

short, we will fail to do the hard-headed policy analysis that we routinely pursue elsewhere, and in consequence buy far too easily into 'big label' projects on the basis of loosely-formulated general ideas alone.

I ask you, then, to consider the following ruminations:

*Problem 1 – The Model is static.* The first, and perhaps the most fundamental, of the difficulties, it seems to me, is that the model itself is static – a frozen portrait of how things are (or could become). But while static, it is being used as the intellectual rationale for launching a process that is inherently dynamic, a process defined by change. Now that sounds like academic gobbledygook – the contemporary social science equivalent of sophistry. So let me put the point in more concrete terms. What the model says is that if certain conditions pertain in a given society – a democratic system of government, for example, along with an honest and sophisticated apparatus for maintaining the rule of law, an effective regime for the preservation of human rights, a moderately well educated population, and so on – then there is a much better chance than there would be otherwise that the society's polity will be stable, that it will provide appropriate public services to the citizenry over which it presides, that it will behave responsibly in its relations with other powers, that it will not become a birthplace of radical politics pursued by transnationally mobile guerilla warriors, and all the rest. But that amounts to saying that if conditions in the failed or fragile state were like conditions (say) in Canada, the inhabitants would behave more like Canadians. All of which may be true. The difficulty, however, is that the conditions in question are not inert objects like the ingredients of a recipe for making cookies – so that, if we mix them together in the appropriate order and in suitable amounts, we can be sure that we will actually emerge from the exercise with... well, 'cookies.' In the real world of human affairs, change *itself* is an unpredictably disruptive force, and the law of unanticipated reactions routinely applies. Change one circumstance, or set of circumstances, and repercussions break out somewhere else, not least of all in the mind-sets of the folk who are most immediately affected.

This can happen even in response to the most prosaically instrumental of innovations. The classic example – well-known to students of development assistance – is the one that often arises with the introduction of farm tractors (and I understand we have recently done a bit of this in