eir conversed, the only outcome will be a rengthening of the social structures that ervice able one or other of the ruling factions maintain power. Societies under dictatant to rial rule are at an impasse. In such contions, no options are open to them, bee places, in order to release the capacity to nor-record foreign aid through a popular conaims or to promote even the idea of st we is development, these societies must first on, beg released from within.

 \mathbf{ablish}_{1}

ower

 \mathbf{berat}_{0}

It is felt in some quarters that the peratio wifall of a dictatorial regime should not we to precede any attempt to improve e lot of poor farmers. It should be inted out that such attempts have alady been made and have failed. There sh the transfer is no lack of good will, funds or expertise, t every attempt came up against the s of brime socio-economic structures and the tempo me social classes that had no interest in nateria cial change. It should also be rememd from that each failure bears its psycho-on—nical toll in dashed hopes. The expert or intende adviser can return home, but the diseign in pointed farmer will stay where he is and in a lirequire more convincing before joining another venture of which he quite y agenthtly does not want to bear the burden. Agen should also be remembered that farmers presere not the first to benefit from whatever is in lion is taken, since corrupt leaders and or collineaucracies redirect funds away from the ure, a jectives for which they were originally

vorld. Immitted. a part These repeated failures, therefore,

fic g_{0a} ve a single cause:

e idea The action is within existing social chieve structures and is carried out with the gener support of that section of the ruling The quiclass currently in power.

ing then in this light, it is not the power of of agene man that is in question, or that of his the mily or his ministers, but rather the other wer of a whole social class that is living ets, an good, not to say excellent, conditions eneral, d does not wish those conditions to etween ange

so far anoeuvre

d the

hat then is the responsibility of recipient to mauntries and foreign advisers? The main by forcoblem here is to determine how much rend iom for manoeuvre is left by dictatorial tin Argimes to those trying to promote social neasuration.

not 👊 The answer depends on whether the lass thition is undertaken by citizens of the nakingcipient countries or foreign advisers. It also belear that the former have no choice but progn fight these negative dictatorships. A e classctatorial regime is strong because it tenablesorts to repression and torture and berelatiouse many of its citizens have not done,

are not doing or do not intend to do what is needed to topple the regime and change the social structures so as to prevent another dictatorship. Those who have made an attempt at some point are now weary from the long and hard struggle, during which, at certain critical moments, their lives have been at stake. The risk here is that they will give up, if they are not assimilated by the regime in power.

Only choice

And yet, for an increasing number of citizens, the only choice is involvement in the social and political struggles being waged in their country. They cannot wait for the regime in power to define areas of action or room for manoeuvre. It is they who must take the initiative and choose the time for and the forms of organized action. They have prime responsibility for the future of their country.

The foreigner, on the other hand, has only those responsibilities that have been assigned to him or that he assumes personally in order to offset the effects of the mechanisms producing the recipient country's dependence upon his own country. The second type of responsibility is not relevant at this stage of the discussion. Delegated responsibilities have a political significance that every foreign adviser must identify clearly and act upon. The simple fact that they are working in a country ruled by a dictatorship legitimizes that regime and its actions. Their presence implies that the regime is accepted as an interlocutor and negotiator, that the rights accorded to it because of its contribution to the financing of projects are accepted and that foreign advisers agree to act as witnesses to the "positive approach" of the regime to those who wish to work for "national reconstruction". Once the foreign advisers are in the country concerned, it is too late; their involvement will be used by the regime to legitimize itself. They may disregard such treatment of their work, but they cannot be unaware of it. In any case, the decision to act or not to act in a country ruled by a dictatorship, whether or not the legitimization of such a regime by one's presence or actions is taken into account, is a political choice and a political action with political consequences. Yet, in spite of all this, some choose to go, hoping to do what it is "possible" to achieve.

Any understanding of the strategy surrounding the notion of what is "possible" presupposes an awareness of the aversion that some people have for political and ideological questions. Such a feeling of distaste may be attributable to the way

Citizensmust choose the forms of action