in an identical manner towards an industrialized economy resembles the notion of modernization theory. Not far from the modernization paradigm touches also the topical discussion on economies' competitiveness: states aiming to climb up the stairs of success by the means of innovation and efficiency. Hence, despite the polemic critique the modernization paradigm has drawn during the last decades, the ideas somewhat accommodated still live on strongly.

2.2.1.1. Viewpoint on trade

The neoliberal economic-centred views on trade draw squarely from the theories of master economists such as David Ricardo or Eli Heckscher and Bertil Ohlin. (Lévy, 2005) While the classical conception of free trade benefiting all from the basis of comparative advantage is naturally a theoretical simplification of the complex modern world, the basic ideology is still used as grounds for economic policies. International trade permits an expansion of the production possibility set and, thus, leaves all the trading partners better off. However, this potential improvement may not necessarily translate into an actual improvement for all concerned and the distribution of the gains from free trade is the main reason behind the ambiguity concerning trade's impacts.

The distributional arguments are the common rationale for interventionist policies and have led to a global economic system filled with tariffs, quotas and other barriers to free trade. Therefore, the aim for complete trade liberalization is more realistically replaced by

the pursuance of negotiation and compliance of fair trade rules in frames of which the global multilateral trading system can operate efficiently and justly enhancing the transition towards freer trade. At the WTO, the aim of the work has never been free trade but freer trade, and therefore, as Ghafele (2004, 445) notes, the WTO as a matter of fact contradicts the liberal trade theories it theoretically adheres. The pursuance of fair rules promoting free trade and allowing the trading countries to fully exploit the opportunities trade provides them with, is indisputably in the interests of all. However, the quandary is engendered when in the progress of liberalisation, the trading partners are faced with the prisoner's dilemma. (Ray, 1998, 621) Even though a cooperative solution of at least partial liberalization would be Pareto optimal, it would be unlikely to result out of individual uncoordinated decisions. The negotiation is based on *quid pro quo*, which legitimates the need for a coordinated and institutionalized negotiation platform, such as the WTO.

2.2.2. Human-centred approaches

The second group consists of various different paradigms I pool together for the purpose of simplification. The combining factor is the focus placed on the people, human well-being and human rights. Elliot (2008, 40) describes this change of emphases in development suggesting that the practice and discourses of development have become more morally informed particularly since the late 1980s. As a result of this process, in 1986, the United Nations adopted the UN Declaration on the Right to Development, within which development itself was identifies as an inalienable human right. [4]

Human rights and well-being have unquestionably always been a concern in development studies, but instead of being directly tackled, they were deemed to follow the linear process of economic development. One of the first approaches to tackle directly the delivery of welfare outcomes was the so-called "basic needs" – approach dating to the beginning of 1970s. According to Elliot (2008, 42), the basic needs approach did much to put poverty, human needs and rights back on official development agendas and resulted in various

[4] UN General Assembly - A/RES/41/128 Declaration on the Right to Development http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm

programmes focusing on households and covering aspects of health, education, farming and reproduction practices.

Another influential approach was introduced by Amartya Sen (1999), who introduced development as a process of real freedoms that people enjoy. According to him, development consists of the removal of various types of unfreedoms that leave people with little choice and little opportunity to exercise their reasoned agency. Freedom is therefore identified as the main object of development, and the focus is put particularly on the roles and interconnections between crucial instrumental freedoms, such as economic opportunities, political freedoms, social facilities, transparency guarantees and protective security. (Sen, 1999, 7) Economic growth, industrialization, technological advances or social modernization can be means to expand freedoms, but they are never identified as development themselves.

The human focus is shared also by the participatory development approach, the purpose of which is to involve local people in their own development. This approach condemns the classical development practices as western ethnocentric, disempowering, and characterized by top-downism. (Mohan, 2008, 46-47) The main idea is that every society must define development for itself and find its own strategy. (Servaes, 1999, 6) As Mohan (2008, 47) mentions, the focus is on the grass-roots level, often involving civil society, which permits a plurality of development goals to be realized, as well as giving communities self-determination they need. A central concept in participatory development is empowerment, which Melkote and Kandath (2001, 197) define as a dynamic process that enhances the possibilities of an individual or a community to face the continuous social changes. Hence, the process of development is being formed in a bottom-up -manner, and the agency in development is given to developing countries.

The emphasis on participation is part of a wider movement, which has transformed orthodox thinking about public sector management over the last two decades and made decision-making based on participation, rather than imposition, central to the idea of modernity. (Brett, 2003, 2) The demand for participatory development is an integral part of personal and social emancipation. Mohan (2008, 46) argues that behind the approach is also the belief in not relying on the state, and therefore it might not be coincidental that

participatory development gained popularity around the same time as the neoliberal counter-revolution of the 1980s, with its discourse of self-help and individualism.

2.2.2.2. Viewpoint on trade

The human approaches to development perceive the advantages or disadvantages of trade in a similar grassroots manner than its concept of development. In essence, trade is deemed neither purely detrimental nor beneficial, but instead, it can be both. The focal point is the changes trade brings to the lives of local communities and individuals.

The core of the discussion regarding trade is often the fact how it creates and destroys jobs or more precisely, as Weinstein (2005, 5) points out, determines where the jobs are located. The negative consequences that trade produce to local communities are often raised to public agenda, but trade can also be used to enhance the living standards of people, and participatory development approach can focus on programs facilitating and supporting local trading practices. The fair trade movement aiming to help producers in developing countries is a good example of this approach.

2.2.3. Structuralist approaches – world systems theory and critical globalization discussion

References to unjust global structures are raised to public agenda to this day especially by vast amount of development NGOs. For example, Kepa, the Finnish Service Centre for Development Cooperation, has emphasized that poverty is a result of structures that feed societal inequality, and the eradication of poverty – ending of impoverishment – can be successful only if these structures and practices will be dismantled. (Wilska et al. 2004) The emphases put on global structures resemble the ideas of *dependistas* and represent its more contemporary version, the world systems theory, according to which any country's development conditions and prospects are shaped primarily by economic processes, commodities chains, divisions of labour and geopolitical relationships operating at the global scale. (Klak, 2008, 101)

Ideologically close to dependency school is also today's critical globalization discussions, according to which the way globalization is coming about inevitably creates winners and losers. Globalization is generally recognized as consisting three different strands: the economic, the cultural and the political. (Potter, 2008, 192) Trade, capital flows and immigration can be seen as the most concrete embodiments of globalization, notably economic. Furthermore, features of trade, capital flows and immigration are blamed to be the cause for the discontents of globalization. Issues such as trade patterns, global value chains and new international division of labour become prominent factors that cause spatial inequality due to global production, ownership and economic processes. The global economy is becoming more and more characterized by polarization, with some people and regions at the cutting edge of globalization, while others are marginalized. One of the most influential globalization critics Joseph E. Stiglitz (2005, 231) argues that "globalization has been hijacked by the special interests in the North, often at the expense of the poor in developing countries".

There are various views among world systems theories and critical globalization approaches, but the basis on which I combine them is the theoretical simplification of their core message identical to the dependency theory: other parts of the world gaining on the expense of others. In addition, characteristic for these theories seems to be the emphases put on external factors when the problems of developing countries are being examined. As Simon (1997, 183) notes, while the simplistic and deterministic constructions of the *dependistas* have long been discredited, this intellectual legacy remains quite tangible and has been reinforced by the strongly negative social impact of structural adjustment and economic recovery programmes and the associated aid conditionalities.

2.2.3.1. Viewpoint on trade

The unfair patterns of international trade are the in the core of the arguments referring to the dependency school and other structural theories. Already in the 1950s, the economists associated with ECLA (United Nations Commission for Latin America), determined declining terms of trade as the main cause for lack of development. According to this theory, later titled Singer-Prebisch hypothesis after its main developers, while trade relations between developed and developing countries are characterized by trade in

industrial goods and raw materials, the income elasticity of demand for manufactured goods increases more rapidly than demand for primary goods. Therefore, the terms of trade for primary commodity exporter have a tendency to decline. (Chang & Grabel, 2004, 23)

According to dependency theories, this very structure of the market is responsible for the existence of inequality in the world system. A different notion on global trade emphasizes not only the inherently twisted structures of trade but also the power of some nations to dictate the trade rules. In essence, the question is about the trade restriction measures applied by industrial nations allegedly causing severe damage to developing countries. (Stiglitz, 2002, 437-438) The endemic debate on the agricultural subsidies provided by developed countries to their farmers represents this vantage point at root, and is also one of the focal discussion points of the Doha Development Round.

The operation of the WTO in general is strongly challenged while the critiques state that due to the asymmetric economic, political and diplomatic powers between the members, the world trading system as coordinated and implemented by WTO is fundamentally unfair. Some even suggest that developing countries would actually be better of without the WTO. (Fung et al., 2010, 187-188)

2.3. Conclusion - The framework

The three different approaches presented above all conceptualize development in different ways. Therefore, also the goals of development as well as means for development and causes of underdevelopment are strikingly different. The next table recapitulates in a simplifying manner the main differences among the paradigms.

Table 2. The Framework

Approach	**Means to development**	**Theoretical background**
Economic-centred approaches	Economic growth, liberalization of markets and trade or state-led growth, industrial policies	Walt W. Rostow (1960) : "The stages of economic growth. A non-communist manifesto"
Human-centred approaches	Participating, empowering the people in the developing countries, enhancing democracy	Amartya Sen (1999): Development as Freedom Robert Chambers (1997): Whose Reality Counts? Putting the Last First
Structuralist approaches	"New world order", improved position of the developing countries	Andre Gunder Frank (1969): The Underdevelopment of Development

When examining the content of my research material, the ministerial statements of the WTO, I utilize this division of paradigms as a frame to recognize different kinds of elements of the development discourse.

3. Rhetoric as methodology

In this chapter I introduce the methodology used in my thesis, rhetorical analysis. As Palonen and Summa (1996, 7) argue, it is however incorrect to refer to rhetorical analysis as one unified method. Instead, it is a discipline with multifaceted traditions and purposes of use. Therefore, I present how the discipline has evolved from the classical rhetoric to the so-called new rhetoric, and generally discuss the different approaches. After this, I examine more detailed the theoretical approaches of two rhetorists, Chaïm Perelman and Kenneth Burke, the theories of whom I draw from in my analysis.

According to Vihinen, (1996, 223) rhetoric focus as basis for the analysis can be seen as a viewpoint that acknowledges and brings focus into politicized dimensions of the matter in question by indicating that there is no one natural way for a topic to be discussed. A certain conceptualization is always engendered by the social and cultural context as well as by the deep-seated value system of the language user. Following the post-structuralistic philosophy, all the truth claims are ideological, because knowledge is bounded on the vantage point and attached to a certain discourse. (Hirsto, 2010, 18-19) Therefore, importance is brought also to the context of the text. Generally, rhetorical analysis shares the same subjects of research with the discourse analysis; both the language itself as well as the social and cultural context behind it, i.e. the micro and the macro level, are being scrutinized. (Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1996, 103) I elaborate more on the relationship between rhetorical and discourse analysis and discuss critical discourse analysis as a theoretical vantage point for my research next.

3.1. Critical discourse analysis as theoretical vantage point

Both rhetorical and discourse analysis stem from the same theoretical tradition, social constructionism. Alongside semiotic, ethnography and conversational analysis, they share the interest of social constructionism in examining how social reality is constructed in linguistic activities. As Jokinen (1999a, 38) mentions, in the tradition of social constructionism, the analysis characteristically starts from the research data and its locally constructive practices, i.e. the examination is being implemented in a bottom-up manner.

Texts per se are the focus of the research, and no "true reality" behind them is aimed to be discovered. Instead, the linguistic social activity of individuals is perceived to be an essential part of reality (Jokinen, 1999a, 38). Furthermore, as per the perception of cultural studies, elements and activities of social reality obtain their meaning in the process of signifying practices, and the real phenomenon outside these practises is thus not accessible (Hirsto, 2010, 19).

Language has both a representative and a performative role. This theoretical presumption applies that there is a dialectical relationship between language and social practices: on the one hand, language represents and reflects the social structures and power relations of the society, and on the other hand, also participates in building and shaping them. (Fairclough, 1995; Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1999, 103)

This legitimizes why researchers of different scientific fields have turned to discourse analysis in an attempt to analyse this relationship of language and the society. As Lindberg (2004, 95) mentions, the importance of language in societal phenomena has been generally acknowledged and thus, individual linguistic choices are deemed meaningful and changes in language are connected to more general social and cultural processes. As Fairclough (2001, 1) points out, in relation to power, sociolinguistic conventions have a dual relation: on the one hand they incorporate differences of power, and on the other hand, they arise out of, and give rise to, particular relations of power. Language is therefore neither transparent nor neutral tool of comprehension, but rather a historic and social phenomenon (Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1996, 103).

This importance put on linguistic choices stems particularly from Halliday's theory of functional grammar. According to this theory, language consists of overlapping systems from which the language user can choose elements. These choices are deemed to represent the beliefs and attitudes of the language user, which therefore makes the analysis of e.g. lexicon interesting. (Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1996, 104)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been especially influenced by Halliday's theories of functional grammar, and strove for exploit it in analysing the role of language in the ideological and political processes. According to Lindberg (2004, 94), the main difference

between critical and noncritical, or analytical (Jokinen, 1999a, 86), discourse analysis is that while noncritical approaches settle for describing the discursive practises, critical approaches aim to prove how discourses are formed and shaped by the influence of power structures and ideologies, and how the discourse systems shape the societal identities, relationships and belief systems. Foremost, critical discourse analysis is a viewpoint that brings focus into the relationship between language and power, and explicitly states its emancipatory interests. (Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1999, 105) The relevant research topics generally stem from the current societal issues and problems that have a representative or semiotic format. According to Fairclough (2001, 30), beginning with a social problem rather than a more conventional research question accords with the critical intent of this approach, the aim of which is to produce knowledge which can lead to emancipatory change.

As Lindberg (2004, 95) points out, it is noteworthy to emphasize that conducting a discourse analysis is also an interpretation, which makes the analysts an active actor. Although not compromising the critical and objective viewpoint, the researcher is however never impartial, since already the selection of the research topic is an expression of point of view.

Following the tradition of critical discourse analysis, the purpose of my research is not to provide answers or reveal truths, but to broaden the understanding of the problematic of the concept of development in the WTO and more generally. The field of international relations exemplifies the interest of CDA put on power structures: encounters between nation states always replicate the deep-rooted structures of power and positioning among them. Discourse analysis, thus, provides a suitable vantage point to approach this social phenomenon.

3.2. Theoretical approaches to rhetorical analysis

Jokinen (1999b, 126-159) places rhetorical analysis as one of the analytical focus points of discourse analysis. While discourse analysis provides the starting point to approach texts,

rhetorical analysis defines the specific elements of interest in the examination. In rhetorical analysis, the linguistic processes of signifying practises are being examined from the viewpoint of how certain versions of "reality" are attempted to be made credible and acceptable, and by what means the audience is attempted to be made convinced to adhere to them. (Jokinen, 1999b, 126-159)

According to Kakkuri-Knuuttila (1998, 234) the subject of rhetorical analysis is always text per se, and its means of argumentation. The broad interpretation of rhetoric, adhering to classical rhetoric of Aristotle, implies that the basis of rhetoric is argumentation, and other rhetoric features are built on it. Rhetoric bore for long a dismissive reputation and was used only for the examination of figurative elements and eloquence. This view was challenged around 1950s by the approach called new rhetoric, which returned the appreciation of rhetoric. As Palonen and Summa (1999, 7) mention, the newly born interest in rhetoric has invoked various interpretations and traditions, but their common feature is that rhetoric is no longer deemed as "mere rhetoric", as something superficial or irrelevant. The figurative elements of language are, however, still recognized, and as Kakkuri-Knuuttila (1998, 234) mentions, while argumentation analysis simplifies and strips the language of its formal elements, rhetoric scrutinizes both the contentual and figurative features of the text.

Palonen and Summa (1999, 7) discuss a "rhetoric turn" in social sciences more generally. This refers to a trend that perception of authorities in science and philosophy has become more relative, and the use of rhetoric and argumentation also in these fields have been recognized. For example, the line of research called "rhetoric of inquiry" examines the argumentation and metaphors used in "hard" disciplines such as economics or natural sciences. (See e.g. McCloskey, 1993) The objects of research have broadened significantly since, as Kakkuri-Knuuttila (1998, 235) mentions, in new rhetoric, one key line of research is focused on analysing fiction literature, where the focus obviously isn't in argumentation. The relationship between rhetoric and politics again was apparent already for the sophists in the ancient Greek: the political dimensions of language as well as the essentialism of linguistic elements in politics are intertwined and generally recognized.

3.2.1. From ancient Greek to new rhetoric

The roots of rhetoric stem from the reasoning of masters of ancient Greek such as Aristotle and Plato, who recognized that the practise of politics is closely intertwined with the power of oratory. Whereas Plato scrutinized this linkage critically, Aristotle enlarged upon identifying the means of persuasion rhetoric provides its skilful user. This classical view, which lays persuasion as the foundation of rhetoric, is presented in Aristotle's book *Rhetoric*. The crucial point to bear in mind is that Aristotle's *Rhetoric,* as many other books of classical rhetoric, is foremost a companion, purpose of which was to teach their readers the means and techniques to become a good speaker. The skill of oratory was seen to be stemming from the ability to choose the proper means of argumentation and persuasion for the situation in hand. (Kakkuri-Knuuttila, 1998, 233-236)

One of the main new perspectives the so-called new rhetoric brought was altering the vantage point from the speaker to the analyst. (Kakkuri-Knuuttila, 1998, 235) Although denouncing classical rhetoric as a mere pragmatic and normative instructions and guidebooks is misleading, the focus of classical rhetoric nevertheless stays in the speaker and one's ability to get the message through. The division to classical and new rhetoric is commonly defined as a clear watershed in the discipline's history. New rhetoric refers to the rehabilitation of rhetorical analysis in the 1950s, when scholars such as Kenneth Burke, Chaïm Perelman and Stephen Toulmin, however independently, started gaining newly interest in rhetorical analysis. As Summa (1996, 51-52) argues, perspectives for analysis varied to a great extent among the three, but the comparison is justified, since they all questioned the underestimating perceptions towards rhetoric prevailing at that time, and contributed to the newly born interest in academia. I scrutinize next more detailed the theories of two representatives of new rhetoric, Perelman and Burke, whose theories I apply in my analysis.

3.2.2 In the search of premises and argumentation techniques– Chaïm Perelman

Chaïm Perelman (1912-1984) was a Belgian professor of philosophy, who first started examining rhetoric and argumentation while being intrigued by the question "can logical assumptions be made from value-based questions?" While logic doesn't seem to provide an

answer on how to settle on an acceptable conclusion in value questions, there would be no possible answer on how justice or any other value could be distinguished from its opposite. Perelman's approach to this scrutiny of the problematic of rational logic in value-based question was to examine natural argumentation as it appeared in different occasions of every day life. His line of reasoning implied that a consensus on values is engendered by the means of argumentation. When examining the rational behind a value system, it is thus deemed necessary to scrutinize how the arguments for or against it are being justified, and how they gain credibility in reality. (Summa, 1996, 62-69)

According to Summa (1996, 64), Perelman's biggest contribution to the field was that he restored the dimensions of classical deduction and assertion to rhetoric and rejected its link with mere eloquence. In the middle of the 20th century, the combination of rhetoric and deduction was deemed incompatible, and Perelman was thus a radical of his time. In his approach, the form and content of the language are intertwined elements of deduction and assertion.

The main part of Perelman's argumentation theory analyses and specifies the means by which a credibility of an argument is built. This scrutiny is by and large divided into two parts: the premises of the argumentation and the argumentation techniques. (Summa, 1996, 69) Next, I discuss Perelman's conception on audience and the premises of the argumentation to the extent necessary for my research purposes. Afterwards, I introduce the concrete argumentation techniques presented in Perelman's theory.

3.2.2.1 The conception of audience and premises of the argumentation

Emphasizing the role of an audience is a central part of Perelman's approach to rhetoric. As Kuusisto (1996, 275) mentions, the pursuance towards assuring an audience is fundamentally the basis of any rhetoric action, since the orator would not engage in argumentation in the first place, if he or she would be able to give orders. The audience essentially defines both the premises and the techniques adequate for the argumentative situation in question.

Perelman defines audience simply as a group of people the orator wishes to have an influence on by the means of argumentation. A separation is however being made between universal and particular audience, the former referring to any undefined person or group with judiciousness, and latter to a group known in advance whose interests and expectations can thus be used in the argumentation. (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971, 19-23) According to Summa (1996, 69), probably more relevant than the concept of universal audience as such in Perelman's theory, is the perception of universalism as a generic basis for argumentation. Assertive and good rational based argumentation is defined to be argumentation, which premises can be generally accepted by universal audience.

The examination of the premises of argumentation acknowledges that argumentative speech or text has from the outset certain assumptions on what can be invoked when enhancing the credibility of the argument. These agreements are then neither explicitly stated nor expected to be questioned in the course of the argumentation. An argument can achieve the position of a fact when being accepted by a universal audience, but value-based conclusions cannot generally achieve this other than by being abstract and imprecisely defined. (Perelman, 1982, 27-28) As Summa (1996, 70) points out, this occurrence is generally exploited in the speeches of politicians: while being conceptualized vaguely enough, it is easy to raise topics such as "welfare" or "efficiency" on the agenda as presumptions of universal agreement.

The agreements behind the argumentation can be based on either the structure of reality or on the preferable. (Perelman, 1982, 23) While the first one deals with facts, truths and presumption, the second one consists of values, hierarchies and loci of the preferable. Loci are basis for assessment accepted by the audience beforehand, but independent of the actual content of the argument. Kuusisto (1996, 278) mentions the example of a locus of defending the innocent as means to argue for a more controversial argument, such as the need to militarily defend a foreign nation.

3.2.2.2 The argumentation techniques

According to Summa (1996, 71) the argumentation techniques are probably the most essential and well-trodden part of Perelman's theory. The examination is divided into four main parts drawing from two different approaches: associations and dissociations. The first approach relies on the associations according to quasi-logical arguments, appeals to structure of reality, and arguments that establish the structure of reality, while the second approach again functions through the dissociation of concepts. (Perelman, 1982, 50)

The quasi-logical arguments replicate the formal structures of logic and mathematics. They aim to exclude alternative interpretations, subjective perspectives and changing external factors from the argumentation. An example of quasi-logical absoluteness would be when a theory is directly applied for the explanation of a phenomenon of social reality.

Arguments appealing to reality create natural-like nexuses between elements of reality, and base the argumentation for an individual case on these nexuses. The simplest form of such argumentation is proving the correlation between two elements based on their successive appearance, such as causality. When establishing causal relation, the orator aims to prove the connection between an individual action and its consequences, or between goals and means. Argumentation based on an authority is, according to Perelman (1982, 94), one example of parallel embodiment of elements, in which an individual is connected with one's actions.

The arguments establishing the real use an individual case as an example, as an illustrator or as a model, or rely on an analogical deduction. The usage of an example in the argument aims at indicating the existence of certain regularity, while accepted regularities are being illustrated with individual cases. The usage of a metaphor is probably the most well trodden form of analogy, which, according to Perelman (1982, 120), is based on illustrating the similarity between two elements of different spheres. Metaphors will be further discussed when analysing the theoretical approach of Kenneth Burke.

The last category of Perelman's argumentation techniques consists of dissociative arguments aiming to separate elements that are generally associated to each other either linguistically or by tradition. By breaking these existing concept structures, called philosophical pairs, the dissociative arguments lead to re-conceptualizations of reality. According to Perelman, all of the philosophical pairs can be presented in the form phenomenon/reality, and the first term of the pairs is deemed incorrect or ostensible while the second term represents more accurately the reality or natural order. (Kuusisto, 1996, 286) In essence, dissociative argumentation is applied when it is being stated that something is not at stake.

3.2.3 The master of symbols and identifications – Kenneth Burke

As already mentioned, Kenneth Burke's approach to rhetorical analysis was strikingly different from Perelman's approach discussed above. Kenneth Burke (1897-1994), who was according to Summa (1996, 52) probably best defined as a critic or a linguistic researcher, was foremost interested in analysing the meanings of rhetoric phenomenon as part of general human behaviour, and its motives, conditions, and reasoning. The role of rhetoric in Burke's aim towards understanding the human behaviour is foremost linked with understanding the activity behind non-harmonic relations. Therefore, Burke links rhetoric into situations of conflict where partiality and power pretensions are always present. (Summa, 1996, 57)

The symbolic dimension of human behaviour was particularly of Burke's interest, and he perceived all human behaviour to be fundamentally about using symbols. According to Gustfiel (1989, 30; Summa, 1996, 60) one of the most influential notions of Burke's work is the understanding of language as a form of social behaviour, essential part of which is the linguistic expression of experiences, actions and endeavours, i.e. their symbolic presentations. In this connection, Burke presents his four master tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony. While a man is essentially "the symbol using, making, and mis-using animal", the duty of the critic and researcher is to interpret the usage and creation of these symbols in all of their forms, and thus examine and reveal the hidden motives of the human behaviour. (Summa, 1995, 55) Notably, contrary to Perelman, Burke was not interested in the assertive argumentation, i.e. the "good rhetoric" as a competence,

but rather in rhetoric as it appears insidiously and hidden. (Summa, 1996, 59) This subconscious dimension was prominent also in Burke's focal theme of identification, which connected the whole examination of rhetoric to the revelation of unconscious identifications.

3.2.3.1. Identification

Burke deemed identification as the main processes of rhetoric, even more central than the classic rhetoric's key concept of persuasion. The orator aims to assert the audience foremost by the means of identification, and because rhetoric identification compensates the disparity of people, it is thus an inevitable process. If people were "truly of one substance", ideal and perfect communication would be possible and rhetoric wouldn't be necessary. (Burke, 1969b, 2; Summa, 1996, 57)

Identification relates to either identifying or separating elements from individuals, groups or larger ensembles. Also the recognition of a phenomenon, or its definition by connecting or separating it from another phenomenon, is a process of identification. Therefore, identification essentially touches on placing separate elements in relation to each other in the reality of social behaviour. (Summa, 1996, 57) Rhetoric is deemed to be present always when competing identification and divisions are feasible or ought to be appeared: the purest identification, a sense of community, doesn't need rhetoric, while pure disparity doesn't provide any premises for it. (Summa, 1996, 57) Furthermore, social order is established and maintained by the process of identification. Belonging to a group always requires separating oneself from another group, and this process is always rhetoric, however not necessarily conscious. Thus, as Summa mentions, (1996, 59) rhetoric identifications are in essence always also political.

3.2.3.2 The four master tropes

According to Summa (1996, 54), Burke's greatest theoretical legacy might be the importance put on the four master tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony.

Instead of mere linguistic elements or figurative and illustrative forms of expression, the master tropes are deemed as main tools of understanding and reasoning.

Burke's trope analysis is based on two concepts of realism: the poetic realism and scientific realism. While poetic realism refers to descriptively presenting a phenomenon from different vantage points, scientific realism excludes perspectivism and relativism, and resorts to a mere objective scientific description based on correlations. Reviving human behaviour into such unequivocal correlations is deemed impossible, and since there is no access to the "reality" behind the phenomena in social sciences, science provides models of explanation and description, instead of providing objective truths. In this context Burke introduces the examination of the master tropes; means of poetic realism and conceptualization. (Kulovaara, 2007, 74-75; Burke, 1969a, 503-504)

The first trope, metaphor, means a comparison between two separate elements, and the understanding of one element through the features of another one. Metaphors can be descriptive, informative, or embellishing, and they can reveal the perspectives and attitudes of the language-user. Therefore, it seems logical that Burke suggests that metaphor could be substituted by the term perspective. (Kulovaara, 2007, 75) As Ghafele (2004, 447) mentions, the use of metaphors makes complex constellations more understandable but at the same time, makes them understood in one particular way. When highlighting some aspects of a phenomenon and ignoring others through the use of metaphors, a specific view of reality is established.

While Burke could rename metaphors as perspectives, he deems metonymies as reductions. In essence, metonymy means the replacement of a word with another word that essentially has the same meaning. An example of the use of a metonymy could be replacing the neutral word woman with the word lady. The connotation of the word changes and the meaning is reduced to concern only a specific type of women deemed to correspond with the connotations of the term. Summa (1996, 54) gives another example of the use of metonymy, when something abstract and immaterial is expressed through something material, such as when feelings are referred to as heart.

Burke's third trope, synecdoche, means expressing something as a part of an ensemble. By the means of synecdoche, an element can be understood through another representation of the ensemble. This is why the alternative name Burke gives to synecdoche is representation. Burke (1969a, 508) gives a concrete example of synecdoche by referring to representative democracy, in which members of parliament represent citizens through their political authorization.

While the first three tropes are means of understanding and building conceptual bridges, the fourth trope, irony, is a way of questioning one vantage point by introducing another fundamentally different view. Burke views irony as a metaperspective, which denies the justification of a single perspective. (Kulovaara, 2007, 77) In essence, irony is a way of reversing the meanings and "truths", and conveying a message opposite of its literal meaning.

3.2.3 Comparison of Perelman and Burke and relevant points regarding my analysis

As discussed above, the theories of Perelman and Burke differ thoroughly from each other and can be used for analysing different aspects in rhetorical analysis. While the basis of Perelman's analysis is in examining argumentation and furthermore, by which means argumentation is "good", Burke is interested in the insidiousness and unconsciousness of rhetoric. Summa (1996, 72) points out that the perceptions on rhetoric of both of them were sort of reductions. On the one hand, Perelman reduces the concept of rhetoric only to its rational argumentative side leaving out the role of eloquence or manipulation. On the other hand, Burke focuses in rhetoric characteristic only in non-harmonious situations.

Perelman's theory offers a lot to an analyst of rhetoric by its focus on concrete elements of argumentation as it appears in every-day-life, since as a matter of fact, argumentative elements can be found in all kind of texts. The statements that consist my research material are characteristically argumentative political speeches the purpose of which is to assure the audience. In essence, by the means of Perelman argumentation techniques, I am able to scrutinize what is being argued and how. In particular, in terms of conceptualizing development, I can examine how are certain meanings for development argued for and

hence attempted to make credible. The concept of premises of argumentation in also very fruitful, because it is interesting to examine from what grounds the argumentation proceeds in the context of the WTO, i.e. do the member countries supposedly share some viewpoints on development. Perelman's theory also emphasises the role of audience in argumentation. However, I exclude the scrutiny of the audience and the relationship between the audience and the orator from my analysis, and merely state by whom the audience supposedly consists of.

As Summa (1996, 72) points out, Perelman's notions on the cooperative nature of rhetoric and universal audience have been sometimes regarded as foreign idealism in political research and therefore, Burke's approach has been more widely used in this field. The arena of international relations is highly characterized by power relations, and as the problems regarding concluding the Doha Round have proven, the purely collaborative nature is often replaced by non-harmonious features. Therefore, the Burke's theories resting on these characters adapt well to my research purposes. The role of identification in rhetoric is valuable, since the discussion on development is always characterized by the division to developed and developing countries and their distinctive roles. In addition, in the field of international relations different groups of countries are always established, and as part of foreign policy, countries inherently associate and disassociate themselves with other countries. Therefore, it is interesting to examine how this process of identification is rhetorically performed in the WTO.

The second feature I utilize from Burke's theory is its symbolic dimension, more precisely the scrutiny of the four master tropes. For the analysis of linguistic construction of the development discourse, I deem relevant to examine also the symbolic side of the language. The construction of development by this symbolism is essential in understanding how the concept is conceived.

4. The Development Discourse of the WTO

In this chapter I examine the official statements made by the member countries during the seventh WTO ministerial conference held 30th November to 2nd December 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. By analysing the concept of development in the statements, I will illuminate what kinds of emphases exemplify the discussion on development in the context of the WTO. As mentioned in the chapter 2, the examination of development as a linguistic phenomenon has been recognized as relevant especially by the scholars representing the school of post-development. For example, Escobar (1995) stresses the role of language in development by arguing that language is fundamental to the way we order, understand, intervene, and justify these interventions. Development is by no means an unequivocal concept, and on this account, the language and linguistic expressions bear great importance when analysing the meanings and connotations of the concept.

As a framework for my analysis I use the table 2, which presents the three different contemporary paradigms of development studies. However, I do not presume that the themes appearing in the documents can be classified according to the paradigms and this is not my purpose. The framework is thus not a systematic tool for the analysis but instead, helps me to recognize and comprehend premises and features of the discussion.

The chapter is divided into three parts according to my research questions. First, I analyse in which context is development used in the statements, what connotations the term encompasses and what other terms are linked into it, i.e. what is as a matter of fact meant by development. Second, I elaborate on how is the relationship between the multilateral trading system and trade liberalization and development understood in the statements. Finally, I look into what kind of roles and positions of power between the developed and developing countries are constructed in terms of tackling development.

An important notion to make is that during my analysis I am not drawing attention on the profile of the country making the statement. Hence, I am not comparing, for example, the statements with the political or economical system of the country, or to any other of its attributes. Only in the third part, in which I analyse the positioning of the countries, I take into account whether the country in question is a developed or a developing country.

Before commencing the actual analysis, it is necessary to illuminate in brief the context of the statements, i.e. the ministerial conference, in which they were presented. In addition, I describe the statements as research material for my thesis.

4.1 The 7th Ministerial Conference and description of the research material

The 7th Ministerial Conference was held in 30th November to 2nd December 2009 in Geneva. The conference was the fourth one held during the Doha Round of trade negotiations. In sharp contrast to the previous ministerial gatherings of the Round, the 7th Ministerial Conference proved to be something of a success. This was largely due the fact that the meeting was actively engineered from the outset to be a routine gathering rather than an ambitious negotiating session attracting large-scale demonstrations and political grandstanding among the delegates. (Scott & Wilkinson, 2010, 142)

The WTO Ministerial Conferences consist of opening, plenary and closing sessions as well as working sessions that provide delegates an interactive forum for discussion under predetermined topics. During the 7th Ministerial Conference these topics were "Review of WTO activities, including the Doha Work Programme" and "The WTO's contribution to recovery, growth and development". The official theme for the conference as whole was stated as "The WTO, the Multilateral Trading System and the Current Global Economic Environment". According to the letter written to press by the Director General Pascal Lamy [5] the 7th conference differed from the previous ones by not being a negotiation session but rather a chance for the ministers to reflect on the current operation of the WTO and its current negotiation round as well as exchange ideas for improvement and enhancement. Blatantly, the pessimism regarding the insurmountable deadlock in the negotiations was omnipresent, and rather than pursuing towards a negotiation conclusion, more realistic approach was to re-evaluate the whole system.

When approaching any textual analysis, it is necessary to begin with defining the nature of the text: what or what kind of text is in question and for what purpose has it been written

[5] Director-General's letter to journalists
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min09_e/dg_letter_e.htm.

for. The textual genre of my research material is political speech and hence, it is necessary to take into consideration the characteristics of this genre in my analysis. Political speeches have been defined as their own genre already by Aristotle and, as mentioned in chapter 3.2.1, they were at the core of rhetorical scrutiny from the outset. As Kakkuri-Knuuttila (2011, 13) mentions, the main arguments political speeches are founded on are either that something must or should not be done, i.e. arguing for or against a point. In essence, political speeches are argumentative by nature, and therefore, the examination of Perelman's argumentation techniques included in them is interesting.

The official statements made by ministers compose a significant aspect of each ministerial conference, in which they are taking place. Made during the plenary sessions of the conference, the statements are the most public way for the member countries to present and argue their position in the discussion and highlight issues they deem relevant. The importance is emphasized also by higher ranked government officials, ministers, presenting them, in comparison to the trade diplomats in regular WTO meetings. The statements are directed to all the parties present in the conferences, i.e. government officials, the WTO secretariat, press and representatives of the non-governmental organizations and other observer members. Furthermore, due to their distribution via Internet, statements and their contents are indented to reach also the general public.

At the time of the 7th Ministerial Conference, WTO had 153 member states. The ministers of 124 members gave a statement in the conference, and 117 statements are made available online in written form. [6]The statements are given in one of the three official languages of the WTO, English, French or Spanish, and 92 of the statements were made in English, 14 in Spanish, and 11 in French. My research data limits only to the 92 statements made in English. From these 92 statements I have extracted text samples and expressions that exemplify my analysis.

[6] Ministerial Conferences - Statements by Members and observers at the plenary session http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min11_e/min11_statements_e.htm.

4.2. Development according to the WTO

The term development appears ubiquitously in WTO's official documents and despite its somewhat contentious role in the organization's mission, the topic has established its position in the WTO agenda. Officially the WTO Agreements state to recognize the link between trade and development, but no further description of the relationship is provided. Effectively, the theme development is somewhat present in practically all WTO meetings regardless of the meeting topic in question, since the developing country members repetitively raise their special position on the agenda. WTO has a separate committee devoted to discussing the issues of trade and development, and several other bodies, the work of which touch on different aspects of development or developing countries. In addition, WTO offers technical support for developing countries.

The largest aspect of WTO's development dimension is the special and different treatment given to the countries defined as developing or the least developed countries (LDCs). The special and different treatment can include provisions granting longer transitional periods for the implementation of commitments, more lenient obligations, and provisions that require other members to safeguard the interests of developing countries when adopting protective trade measures. The LDCs enjoy the greatest level of special attention drawn to them in each WTO agreement, and this conflictingly somewhat wanted status can only be given by the UN Economic and Social Committee resting upon strict criteria. Each member country is able to state whether they are a developed or a developing country, but other members have the right to challenge this position.[7]

Notably, a clear definition for the term or elaboration on the topic of development is not included in any official WTO texts introducing the development dimension of the organization. Hence, when members refer to development in the organization's context, it is left for them to determine what they mean by development. In the statements of the 7th Ministerial Conference, four distinctive discourses could be recognized in terms of how development was understood. The first discourse describes development as vague and

[7] Who are the developing countries in the WTO? http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/devel_e/d1who_e.htm.

undetermined, the second one focuses on the economic side of development, the third one on the human side, and the fourth discourse emphasizes development as integration to the world economy. I examine more detailed how these discourses are constructed next.

4.2.1. Development as a vague and undetermined concept

None of the members explicitly define the term development in the statements, for example by stating that 'Development is…' or 'Development means... '. A few of the statements include expressions such as *economic development*, *social development* or *rural development*, which determine more precisely what kind of development the language-user is referring to. However, a more common way to refer to development is to use the word as a determinator to another abstract noun describing the character of the expression. Such common word pairs are *development dimension*, *development aspect, development goals, development outcome, development thrusts, development challenges, development aspirations or development package.* Other expressions entail a more positive and promising connotation, such as *development dividends* or *development gains,* while others focus on the necessity of development, such as *development imperatives* or *development needs*. Egypt even applies quotation marks on the word development, when arguing that "*Delivering on "development" should remain the core component of DDA"*. The use of quotation marks can be interpreted in many ways, but most probably in this case, Egypt aims to emphasise the vagueness and perhaps also contentiousness of the term.

Vincent and the Grenadines refers to *development deficits* of the Uruguay round while the United States perceives satisfying conclusion of the Doha round as fulfilling the *development promise*. In both cases, an illusion of an end-result of negotiations enabling the reach of a specific limit of development is created. However, these expressions do not provide an explanation of what this set target for development is. The illusion of a specific goal for development somewhat follows the notion of modernization theory: countries progressing in an identical linear manner towards the end-goal of modern industrial society. The end-result of development would be a predetermined static state.

The vagueness of the development seems to be in line with Perelman's notion on value judgements that can be objects of a universal agreement only when they remain

undetermined. According to Perelman (1982, 27-28), "when one tries to make them precise, applying them to a situation or to a concrete action, disagreements and the opposition of specific groups are not long in coming". This idea of development as a value-based concept is, as a matter of fact, rather axiomatic, because different meanings of the term are often invoked by values and ideological emphases of the language user. The development that is increase of living standards and poverty alleviation for some might be unnecessary westernization and commercialisation for others. Also Wilska (2007, 5) notes that the ambiguity of the definition of development enables it to be advocated from many different starting points; we can talk of development that is right and wrong, good and bad. The importance and benevolence of development can be an object of universal agreement only when the concept is undefined.

The ambiguity of development is exemplified in the statements also by the amount and diversity of terms that are used in conjunction with it. Due to the usage of these expressions as important aspects of the development round, they can be interpreted to serve as further explanations for what is foremost deemed as development according to the language-user. The expressions, such as *increase of welfare, prosperity, employment* or *economic growth, improvement of living conditions* or *livelihood, poverty reduction,* and *food security,* appear commonly in the statements either with the word development or without it.

4.2.2. Development as economic development

As mentioned in the chapter 2, despite the more multifaceted concept of development being introduced especially more recently, the economic aspect is generally emphasized still to this day in development talks. This holds true in the statements: many of them don't refer to any other attributes of development than economic.

> "A development-friendly conclusion of the negotiations should open new trade opportunities and allow developing countries to benefit from increased growth" (Denmark)

> "In the context of the current global economic recession, an ambitious outcome of Doha Development Round is crucially important to create economic prosperity and growth globally" (Malawi)

The statement of Denmark adheres directly to the neoliberal formula, according to which development is being promoted by *new trade opportunities* and *increased growth.* Malawi seems to perceive *economic prosperity and growth globally* as the primary goals of the Doha Round, and thus reduces the development agenda to the pursuance of economic growth in both developed and developing countries alike. Economic growth is the end-goal and it is not deemed necessary to explain how it would actually contribute to development. Therefore, neoliberal agenda is serving as a premise for the argumentation, and since neoliberalism would be foremost a value-based agreement, the agreement bears on the preferable. (Perelman, 1982, 23) Treating neoliberalism as a premise is a contentious decision, but as Kuusisto (1996, 278) notes, expressing a controversial issue as a self-evident fact is an essential part of the argumentation process, because it prepares the audience to accept also further arguments and determines the limits of the target audience. While it might be self-evident that all the members do not adhere to neoliberal ideology, Denmark and Malawi would therefore seem to address only those who do.

In many cases, economic features appear together with the word *development*.

> "In conclusion, we believe that the outcome of this conference will contribute in improving the global economic environment which should be translated into a dynamic process of economic growth and development particularly for the vulnerable developing countries." (Kenya)

> "Effective trade rules need to be designed to make trade really work as an engine of growth and human development. " (Ghana)

The use of the word development complementing economic attributes is interesting, because it isn't clear what kind of distinction the language-user is making between *development* and the attributes mentioned separately. Kenya draws a potential causal tie from the *outcome of this conference*, to *improving global economic growth* and further to *economic growth and development.* Growth and development thus serve as equal ends of the causality chain, i.e. growth is not deemed as a cause for development or vice versa. The

engine metaphor, Ghana is referring to, is a customary expression, but actually a powerful and contentious choice, since it implies that trade is the sole factor for triggering development, i.e. without trade development could not be triggered. Burke suggests that the trope metaphor could be replaced by the name "perspective" (see chapter 3.2.3.2) and in this case, the metaphor provides a perspective emphasizing the absolute necessity of trade for development.

When using the word development complementing economic attributes, meanings of the term development can be interpreted in two ways. On the one hand, development is associated with mere economic features and can hence be understood to be in line with them. On the other hand, since development is mentioned separately, it could imply that it actually stands for something different than economic growth, recovery or prosperity. Only Ghana makes this distinction clear by pairing the term economic growth with *human development.* I discuss the emphases given to human attributes of development appearing in the statements next.

4.2.3. Development with a human face

The terms *human development* or *social development* appear in the statements a couple of times, and always in conjunction with at least one other term. However, expressions referring to human aspects of development are included in many ways. One example is *human progress* mentioned by Norway. Interestingly, the words 'human' and 'progress' being paired together invoke a strong connotation of the progress of human being, instead of human aspects of progress or development. The notion could thus be interpreted to refer to ideas of the classical modernization theory and to a development of the human being from savagery to civilization.

St. Kitts and Nevis defines *genuine development* in terms of human aspects.

> "Aid for trade should however not replace a genuine development – friendly outcome in the core modalities demanded by our people." (St. Kitts and Nevis)

In addition to directly referring to *core modalities demanded by our people*, the human aspect is emphasized by using the adjective *friendly*, usually referring to human attributes. The use of possessive pronoun *our,* referring to the commonality of the issue, is in accordance with Burke's theory, which states that identification is the main process of persuasion in rhetoric. (Summa, 1996, 56) References to associating or separating oneself from a group will be further discussed in part 5.5. Similar to St. Kitts and Nevis´ reference to *genuine development* is Botswana's mention of *concrete, substantial welfare gains*.

> "In this regard therefore, the success of the Doha Round should, in my view, be defined by the extent to which its outcomes translate into concrete, substantial welfare gains for the world's poor. "(Botswana)

Human side of development is connected to the adjectives *genuine, substantial and concrete*, and hence human development is emphasized as something real and tangible. In comparison to other aspects of development, it is the human aspect that is therefore *real* development.

Also Cuba brings the human aspects of development to the fore.

> "The solution is not to continue applying the failed neoliberal formula, but to apply different approaches that consider the human being as the reason and center for development, in accordance with to the Millennium Development Goals." (Cuba)

Cuba makes an explicit distinction between the neoliberal formula and human development, and uses a dissociative technique by separating the *solution* from *neoliberal formula,* the ideology generally associated with the operation of the WTO. Human being should, according to Cuba, be the *reason* for development. This is an interesting expression, since it is not often questioned why development should be promoted in the first place. Oxford Dictionary defines the term *reason* as "a cause, explanation, or justification for an action or event". The human being should, according to Cuba, be the justification for development, and therefore only the development that benefits the human being would be justified.

Besides Cuba, also other members refer to the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of the United Nations, which foremost represent the human side of development.[8]

> "We believe lack of progress will delay achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, the target date for which is now only 5 years away." (UK)

> "Likewise, this should enable them (developing countries) to industrialize, generate wealth and employment opportunities and ensure that trade contribute to poverty eradication and galvanize our efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals" (Namibia)

The MDGs are seen as a superior development goal separated from the development objectives of the Doha Round. Their achievement is seen as the foremost development objective, to which the conclusion of the development round would contribute. In the statement of the UK, argumentation is based on the structure of reality by appealing to liaisons of succession, more precisely to the causal tie between the conclusion of the development round and achievement of the MDGs. The argument implies that the round should be concluded, because this leads to the achievement of the MDGs. In the example of Namibia this causality is not taken as a fact, since the verb *should* is used to indicate that the current state differs from this. In the statement of UK, the causality is recognized, but instead of taken as a fact it is being *believed* to.

Despite the fact that precision of the targets constituting the MDGs can also be disputed, in the statements they are being referred to as a defined specific target that is either the main object to achieve or the unattainability of which is lamented. Their role as the official target for development is used as a premise for the argumentation, and the audience's adherence to the thesis is assumed as given. The adherence can be taken as given when addressing a group, which by their profession or commitments are supposed to act accordingly. (Perelman, 1982, 31) This applies in the case of the MDGs and the WTO members, because the MDGs have been universally signed by all UN members, and thus also by all the WTO members. Furthermore, unlike the abstract value of benevolent

[8] The eight Millennium Development Goals: 1) eradicating extreme poverty and hunger 2) achieving universal primary education, 3) promoting gender equality and empowering women, 4) reducing child mortality rates, 5) improving maternal health, 6) combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases, 7) ensuring environmental sustainability, 8) developing a global partnership for development.
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/

development, the MDGs play the role of Perelman's concrete value bearing upon specific being, group or an institution, such as the UN in this case. (Perelman, 1982, 32) References to MDGs are also authority arguments, since the institutional role of the UN legitimates them.

A few statements featured outright expressions referring to the human consequences of underdevelopment.

> "One billion population is starving on this planet." (Ukraine)

> "We need to educate 120 million school-age children currently out of classrooms, to help 250 million working children, to provide safe waste disposal for some 2.6 billion people, and to eradicate poverty and malnutrition that results in some 25,000 child deaths each day. The state of the world's basic social services also shows millions of people not having sufficient food, one billion people lacking access to safe and potable water, and 2 billion living without sanitation supplies." (Philippines)

The examples of Ukraine and Philippines resemble the basic need –approach (see chapter 2.2.3) emphasizing the fundamental necessities of modern human life. These statements appeal to the audience by premising their argumentation on a universal value of helping the less fortunate and on the locus of dignity. (Perelman, 1982, 30) The presumptions behind the arguments are universal agreements, such as poverty and hunger must be removed, and children must be educated and not allowed to work. In addition, the arguments are strongly intensified by the usage of quantities, and in terms of Perelman's agreements behind the argumentation, the audience is thus assured by using the general locus of quantity. While what is good for the greatest amount of people is preferable to something that profits only a few, something negative is less preferable the more people it involves. (Perelman, 1982, 30)

4.2.4 Development as integration to the world economy

In addition to economic and human aspects of development discussed above, the theme integration to the world economy is highlighted in the statements as a crucial aspect for developing countries.

> "Further integration of their (least developing countries) economies in the multilateral trading system through increased regional and global configurations therefore remains their only hope." (Tanzania)

> "In conclusion, allow me to re-emphasise that the successful conclusion of the Doha negotiations will go a long way in accelerating economic growth, alleviating poverty and integrating developing countries into the multilateral trading system. " (Botswana)

According to Tanzania, further integration in the multilateral trading system is the *only hope* for the least developing countries, i.e. the integration would be the only way for them to develop. The underlying presumption, according to which integration is always beneficial for developing countries, reveals that the neoliberal ideology is the premise for the argumentation also in this connection. Botswana mentions integration in conjunction with *economic growth* and *alleviating poverty*, which count among the economic and social aspects of development. Interestingly, no causal tie can be marked between further integration and other aspects of development: *integrating developing countries into the multilateral trading system* is a goal per se, not because it contributes to development. This is apparent also in the statement of Portugal.

> "Closer integration of Developing countries, particularly the LDCs, into global markets, as well as the achievement of their own development objectives, must be one of our priorities. " (Portugal)

While Portugal separates *closer integration of developing countrie*s from *their own development objectives,* a notion following the ideas of participatory development, it nevertheless deems both as equal priorities.

The linkage between integration to the global economy and development was emphasized already by the *dependistas* in the 1970s as discussed in the chapter 2. However, while the scholars adhering to structural theories have emphasized the unjust way the developing countries are integrated to the global economy, a majority of the WTO members focus on the need for more integration. Deeper integration to the world economy and to the multilateral trading system appears as one of the main facilitators for development.

Some members touch closer to the critical world systems – dogma in their statements: in the statement of Jordan, *equitable and just dissemination of economic prosperity in the world* is defined as the *overall objective*. The statements of Kyrgyz and Greece entail notions of the polemic globalization critique.

> "We agree with the statements that under conditions of major inequality around the world in terms of socio-economic development and resources, risks and benefits of globalization are distributed asymmetrically between the countries and that less developed economies are often deprived of the opportunity to benefit from equal participation in the processes of globalization." (Kyrgyz)

> "Fighting poverty and building an inclusive world is another challenge the international community faces today." (Greece)

While Kyrgyz states explicitly to *agree* with the notion that *risks and benefits of globalization are distributed asymmetrically*, Greece's stand can be interpreted from the importance put on *building an inclusive world*. The need for *inclusive world* presumably refers to the notions of globalization critics, according to which parts of the world are being left out from the process of globalization (see chapter 2.2.2).

Bolivia, on the other hand, draws more squarely from the ideas of the dependency school by referring to *trade dependence.* As noted in chapter 2.2.2, unfair patterns of global trade are still emphasized as the main problem for development especially by many NGOs. Trade dependence, among aid or technological dependence, is according to Ghosh (2001, 133) one of the areas of development, where dependency plays a major role still today.

Also Sierra Leone highlights the discontents of globalization, but has a strikingly different view on trade.

> "As such making the results and benefits of globalization more inclusive and more beneficial to the least privileged countries everywhere should remain our major objective. (…) Trade is indeed one of the solutions and that is the reason why we are here today." (Sierra Leone)

Unlike the polemic world system -dogma or critical globalization views, Sierra Leone perceives trade as *one of the solutions* instead of the main problem. The distinct relationships constructed between trade and development are scrutinized more detailed in the next part.

4.3. Development and the multilateral trading system

As discussed in the chapter 2, the different paradigms of development studies have strikingly different attitudes towards international trade: it can be perceived as the saviour for developing countries, as one of the main causes for their plight, or as something in the middle. The first one of these positions, free trade benefits all, is the official ideology of the WTO. However, the level of faith in free trade varies greatly between the member states, and even though the vast majority of members ostensibly swear by free trade in principle, in many cases this is anyhow breached in practise. As Stiglitz (2002, 438) points out, despite the endemic rhetoric in favour of rapid liberalisation, rich countries with full employment and strong safety nets generally argue that they need to impose protective measures to help those adversely affected by trade. The question is how could developing countries then be expected to obey to these directions touting trade liberalisation.

In the ministerial statements made during the 7th Ministerial Conference, three distinct positions on the impacts of free trade for development could be recognized: free trade was deemed beneficial for development, potentially beneficial for development, or detrimental for development. The first two of these discourses were clearly more prevalent while the last one was presented merely in a couple of statement.

4.3.1. Free trade beneficial for development

The advocacy of free trade becomes apparent in the statements in various ways. Some members explicitly state their position as supporters of trade liberalization.

> "On development, Ireland believes trade is one of the most important drivers." (Ireland)

> "Bulgaria, as a WTO Member and Member State of the European Union, fully believes in the principles of economic integration and the benefits of a liberal and open global trading system, based on clear and transparent rules." (Bulgaria)

> "Greece believes that the main contribution to recovery, growth and development will be the conclusion of the DDA in 2010, on the basis of the progress already made. " (Greece)

Interestingly, the verb '*believe'* was used several times when member countries expressed their support for free trade. According to Oxford Dictionary, one definition of 'believe' is to "accept that (something) is true, especially without proof". Despite being the cornerstone of the operation of the WTO, the merits of trade are thus not taken as a fact in these statements, but rather as something to accept to be true without proof. While Ireland *believes* that trade is beneficial for development, Bulgaria *believes* in the benefits of multilateral trading system and Greece in the benefits of concluding the Doha Round. All these three aspects are, hence, actually deemed as matters of faith. *Believe* being a word that commonly refers to religious belief can also be interpreted as a sort of metaphor. According to Burke (1969a, 506), metaphors are linguistic expansions that take the description to a new level, and in this case, the religious reference provides the expression with a sense of deep and strong commitment the language user wants to stress as a means of argumentation.

However, in some of the statements, the benefits of free trade, and thus the neoliberal formula, are perceived more as a fact than as a belief.

> "This Round will bring the benefits of growth and development through trade liberalization to all 153 Members of the WTO." (Japan)

> "We should remember that liberalised trade is the cornerstone of development." (Iceland)

> "We have made our specific interests well known: that meaningful market opening is required to complete the Round. " (USA)

In the statements of Japan, Iceland and USA, the neoliberal formula is the premise of the argumentation, which is exemplified by using the verbs *'is'* and '*will*' instead of less definite 'can', 'could' or 'would': this Round *will* bring the benefits of growth and development, liberalised trade *is* the cornerstone of development, and meaningful market opening *is* required to complete the Round. Iceland uses the metaphor *cornerstone* to emphasize the absolute necessity of trade for development: development is either fully dependent or based on trade. USA deems meaningful market opening as a necessity for completing the development round, and thus simultaneously implies that market opening is the most important factor for development. These neoliberal notions are premise of the argumentation, because the way they are presented implies that they are not expected to be questioned.

Also Pakistan and Canada squarely adhere to the neoliberal formula in their statements.

> "A world of opportunity awaits us. We can either provide strength to free trade and ensure prosperity for the weakest amongst us or we can let this opportunity slip by. The latter is not an option." (Pakistan)

> "We cannot afford to lose sight of the importance of keeping markets open and creating new market access opportunities, especially for our developing and least-developed trading partners." (Canada)

Pakistan and Canada apply a dissociative argumentation technique by separating what is *an option* or what can be *afforded* from not concluding the round and further liberalizing trade. Stating that something is not possible is a powerful means of persuasion, because it doesn't provide the audience with any other choice than to accept the argument.

Pakistan accentuates its message by using a metonymy *a world of opportunity*. While metaphors connect the word with features of another element, metonymies replace the

word with another essentially similar word. Reference to a *world of opportunity* invokes an image of a whole new world different and improved version of the world of today. Comparing the expression with more neutral 'new opportunities' makes the connotational difference obvious, even though the expressions are in essence synonymous. This new meaning for the expression is also a reduced meaning, which is why Burke refers to metonymies as linguistic reductions.

In addition to the explicit ways members expressed their advocacy for free trade, their position could be interpreted also more implicitly. One example is the way members pride on the level of openness of their own trade regime.

> "Albania offers today a very liberal trade regime for investors and a consolidated, transparent and favourable business climate." (Albania)

> "Despite the challenges and difficulties, Maldives continues to be one of the most open and liberal economies. (…) Our trade and investment policies are liberal and open. " (Maldives)

Albania and Maldives seem to be demonstrating that they are 'good' members and aim to gain respect and approval from other members. This implies that the unstated presumption behind the arguments is the adherence to the neoliberal ideology: the freer your economy is, the better.

4.3.2. Free trade potentially beneficial for development

In some of the statements, the link between trade and development is recognized, but its complexity is also emphasized. The notion seemed to be that trade can support development, but necessarily doesn't.

> "Nigeria acknowledges that trade liberalisation can and does contribute to economic growth and development. However, we also recognise that the relationship between trade liberalisation and development is not automatic." (Nigeria)

> "Trade is, and could continue to be an important means of achieving these crucial goals of development. (…) While the multilateral trading system has worked and served international trade well, it has not sufficiently served the interests of the weak and vulnerable economies like Namibia. " (Namibia)

Nigeria and Namibia both use two verbs, a more definite and a less definite one, to exemplify the nature of the relationship: trade liberalisation *can* and *does* contribute to development, and trade *is* and *could* continue to be an important means of achieving these crucial goals of development. While Nigeria probably aims to emphasize that the link exists, but however, is not automatic, Namibia seems to imply that the link exists at present, but necessarily won't in the future. Furthermore, Namibia uses a dissociative argumentation technique by separating what has worked and served international trade well from what has benefited the weak and vulnerable economies.

The potential benefits of trade are highlighted also in the statement by Finland.

> "Trade can create opportunities for growth and well-being on the basis of division of labor and comparative advantages." (Finland)

In the statement of Finland the nature of the relationship between trade and development is described by using the expression *opportunities*: trade can create *opportunities* for development instead of creating development. The certainty of the relationship is further diminished by using the modal verb *can.* In addition, the potential benefits of trade are justified by referring to the classical economic theory, which gives the impression that the language-user does not perceive the argument as a fact or truth, but rather as something that needs to be justified. The justification of the argument is being done by the means of quasi-local technique, which replicates the structures of formal logic. By referring to a theory, the language-user aims to create laboratory-like conditions, where features such as individual evaluation criteria or changing environmental factors, inevitably connected to human activities are excluded. (Kuusisto, 1996, 280)

The need for justification or proof for the benefits of free trade for development become apparent also in the statements by Rwanda and Australia.

> "Rwanda welcomes the opportunity provided by the seventh session of the WTO Ministerial Conference to reflect on the role of the multilateral trading system in promoting economic recovery and development." (Rwanda)

> "And finally I think it is in all of our interests to find better and more effective ways by which we measure the benefits of trade and to demonstrate why it is in everyone's interests that we continue the liberalization agenda." (Australia)

While Rwanda considers the reflection on the role of the multilateral trading system in development important, Australia emphasizes the need to find ways to measure this relationship. Interestingly, Australia wants to measure why the liberalization agenda is in everyone's interests instead of whether it is or not. Australia doesn't thus question the benefits of free trade, but deems important to prove it for others.

Some members recognized the potential benefits of free trade, but emphasize instead the negative effects.

> "It is no hidden secret that trade opening works for development but only if the imbalances it creates between developed countries and LDCs are adequately addressed. These imbalances have prevented LDCs from taking advantage of existing programmes." (Sierra Leone)

Sierra Leone emphasizes the hegemonic position of the 'free trade benefits all' –view by stating that it is *no hidden secret that trade opening works for development*. The expression *no hidden secret* is a metonymy stating in a more eloquent manner that 'everyone knows'. Furthermore, the metonymy entails a connotation that reduces the importance put on the matter in question. The main point is not that trade opening works for development, but that the role of imbalances it creates is crucial. In the statement of Sierra Leone, trade is perceived to be potentially both beneficial and detrimental for development.

4.3.3. Free trade detrimental for development

The minority discourse appearing in the statements entailed emphases given to the disadvantages of free trade. While some of the statements perceive the neoliberal formula eulogizing liberal trade as a fact, as described earlier in this part, some others challenge

this notion thoroughly. One way the negative effects of trade liberalization are emphasized, is to use own experience as an example.

> "The much touted benefits of trade liberalization have not materialized for some of us. In fact, in the case of my own country, Jamaica, imports have grown disproportionately to exports. (Jamaica)

> "We were told that economic liberalization coupled with trade liberalization would unleash the latent economic potential of small vulnerable economies like that of Saint Lucia. Mr. Chair, despite swallowing the bitter pill of economic liberalization and despite our attempts to adhere to our obligations under the Marrakesh Agreement, we are still in search of the economic promise land." (Saint Lucia)

Both Jamaica and Saint Lucia use associative argumentation technique establishing the real by using themselves as an example. As Perelman (1982, 106) notes, argumentation by example seeks in the specific case the law or the structure, which the example reveals. In these cases, Jamaica and Saint Lucia are aiming to a generalization: the economic liberalization doesn't work in general, because it hasn't worked for them. Argumentation by example can be an efficient means of argumentation, because as Perelman notes (1982, 106), even though the scope of the rule or degree of generalization can be disputed, the principle of generalization itself cannot.

Jamaica refers to the polemic notions of unjust global trade structures that treat countries unequally, and thus follows the adherents of dependency or world system theories. The statement of Saint Lucia is characterised by colourful and symbolic language and the use of tropes. The metaphor *swallowing the bitter pill* is an idiomatic expression for something that is hard to accept accentuating the unpleasanty of the event. In addition, the metaphor implies that Saint Lucia had no choice but to liberalize its economy, i.e. it was not something it did voluntarily. The expression e*conomic promise land* can be interpreted as an irony, which, as a Burke's trope, functions as a challenger for a mere one vantage point. (Burke, 1969a, 512-513). The biblical reference to *promise land* is an exaggeration, and exaggerations are often interpreted as linguistic marks of irony in classical rhetoric (Leiwo & Pietikäinen, 1996, 101) In essence, the language-user is ridiculing the neoliberal ideas of economic liberalization as the savour for countries. The use of colourful and symbolic language as a means of argumentation could imply that the neoliberal notions were

deemed to prevail in the context of WTO, and in an attempt to challenge them and draw attention, more striking language is being used.

Some of the statements directly state that the current system and the WTO dogmas based on neoliberal ideology are flawed and should be altered.

> "The conclusion is that, in order to prevent any such crises in the future, there must be a return to the principle of regulation by the State. To do this, the liberalization commitments made with respect to the financial services sector in the WTO have to be reversed. Greater liberalization does not necessarily lead to greater prosperity, in this case it means greater poverty. The WTO dogmas need to be revised." (Bolivia)

> "The crisis has denied the myths that deregulation and economic liberalization promote growth and development. (...) The international trading and financial system needs to be radically transformed, not superficially, so as to face the challenges of the XXI Century." (Cuba)

Both Bolivia and Cuba refer to the on-going financial crisis as a proof for the unworkability of economic liberalization, and by connecting these two elements, they use an associative argumentation technique appealing on the structure of reality. The economic liberalization is deemed as a cause and the crisis as a consequence. While Bolivia highlights the necessity of change by using the modal verbs *must* and *have to*, the argument by Cuba is intensified by referring to the benefits of deregulation and economic liberalization as *myths.* Myth is a powerful term, which completely withdraws the validity of the matter in question.

As analysed in this part, the viewpoints on the relationship between free trade and development differed greatly in the statements and ranged from the benefits being viewed as a fact to being denounced as a myth. In the next part, I draw attention on how different roles are constructed for developed and developing countries in terms of tackling development issues.

4.4. Roles of developed and developing countries in tackling development

The questions of who are deemed as active players in the process of development or who have responsibility have always been at the heart of development studies and any discussion concerning development politics. The questions generally deal with perspectives of developed countries towards developing countries and the transfer of resources from rich to poor, such as development aid. The responsibility to cater for the less fortunate stems from the teachings of religions, and the roots of development aid lie in the missionary movement dating back to the 19th century. The main goal was to save the souls of the heathen, but also to materially improve their living conditions. (Lindberg, 2004, 89)

The most extreme viewpoints concerning the questions of responsibility emphasize the consequences of colonialism and neo-colonialism and deem developed countries as the main culprits for the plight of developing countries. According to these standpoints, in addition to the historical impacts caused by colonization, the developed world is responsible for preventing the development in the developing world by maintaining global structures, such as unfair trade patterns, which hinder development. The topical discussions on climate change also touch close to these ideas: developed industrial nations are responsible for climate change, but the developing countries are the ones suffering the most (see e.g. McGregor, 2008). In addition to emphasizing the responsibility of the developed countries, such viewpoints often seem to give all the power to developed countries by implying that only they can change the status quo and enable development in the developing world. More recent paradigms of development studies have, however, questioned this approach and focused on emphasizing the agency of developing countries, for example by applying the notions of participatory development, as discussed in chapter 2.2.3.

In terms of roles and positions of developed and developing countries, three different discourses could be recognized from the statements. The first one belittles the differences between developing and developed countries, deems development as something that benefits all, and in the process of which everyone has an equal role. The second one makes a clear distinction between developing and developed countries, but binds them in a

positive relationship of either partnership or donor-recipient relationship. The developed countries provide aid to developing countries and support them based on their own political interests, philanthropy or both. The third discourse implies that the developed countries are at least partly responsible for causing the underdevelopment and they also hold the key for solving the situation.

4.4.1 Development for all

Some of the statements emphasize that the multilateral trading system and conclusion of the Doha Round should lead to benefits for all members. This axiomatic notion becomes interesting, when being brought to the context of Doha Development Round: if the interests of all are the priority of the Doha Round, what creates the development aspect of it?

> "The way forward for the WTO is to liberalize trade for the benefit of all. The gradual opening of markets should contribute to achieving further objectives – sustainable development, poverty reduction, welfare and stability." (Denmark)

> "Finally, the Doha outcome has to reflect key interests of all members. We will only have a successful agreement where everyone's special interests are adequately catered for." (Ireland)

In the statement of Denmark, the way forward is highlighted to be *for the benefits of all.* Denmark further refers to *sustainable development, poverty reduction, welfare and stability*, which also seem to be meant to concern all the members. Furthermore, in the statement of Ireland, Doha outcome that reflects *interests of all members,* and where *everyone's special interests are adequately catered for* is deemed an absolute necessity. The associative argumentation technique forms a direct causal tie between the successfulness of the agreement and catering for everyone's special interests: the Doha outcome is not successful if it doesn't reflect the interests of all. Therefore, surprisingly, the crucial aspect is not to prioritize the interests of developing countries. The development aspect is brought to concern all the members, which becomes apparent also in the statements of Finland and Singapore.

> "In fact, trade policies can have an important role in promoting sustainable development in all its three dimensions, the ecological, economic and social – both in developed and developing countries." (Finland)

> "Repeated studies indicate that the Round would bring income benefits and development prospects that would be enjoyed across developed and developing world" (Singapore)

Finland itemizes three separate dimensions of development, which can be promoted by trade policies, both in developed and developing countries. Although the notion of development for developed countries might be peculiar, when defined in its three dimensions, development is more naturally connected also with the developed world. Furthermore, when paired with the term *sustainable*, the expression is widely used in reference to development everywhere. According to Singapore, the Round would bring *development prospects* also to the developed world. The argumentation is based on the structure of reality, because it uses an argument from authority by referring to *repeated studies.* As Perelman notes (1982, 94), the authorities invoked in argumentation can vary considerably and range, for example, from general opinion to a designated person or physics or a doctrine.

In these statements, development is understood as a continuous process the end of which hasn't been reached by developed countries. The notion is in accordance with some of the most recent approaches of development, which emphasize that the problem of development is a relative one and no part of the world can claim to be developed in all respects. (Servaes, 1999, 6) Some of the statements define more clearly what this development for developed countries could be.

> "We believe that a balanced completion of the Doha Round will significantly contribute to the recovery and growth of the global economy, and establish a more sustainable, development-oriented international trading regime, giving new opportunities to all Member States. (…) It is about better living standards for our people better healthcare and education, less poverty and a cleaner environment." (Cape Verde)

> "Trade liberalization is not an end itself: it has to contribute to economic growth and welfare on a global scale as well as to improving living conditions in all countries." (Austria)

Cape Verde highlights *recovery and growth of the global economy* and *new opportunities to all Member States,* and further lists the exact elements of development that seem to be the focus of these new opportunities. The importance of development-oriented trading regime is mentioned, but benefits for developing countries in particular are not emphasized. In a similar vein, Austria highlights the issues *economic growth and welfare on a global scale* and *improving living conditions in all countries*. These notions imply that the aim is not to close the gap between developed and developing countries but create progress for all countries in a way that would not change the unequal distribution of global wealth.

Emphasizing the benefits of the Doha Development Round and free trade to all member countries can also be interpreted to serve as a means of argumentation. Naturally, when addressing the audience consisting of all members, it seems more effective to emphasize the interests of all instead of only one group. By not making a separation between the interests of developing or developed countries, one of which every member country belongs to, the commonality of the issue is emphasized. This commonality is highlighted, for example, by Cape Verde with the reference to *our people*. As for Burke's identification process, in these statements, the speaker is identifying itself with the group of all WTO members and the lack of identification to only one group also works as a means of argumentation.

4.4.2 Developing countries need help

The common debates of today over development aid touch to the core of the matter regarding assistance provided by developed countries to developing countries. Due to the problems regarding the nature and effectiveness of the assistance, some thoroughly question the usefulness of aid. (see e.g. Moyo, 2009) However, developed countries generally provide aid as a part of their foreign policy and in the context of the WTO, the Aid for Trade –initiative is a key part of the special treatment given to developing country members.

The importance of assistance for developing countries is heavily emphasized in many of the statements of developing country members.

> "Mr Chairman, the importance of Aid for Trade in addressing constraints afflicting supply side capacities and trade related infrastructure deficiencies for developing countries cannot be over emphasised, especially in these tough times. Let me take this opportunity to urge all our bilateral and multilateral development partners to fulfil their commitments under the Aid for Trade initiative." (Zimbabwe)

> "We strongly urge development partners to abide by their commitments, to provide more substantial financial resources and to respect their announced contributions to the Enhanced Integrated Framework." (Madagascar)

In these statements, the speaker is directly addressing *development partners* and emphasizing the importance of continuing the assistance they provide. The use of expression *development partners* instead of, for example, aid donors is in conjunction with the participatory development –approach: development work is being done in partnership and both parties have an important role in the process. Clear distinction between the developing and developed countries is however being made, and the position of the speaker is made evident by referring to *our* development partners. The importance of assistance is not being discussed objectively, but instead, the identification of the speaker works as a means of persuasion by making the issue more personal. In both of these statements, a strong appealing verb *urge* is used, and Zimbabwe further mentions that the issue *cannot be over emphasised*. In addition to accentuating the vast importance of the matter, reference to the commitments the development partners have made, works as a basis of the argumentation. Thus, the argumentation draws from a universal agreement; what has been committed to, needs to be fulfilled.

Similarly, some statements address the development partners but appeal to them in a less demanding manner.

> "We trust that our development partners will come forward to assist us to meet these challenges." (Sri Lanka)

> "We sincerely hope that our developed partners would be sympathetic to our needs and concerns. " (Barbados)

In the statements of Sri Lanka and Barbados, the persuasion is being done in a crucially different manner than in the statements discussed above: while the former statements demand the development partners to abide by their commitments, the latter ones kindly ask the development partners for help. Furthermore, instead of appealing to the need to fulfil their commitments, the statements are appealing to the good will of the development partners. Hence, both a demand and a kind request work as means of persuasion.

Also some developed countries highlight the importance of the assistance.

> "They do not have at their disposal the safety nets or economic stimulus packages that countries such as mine can afford. (…) We, the richer countries, must help them succeed, by enhancing the Aid for Trade regime but not least; to conclude the DDA swiftly." (Norway)

> "Trade liberalization is not enough for developing countries in itself. (…) That is why we in Australia are pleased to participate by significantly increasing our commitment to the WTO's fund for Aid for Trade programme and also our contribution recently announced to the Advisory Centre for WTO Law." (Australia)

In the statements of Norway and Australia, the identification of the speaker to the group of aid donors and richer countries is explicitly stated. Norway uses the separating pronouns *'they'* and *'us'*, and hence implies that there is clearly two groups of member countries. The statements seem to be addressing other developed countries, and while Norway places a demand stating that *we, the richer countries, must help,* Australia emphasizes its own goodwill by informing about its participation in aid programs and reasons for it. By providing an example, Australia seems to be suggesting that since Australia is participating, others should, too. When aid-giving is generally emphasized as important by another developed member, it becomes hard for other developed members not to participate.

In addition to emphasis given to the need for support to developing countries, some statements entail a notion according to which developed countries have more power than their ability to help.

> "We urge therefore the major players to balance national interests with the DDA and take up their leadership challenge in advancing the negotiations towards their successful conclusion" (Kenya)

> "We further call on the developed countries to demonstrate the required leadership by exercising the flexibilities that would translate the present political commitments into the concrete proposals that would lead to the successful conclusion of the Round in 2010." (Nigeria)

The statements of Kenya and Nigeria *urge* and *call on* the developed countries to take action in terms of concluding the Doha Round. Kenya uses the expression *major players* emphasizing the power that some countries have in the 'game'. Furthermore, these countries are asked to *take up their leadership challenge* and *demonstrate the required leadership.* The presumption behind the argument is the system of global power structures: leadership and the necessary actions to conclude the Doha Round can be taken up only by developed countries. Developing countries are left with the role of urging them to do this. Interestingly, developing countries themselves are not questioning this power structure and demanding more power or active role in the process.

Along the similar lines, St. Vincent and the Grenadines implies that their ability to participate in the process of trade negotiations is in the hands of developed countries.

> "St. Vincent and the Grenadines looks forward to making its contribution to the process, as long as we are enabled to do so." (St. Vincent and the Grenadines)

The idea of developed countries *enabling* developing countries is very interesting, since it suggests that developing countries have the capability and willingness to participate, but they need to be first externally enabled. In a similar vein to classical development theories, in which development is brought to developing countries from the outside, overcoming the development challenges seem to be merely dependent on external factors.

4.4.3 Developed countries are responsible for hindering development

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, according to viewpoints often emphasized by developing countries or NGOs promoting their interests, developed countries are at least partly responsible for the underdevelopment due to the legacy of colonization or the maintenance of the global structures of today. Similar stances were apparent in the statements and as can be expected in the context of the WTO, the unfair trade structures hindering development are emphasized in some of them.

> "Instead of prioritizing the advancement of outstanding reforms that are of urgent need to developing countries, like cotton and the LDC package, recent engagements have been dominated by unfair demands placed on major developing countries to enhance market access for the benefit of narrow commercial lobbies in parts of the developed world." (South Africa)

> "At the same time, the WTO must ensure compliance with the moral obligation on developed countries to open up their markets to developing countries and to eliminate the large subsidies given to their agricultural products." (Bolivia)

South Africa states explicitly that instead of the reforms that are urgent need to developing countries, the benefits of commercial lobbies in the developed world have been prioritized in trade negotiations. The injustice of the situation is accentuated by comparing the *urgent needs* of developing countries with the *benefits of narrow commercial lobbies*. Bolivia is referring to *moral obligations* of developed countries in terms of altering the structures of trade. Stating that something is a *moral obligation* bases the argumentation on a preferable, on a universal value of moral: the audience is assumed to have a sense of moral and seek to behave in a moral way. Asserting that something is a *moral obligation* instead of explaining why something should be done is a powerful means of argumentation, because it suggests that everyone with a sense of moral must act accordingly.

An emotion-based argumentation is used also in the statement of Ghana, in which the current situation of trade relations is described in an explanatory manner.

> "Eight years on, very little commitment has been exhibited, especially by our developed counterparts to ensure the realisation of the development goals that we have set for ourselves to the benefit of the entire membership of this organisation. (…) Our countries continue to devote their rather meagre resources – human and financial – to participate in the negotiations by pressing their concerns home in the hope that we would reach our common goal of a new global trading relations, (….) This important sector however remains not only uncompetitive but also near collapse in some African countries as a result of subsidies that the developed countries continue to devote to their agricultural sector. " (Ghana)

Firstly, the actions of developed and developing countries are contrasted in a manner that makes evident which one is the villain: while *very little commitment* has been exhibited by the developed countries, developing countries *continue to devote their rather meagre resources* and *press their concerns home* for the common goal. Secondly, by mentioning the state of one sector in developing countries, an illustrative example is given of the consequences of unfair trade rules. By the use of the expression *as a result,* a direct causal tie is explicitly established between the subsidies in developed countries and the poor state of one industry in African countries.

The global financial crisis is emphasized in some of the statements as a central element hindering development.

> "In particular, we have continued to experience the devastating and far-reaching effects of the current global economic and financial crisis on the fragile and vulnerable economies of developing countries, even though the crisis originated in the developed economies." (Nigeria)

> "Many serious economists say that the origin of the crisis lay in the lack of regulation of the financial system in an extremely powerful country, naturally a Member of this Organization." (Bolivia)

Nigeria highlights both the dreadfulness of the crisis by using the adjectives *devastating* and *far-reaching* as well as the poor nature of developing countries by the adjectives *fragile* and *vulnerable.* The expression *even though* accentuates the inequity of the situation. The premise of the argument seems to be the presumption that effects should not be suffered where the crisis hasn't originated, which is an interesting notion when reversed: it would

be more justified that there is suffer, where the crisis originated. Bolivia lays the responsibility of the crisis on only one member country, but leaves the country unnamed as an ostensible expression of courtesy. The addition *naturally a member of this organization* however makes the statement offensively accusing, since the speaker seems to remind everyone that the accused member is present. The argument is an authority argument, because it refers to *many serious economists* and the level of the authority is increased by the quantity *many,* drawing from the locus of quantity, and adjective *serious*, which is used as a synonym for 'professional' or 'credible'.

In addition to references to consequences of trade structures and economic crisis, developed countries were given responsibility for the plight of developing countries also due to their other actions.

> "We have also witnessed an upsurge of government intervention and the re-emergence of protectionism, particularly in some developed countries. These events have placed in jeopardy and, in some instances, derailed the development efforts of many developing countries, including small vulnerable economies like ours. (...) This failure is in part explained by the self-serving actions of some members, particularly a few developed countries." (Barbados)

> "Under supposedly environmental tricks, there is a current proliferation of initiatives like taxing products from underdeveloped countries on the basis of the level of greenhouse gas emissions linked to their production. The purpose is not to protect the planet, when in parallel the historic responsible for pollution do not take on multilateral commitments, but to stop the process of development of the South through the application of unilateral protectionist measures that will not solve the problem of the global climate change." (Cuba)

Barbados refers to government intervention and protectionism, highlights *particularly in some developed countries,* and argues that as a result of these actions, the development efforts have been derailed. The failure of concluding the Doha Round is also *partly explained by the self-serving actions of some members*, and *particularly a few developed countries* are highlighted again. Cuba is putting the blame on the environment protection measures applied by developed countries and explicitly questions them by using the adverb *supposedly* and the word *tricks*. The term *tricks* can be interpreted to serve as a

metonymy reducing the meaning of the expression to a dismissive level. Cuba further dissociates the *purpose* of these environmental tricks from protecting the planet, and states that instead, the purpose is to stop the process of development in the developed world. Thus, Cuba makes a direct accusation that developed countries are consciously stopping the process of development.

Also Jamaica implies that developed countries are able to hinder development.

> "We must not be handicapped in our efforts to promote economic growth, poverty alleviation, social development, rural development and greater integration into the global economy." (Jamaica)

The use of the metaphor *handicapped* is a strong linguistic expression literally referring to a person with a disability and thus, combines the associations of a disabled person with the state of developing countries. Moreover, instead of referring to the state of developing countries as handicapped, Jamaica refers to the process of being handicapped supposedly by developed countries. The message seems to imply that instead of being in need of help from developed countries, developing countries can promote development themselves. However, importantly, developed countries have the power to prevent this process. The fact that Jamaica deems important to stress this issue suggests that there is a concern over the actions of developed countries that deliberately or unintentionally prevent development in the developing world.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter I sum up the key results of my research. As per my research questions, I present how firstly, the concept of development (chapter 4.2), secondly, the relationship between trade and development (chapter 4.3), and thirdly, the roles of developed and developing countries (chapter 4.4) are linguistically constructed in the development discourse of the WTO. Furthermore, in particular by applying the theories of Perelman and Burke, I present through what rhetorical means the discourse is constructed.

In addition, I discuss my research findings against the background of conversations I was following when interning for the Finnish delegation to the WTO during the summer 2012. I also discuss what kind of more general implications for the Doha Round and development policy can be drawn from my research findings in terms of how development is being discussed and presented in the arena of international politics. Finally, I present the limitations of my research and my suggestions for future research.

5.1. Main results

The following table recapitulates the main results of my analysis divided into the three topics as per my research questions and both on the contents of the discourse and its linguistic construction.

Table 3. The main results

	Content of the discourse	Construction of the discourse
The concept of development	Abstract Economic aspect ubiquitous Notions on human aspect More/better integration in the world economy Traditional approach	Development as a value judgement Neoliberalism, MDGs, and sense of moral premises of the argumentation Contentious suggestive metaphors
Relationship between trade and development	Benefits of free trade a belief, a fact or a possibility Disadvantages of free trade justified	Trade liberalization the only option Colourful striking language, use of tropes Argumentation by presenting causal ties and using examples
Positioning of the countries	Development in the interests of all Developed countries have the power to assist, promote and stop hindering development	Identification to all members Appeals to commitments or goodwill and moral Global power structures a premise Striking direct accusations

No single prevailing understanding of the meaning of development could be interpreted from the statements. Development was not once explicitly defined and was generally referred to in an abstract manner. This implies that the concept is deemed to be value based and it can be a mutual goal among the WTO members only when left undefined.

Despite the lack of clear unanimous vision of development appearing in the statements, the most prominent element was its economic aspect. The economic aspect of development was referred to in conjunction with several other distinctive features, but nevertheless, it was always included. On the one hand, the emphasis of economic aspect can seem logical regarding the context of trade negotiations, but on the other hand, it can be interpreted to reflect the arguably orthodox position of economic-centred approach in development more generally (see chapter 2).

While economic aspects of development were ubiquitous, the development discourse also included emphases on the human side of development and on the need for more or better integration to the global economy. Many aspects of the discourse stemmed from the very grand narratives of development studies: modernization theory and dependency theory combined with a more human approach. This conception of development could be argued to present very traditional or even old-fashioned. More diverse and contemporary ideas connected to development, such as the cultural or gender perspective or the approaches emphasizing empowerment and the role of the individual, were greatly absent. References to ecological or sustainable development were mentioned merely a couple of times.

The most common premise for the argumentation was the neoliberal ideology. Even though neoliberalism as a term was mentioned only in the statements opposing it, numerous statements based their argumentation on the presumption of adherence to neoliberalism. As per the nature of premise of argumentation, the benefits of neoliberalism were not defended or explained, but the audience was presupposed to adhere to this agreement from the outset. The neoliberal premise was exemplified by the use of metaphors, such as trade is the *engine* or *cornerstone* of development, which entail strong neoliberal claims on the absolute necessity of trade for development.

The neoliberal notions were commonly used as a premise, but the arguments emphasizing more human or social side of development proceeded from a strikingly different starting point. The arguments appealed first and foremost to audience's moral and emotions, and the agreements behind the argumentation were, for example, sense of moral and the locus of dignity. In addition, the role of the Millennium Development Goals as the official target for development was a presumption the argumentation was based on.

The benefits of trade liberalization for development were predominantly presented in the statements either as a belief, a fact or a possibility. Several members explicitly state to *believe* in the benefits of free trade, and hence emphasize committed adherence to the neoliberal ideology. Some others referred to the relationship as an absolute truism, and notably, in neither case, the reasons why trade is beneficial for development were deemed relevant to rationalize. Not keeping markets open was simply *not afforded* and *not an*

option. Some statements took into consideration the complexity of the relationship between trade and development, which became apparent, for example, by the choice of lexicon, such as the use of less definite verbs.

A few members questioned the neoliberal ideology on the benefits of free trade thoroughly and their statements were characterized by the use of colourful and symbolic language, such as metaphors and irony. The process of trade liberalization meant *swallowing the bitter bill*, the benefits of free trade were a *myth*, and liberalization as saviour for countries was ridiculed by referring to *economic promise land*. Colourful language was a central element of the minority discourse representing resistance to the assumingly prevailing attitudes of the audience.

While the benefits of free trade were commonly not rationalized, the members emphasizing the disadvantages based their argumentation on, for example, the existence of causality or an example. These simplistic explanations suggested that financial crisis is a direct consequence of the unworkability of economic liberalization and the negative effects trade liberalization caused for one country proves its unworkability everywhere. Unlike the arguments touting free trade, the arguments emphasizing the disadvantages of free trade aimed to give evidence to back up the argument. Also this implies that the prevailing ideology was assumed to be neoliberalism.

The roles for developing and developed countries in the process of development were constructed in many ways in the statements. On the one hand, development was deemed to be something for all, and the interests of developing countries were not always emphasized. On the other hand, especially when the importance of aid was discussed, clear distinction between developed and developing countries was made and the issue was discussed in a personal manner; developing countries in particular making explicit pleads of help to their development partners appealing either on their good will or on their commitments.

A clear positioning in terms of power relations was presented especially by developing countries. Many statements seemed to suggest that developed countries have the power to help developing countries and without this assistance development cannot be enabled. In

addition, a couple of statements implied that developed countries are currently hindering development and therefore, by ending these activities they would also enable development. In a similar manner to the disadvantages of free trade discussed above, the accusations made that developed countries prevent development were expressed with colourful and striking language. In any case, developed countries seemed to have the main role in the process of development.

5.2. Discussion and implications for the Doha Round and development policies

The ambiguity of development is indisputably a character of both academic and political discussions: either development is used as a reference to acres of distinctive goals and activities or it simply remains as a broad abstract phenomenon. In the context of UN agencies, development is often included as a separate agenda point in practically all organizations whose domains vary from telecommunications and intellectual property to environment and labour rights. This is generally justified by the membership of developing countries and the special treatment they require in all areas. Notwithstanding, critics question whether the thematic of development should be introduced in all organizations and whether it, as a matter of fact, is linked to all these different areas. In addition, development as a separate agenda point is sometimes accused of greatly lacking substance and remaining as a mere ostensible feature. This phenomenon is closely linked to the ambiguity of development: when left undefined, the concept of development can be used endemically.

However, the abstract and ambiguous nature of development can be problematic in many aspects. It might be self-evident that one of the reasons why effective global development work is challenging is that there is no unequivocal understanding of what is development and hence, how could it be promoted. The existence of mutual understanding globally for development policies becomes even more unconceivable when taking into consideration the lack of unanimity even within one organization, such as the WTO. While development is seen as value-based and necessary to refer to only on an abstract level in an attempt to avoid discord, it is understandable why the development objectives of the Doha Round, among those of many other development projects, have not been realized. It would be better to move pass the focus on ideological and value-based concept of development and

strive for finding smaller concrete elements as mutual goals to focus on. As mentioned in the introduction chapter, there is a great need to produce more systematic knowledge for development in order to be able to deliver results, and the most plausible way to do this, is to concentrate on measurable concrete elements that are beyond the value-based concept.

Another interesting point of WTO's development discourse is the prevalence of neoliberalism as a premise for argumentation. Development policies based on neoliberal ideas, the so-called structural adjustment programmes, which were introduced to developing countries by the IMF and World Bank, have been widely criticised and replaced by different approaches already in the 1990s. While disadvantages of extensive privatization programmes have been generally recognized, WTO's development discourse still included simplistic not reasoned notions on the necessity of keeping markets open for development. This eulogy of free trade can seem ostensible taken into consideration the vast amount of protectionist measures all the member countries employ. Instead of continuing to emphasize merely the controversial and ideological issue of liberalization of trade, the development aspects of Doha Round could perhaps focus on smaller concrete elements, where it is easier for the member countries to find solid agreement.

In addition to the neoliberal notions, the traditional view of development dominating WTO's development discourse is noteworthy. While there has been a clear trend among NGOs and development scholars to approach development in more versatile ways, there is still a lot to be done in terms of altering the development discourse more multifaceted in international politics.

Responsibility was put on developed countries to a great extent in terms of enabling development. This notion is very interesting, since after decades of development work emphasizing participatory and empowering approaches, development seems to be still perceived as being brought to developing countries from the outside. The fact that developing countries shun claiming agency for their own progress and emphasize the responsibility of developed countries was somewhat discussed in Geneva among the people working for UN agencies. The polemic discourse suggesting that developed countries have to still pay back debt they owe to developing world due to the colonial history still lives strongly today. Moving pass this antagonism between developed and

developing countries and the accusing discourse would be greatly required in order to focus on the actual tackling of concrete development issues.

5.3. Limitations of the research and suggestions for future research

One of the limitations of my research concerns the choice of research material. While my analysis of the WTO's development discourse is limited only to the ministerial statements of the 7th Ministerial Conference, numerous other WTO documents could provide excellent insights on the organization's language of development. One interesting example would be to compare the statements made in different ministerial conferences, for example the first conference of the Doha Development Round or conferences during the previous negotiation rounds with the most recent conference. By the means of comparison the examination could focus on how the development discourse has changed, or has it, during the time the topic has been given different level of emphasis. In addition, several other WTO documents would be interesting research material, such as the statements of the Director General or the official resolutions of the meetings. In striving to understand the development discourse of the organization, one approach could be to examine different documents produced both by the members and by the secretariat for different purposes.

My research is naturally limited also by the choice of methodology, i.e. rhetorical analysis and the approached of Perelman and Burke. The rich language used in the statements would provide material for textual analysis with focus on various aspects disregarded in my research. The examination of the role of audience - central part of Perelman's theory - is marginalized in my research, but could nevertheless provide interesting findings on to who, in essence, the statements are addressed to; are the ministers addressing each other, international public or perhaps the citizens of their own countries.

Further research could be conducted also regarding some of my key findings. One interesting point is the colourful symbolic language that was foremost used in the statements representing the minority discourse expressing contradicting opinions to the prevailing discourse. The role of colourful language as a form of resistance could therefore be researched in different contexts, for example, in the field of international relations.

The predominance of adherence to neoliberalism as a premise for the argumentation could be examined wider in the context of international organizations. While the strong support for economic liberalization can naturally be affiliated with the nature of the organization such as the WTO – even thought trade restrictions its members nevertheless apply makes the affiliation less obvious – interesting would be to examine the role of neoliberal notions appearing in the texts of organizations such as UN Development Programme (UNDP), United Nation's Children Fund (UNICEF) or UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

All in all, due to the immense problematic regarding the concept of development despite its endemic use, the analysis of development discourse in various contexts would be interesting and relevant. Broadening understanding of what is actually meant by development and how these viewpoints can vary would also broaden understanding of the vast challenges regarding efficient global development work.

References

Aghion, P. & Bolton, P. 1997. A Theory of Trickle-Down Growth and Development. The Review of Economic Studies, Vol. 64, No. 2.

Alasuutari, P. 1996. Theorizing in Qualitative Research: A Cultural Studies Perspective. Qualitative Inquiry, 2(4): 371-384.

Andersson, K. & Martin, W. 2005. Agricultural Trade Reform and the Doha Development Agenda. The World Economy. Vol. 28, No. 9.

Brigg, M. 2002. Post-development, Foucault and the colonisation metaphor. Third World Quarterly, Vol. 23, No 3.

Brett, E. 2003. Participation and Accountability in Development Management. The Journal of Development Studies, Vol.40, No.2

Burke, K. 1969a: A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Burke, K. 1969b: A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Ceva & Fracasso. 2010. Seeking mutual understanding: a discourse-theoretical analysis of the WTO Dispute Settlement System. World Trade Review, Vol. 9, No. 3

Chambers, R. 1997. Whose Reality Counts? Putting the last first. Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chang, H. & Grabel, I. 2004. Reclaiming Development. An Alternative Economic Policy Manual. London: Zen Books.

Conway & Heynen. 2008. Dependency theories: from ECLA to André Gunder Frank and beyond. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Das, D. 2008. A Kiss of Life for the Withering Doha Round of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations? Global Economic review. Vol. 37, No. 2.

Desai & Potter (eds.) 2008: The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Dodds K. 2008: The Third World, developing countries, the South, poor countries. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Elliot, J. 2008. Development and social welfare/human rights. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Escobar, A. 1995. Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Esteva, G. 1992: Development. In Wolfgang Sachs (ed.): The Development Dictionary. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Evenett & Hoekman (eds.) 2006. Economic development and multilateral trade cooperation. Washington, DC : World Bank.

Eyerman, R. 1984. Social Movements and Social Theory. Sociology. Vol. 18, No. 1.

Fairclough, N. 1995. Critical Discourse Analysis. Boston: Addison Wesley.

Fairclough, N. 2001. Language and Power. London: Longman.

Fine, B. 2009. Development as Zombieconomics in the Age of Neoliberalism. Third World Quarterly, Vol. 30, No. 5

Frank, A. G. 1966. The Development of Underdevelopment. Monthly Review Press.

Fung, Garcio-Herrero, Siu, 2010. Developing countries and the World Trade Organization: A foreign influence approach. The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development. Vol. 19, No. 1.

Ghafele, R. 2004. The metaphors of globalization and trade. An analysis of the language used in the WTO. Journal of Language and Politics. Vol. 3, No. 3

Ghosh, B. 2001. Dependency Theory, Revisited. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Hettne, B. 2001. Discourses on peace and development. Progress in Development Studies 1, Vol 1.

Hettne B. 2008. Current trends and future options in development studies. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Hirsto, H. 2010. Vastuutonta puhetta? Esseitä talouden merkityksellistämisestä. Väitöskirja: Aalto-yliopiston kauppakorkeakoulu. Acta Universitatis oeconomicae Helsingiensis. A, 377. Helsinki: Aalto-yliopiston kauppakorkeakoulu, 2010. ISBN 978-952-60-1059-5.

Hoekman, B. & Kostecki, M. 2001. The Political Economy of the World Trading System. The WTO and Beyond. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoekman, B. & Nicita, A. 2010. Assessing the Doha Round: Market access, transitions costs and aid for trade facilitation. The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development. Vol. 19, No. 1.

Jensen & Gibbon. 2007. Africa and the WTO Doha Round: An Overview. Development Policy Review, Vol. 25, No. 1

Jokinen, A. 1999a. Diskurssianalyysin suhde sukulaistraditioihin. In Jokinen, Juhila, & Suoninen, (eds.) Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Jokinen, A. 1999b. Vakuuttelevan ja suostuttelevan retoriikan analysoiminen. In Jokinen, Juhila, & Suoninen, (eds.) Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Kakkuri-Knuuttila, M-L. 1998. Retoriikka. In Kakkuri-Knuuttila (ed.) Argumentti ja kritiikki. Lukemisen, keskustelun ja vakuuttamisen taidot. Gaudeamus, Helsinki.

Kakkuri-Knuuttila, M-L. 2011. Puhetaito ja puheiden lajit Aristoteleella. In Heikkinen, Vuotilainen, Lauerma, Tiililä & Lounela (eds.) Genreanalyysi – tekstilajitutkimuksen käytäntöä. Kotimaisten kielten keskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 29. Kotimaisten kielten keskus: Helsinki. URN:ISBN 978-952-5446-72-2 ISSN 1796-041X

Klak, T. 2008. World-systems theory: Cores, peripheries and semi-peripheries. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Kulovaara, K. 2007. Kilpailuvaltion kielioppi. Työmarkkinapoliittisen retoriikan analyysi. Pro gradu-tutkielma. Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja filosofian laitos. Jyväskylän yliopisto. Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-2007395.

Kuusisto, R. 1996. Sodan retoriikasta. Persianlahden ja Bosnian konfliktit läntisten suurvaltajohtajien lausunnoissa. In Palonen & Summa (eds.) Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Lévy, B. 2005. Global Competition and Economic Development: Key Governance Issues. Competitiveness Review. Vol. 15, No. 2

Leiwo, M. & Pietikäinen, S. 1996. Kieli vuorovaikutuksen ja vallankäytön välineenä. In Palonen & Summa (eds.) Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Lindberg, M. 2004: Kehityksen kieli – luodaanko maailma sanoilla? In Heta Gylling (ed.): Kehityksen etiikka ja filosofia. Helsinki: Gaudeamus

McCloskey, D. 1983. The Rhetoric of Economics. Journal of Economic Literature. Vol, 21

McGregor, D. 2008. Climate change and development. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Melkote & Kandath (2001): Barking Up the Wrong Tree? An Inward Look at the Discipline and Practice of Development Communication. In Melkote & Rao (eds.): Critical Issues in Communication: Looking inward for Answers. New Delhi: Sage.

Mohan, G. 2008. Participatory development. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Montanye, J. 2005. Rhetoric and Economic Policy. The Independent Review, Vol. 9, No.3

Moyo, D. 2009. Dead Aid. Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Munck & O'Hearn (eds.) 1999. Critical Development Theory. Contributions to a new paradigm. Zed Books. London & New York.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. 2000. After post-development. Third World Quarterly. Vol. 21, No. 2

Palonen, K. & Summa, H. 1996. Johdanto. Retorinen käänne? In Palonen & Summa (eds.) Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Perelman, C. 1982. The Realm of Rhetoric. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. 1971. The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.

Potter, R. 2008. Global governance, divergence and development. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Ray, D. 1998. Development Economics, Princeton University Press, Princeton New Jersey.

Rostow, W. 1960. Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Sachs, W (ed.) 1992: The Development Dictionary. London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Schuurman, F. 2000. Paradigms lost, paradigms regained? Development studies in the twenty-fist century. Third World Quarterly, Vol. 21, No 1

Schuurman F. 2008. The impasse in development studies. In Desai & Potter (eds.): The Companion to Development Studies. Hodder Education. London

Scott, J. & Wilkinson, R. 2010. What Happened to Doha in Geneva? Re-engineering the WTO's Image while missing key opportunities. European Journal of Development Research. Vol. 22, No 2

Sen, A. 1999: Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Servaes, J, 1999: Communication for Development. One World, Multiple Cultures. Cress- kill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Sevilla, C. The WTO Doha Development Agenda: What is at stake. Berkeley Joural of international law. Vol. 25, No. 3

Simon, D. 1997: Development reconsidered; new directions in development thinking. Geografiska Annaler.

Stiglitz, J. 2002. Two Principles for the Next Round or, How to Bring Developing Countries in from the Cold. The World Economy. Vol. 23, No. 4.

Stiglitz, J. 2005. The overselling of globalization. In Weinstein, M. (ed.) Globalization: What's new? New York: Columbia University Press.

Summa, H.1996. Kolme näkökulmaa uuteen retoriikkaan. Burke, Perelman, Toulmin ja retoriikan kunnianpalautus. In Palonen & Summa (eds.) Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Thomas, A. 2000: Meanings and Views of Development. In Tim Allen – Alan Thomas (eds.): Poverty and Development into 21st Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, C. 2004: Poverty, Development, and Hunger. In Baylis & Smith (eds.): The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vihinen, H. 1996. Maatalous tekstinä. Retoriikka maatalouspolitiikan tutkimisessa. In Palonen & Summa (eds.): Pelkkää retoriikkaa. Vastapaino, Tampere.

Wilkinson, R. 2009. Language, power and multilateral trade negotiations. Review of International Political Economy. Vol. 4, No. 16

Willis, K. 2005. Theories and Practices of Development. London: Routledge

Wilska, Von Consdorff, Lahtinen, Rekola. 2004. Köyhdytetyt. Ihmiskunnan epävirallinen enemmistö. Kehitysyhteistyön palvelukeskus, julkaisusarja 25. Helsinki: Like.

Weinstein, M.M (ed.) 2005. Globalization: What's new? New York: Columbia University Press

Woo-Cummings, M. 1999. The Developmental State. Cornell University Press.

Online sources

About the WTO — a statement by the Director-General.
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/wto_dg_stat_e.htm, retrieved 3.12.2011

Doha Development Agenda - Subjects treated under the Doha Development Agenda
http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/dda_e/dohasubjects_e.htm, retrieved 10.8.2012

UN General Assembly - A/RES/41/128 Declaration on the Right to Development
http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm, retrieved 4.11.2012

Director-General's letter to journalists
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min09_e/dg_letter_e.htm,
retrieved 3.12.2011

Ministerial Conferences - Statements by Members and observers at the plenary session
http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min11_e/min11_statements_e.htm,
retrieved 3.10.2011

Who are the developing countries in the WTO?
http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/devel_e/d1who_e.htm, retrieved 10.12.2011

The eight Millennium Development Goals:
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/, retrieved 3.3.2012