

DISKUSSIONSPAPIERE

Ulrich G. Wurzel

Middle East-Related Economic Research in Germany

Scientific Community, Institutional Framework,
Subject Choice and Methodological Selectivity

Herausgegeben von
Dieter Weiss und Steffen Wippel

Freie Universität Berlin,
Fachbereich Wirtschaftswissenschaft,
Fachgebiet Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients

106

DISKUSSIONSPAPIERE

Ulrich G. Wurzel

Middle East-Related Economic Research in Germany

Scientific Community, Institutional Framework,
Subject Choice and Methodological Selectivity

106

Berlin 2009

Content

1	Who Is Doing Economic Research on the Region?	1
1.1	Mainstream Economics Does Not Deal with the Middle East.....	1
1.1.1	The “Relevance Gap”	1
1.1.2	Orthodox versus Non-orthodox Paradigms and the Consequences of Choice.....	2
1.1.3	Data Problems: Limited Applicability of Mainstream Methods and Instruments	3
1.2	The Middle East Economic Research Community in Europe.....	3
1.2.1	A Specific Profile	3
1.2.2	Institutional Affiliation of European Economic Research on the Middle East.....	4
1.2.2.1	Institutional Structures	4
1.2.2.2	The Impact of Institutional Affiliation and Funding Schemes.....	6
2	The Choice of Research Topics, Methods and Theories.....	7
2.1	The Spectrum of Research Topics	7
2.1.1	Factors Contributing to the Choice of Research Topics	7
2.1.2	Are There Any Clear Patterns in the Choice of Research Topics?	9
2.1.2.1	General Scientific Research on Middle Eastern Economic Systems vs. Application-Oriented Analysis.....	9
2.1.2.2	Focus on Topics of Economic, Political and Social Relevance for the Societies Concerned.....	10
2.1.2.3	Thematic Selectivity – Some Empirical Findings.....	10
2.2	The Choice of Research Methods and Instruments.....	17
2.2.1	The Lack of Data and its Consequences for the Methodological Approaches	17
2.2.2	Other Factors Impacting on the Choice of Research Methods and Instruments.....	19
2.3	Theories, Paradigms and Concepts	20
2.3.1	Empirical Findings Concerning Theories, Paradigms and Concepts.....	20
2.3.2	What Shapes Theoretical and Thematic Preferences – Methodological Constraints or the Researcher’s Background?	22
3	Essentialism and Economic Research on the Region.....	23
3.1	Essentialist Approaches – Periodic Disappearance and Return.....	23
3.2	The “Middle East” as a Distinct Region	27
4	The “Other” and the Opportunity to Fundamentally Criticise the Established Politico-Economic System – of the “Other”	27
5	References	29

Abbreviations

CAPMAS – Central Agency for Planning, Mobilisation and Statistics, Cairo

CEEC – Central and Eastern European Countries

DIW – German Institute for Economic Research, Berlin

DOI – Deutsches Orient-Institut

EU – European Union

FAO – World Food Organisation

FEI – Federation of Egyptian Industries

GAFTA – Greater Arab Free Trade Area

GCC – Gulf Cooperation Council

GDI – German Development Institute

GDR – German Democratic Republic

GIGA – German Institute of Global Area Studies, Hamburg

GNP – Gross National Product

IAI – Institute of International Affairs, Rome

Ifo – Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, München

IMC – Industrial Modernisation Centre, Cairo

IMF – International Monetary Fund

NGO – Non-Governmental Organisation

SSAP – Stabilization and Structural Adjustment Programme

SWP – Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Berlin

UMA – Arab Maghreb Union

UN – United Nations

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

USAID – United States Agency for International Development

ZEF – Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung, Mannheim

ZMO – Zentrum Moderner Orient, Berlin

1 Who Is Doing Economic Research on the Region?

1.1 Mainstream Economics Does Not Deal with the Middle East

The most important factor determining the thematic, theoretical and methodological choices of economic research on the Middle East in Germany is the fact that German (as well as general European) mainstream economics is ignoring the region as an object of research. This observation finds its exception only with regard to a limited number of economic research issues such as oil and gas, Euro-Middle Eastern (or Euro-Mediterranean) trade and, to a limited extent, the international economic consequences of conflicts in the region (e.g. the Israeli-Arab conflict and its potential resolution in the early 1990s, the Iraq war in recent years).

1.1.1 The “Relevance Gap”

One reason for this neglect is that economic research issues considered important in the economic, political and intellectual centres of Western Europe have been rarely those which have been of relevance for Middle Eastern societies during the same period of time (say, for example, in the early or mid-1980s or in the late 1990s). Therefore, for a common German economist, it would be difficult to simply extend his/her research on a particular topic that is relevant to European societies at a particular point in time directly to the region of the Middle East. This “relevance gap” mainly results from the differences in the levels of socio-economic development between the European and Middle Eastern economies – and linked to that – from different practical challenges and priorities for scientific analysis, in particular in economics.

At the same time, topics of importance for the region are not very attractive for a German mainstream economist. An average German economic researcher trying to pursue a normal academic career will not see many incentives to deal with the problems and challenges of a region, that differ so much from what is considered important in the researcher’s environment. In short, one cannot make a career as an economist with a research focus on the Middle East.

There are, of course, issues and topics which are relevant for both regions at the same time – and, one should add, in times of globalisation, cross-border migration, etc., this is increasingly so. However, compared to the high priority issues of German and European economic research, these topics are still relatively unimportant. Who cares, for example, for German exports to or direct investment in Oman at a time when China or India offer unprecedented opportunities? Who wants to analyse unemployment in Algeria at a time when Germany struggles with the need to fundamentally restructure its own labour markets and social security systems, thereby touching the very core of the European capitalist model as established during the last half century? Who will deal with issues of technology absorption and innovation capabilities in Syria or Egypt when Europe’s economies have to undertake serious efforts in order to keep up their own technology- and innovation-based competitive advantage vis-à-vis the USA and east and south-east Asia?

1.1.2 Orthodox versus Non-orthodox Paradigms –and the Consequences of Choice

Economics is, of course, not a uniform discipline. As in most disciplines, differing and often opposing paradigms and schools offer various thematic, theoretical and methodological choices and have their related preferences and profiles. However, in essence German and European mainstream economics is still based on orthodox, neo-classical assumptions and methodology, albeit in different stages of modernisation and adjustment. As early as in 1965, Hans Albert, leading German scholar in the theory of science, fundamentally criticised neo-classical economics for its methodology, finally drawing conclusions which are as relevant today as they were more than 40 years ago. According to him, due to the high degree of abstraction, the unrealistic assumptions and a strong tendency of neo-classicists to systematically ignore empirical facts – a tendency that, in his eyes, directly results from their methodology –, theories and statements put forward by neo-classical economists, quite often, lack any substantial information and, therefore, are widely irrelevant for practical as well as for scientific purposes (Albert 1965, p. 407 f.).¹

This constitutes a major problem for research on the Middle East because the inadequacy of the basic assumptions of mainstream theory is particularly obvious when the approach is to be applied in the context of a less-developed country in this region.² A researcher has to make a rather difficult choice: He or she can stay in mainstream economics – and will therefore not produce too much meaningful work on the Middle East.³ Or, he/she decides to do serious research on the region and, as a pre-condition, has to leave the dominant orthodox paradigm – and, with it, the mainstream economics community. For a young researcher planning his/her academic career, this implies a huge risk, in particular as jobs for economists with an explicit specialisation in *any* “area studies economics” are much less available than for general, mainstream economists. Being accepted in both scientific communities is a status difficult to achieve.

¹ Albert further shows that the way in which theoretical statements are formulated and models established by neo-classicists renders most of the arguments immune against any falsification attempt – no matter whether the relevant empirical findings are generated in economics, sociology, social psychology or other sciences (ibid., p. 409-417). The author’s criticism of neo-classical economics leads him to propose a conscious re-linking of economics and sociology (“Soziologisierung des ökonomischen Denkens”, p. 421) in order to overcome neo-classicism – an approach which, among others, was taken up by the Berlin-based German Development Institute to become a major theoretical foundation for its research activities in the 1960s.

² „To what extend the factors that are used in economic analysis are actually relevant to explaining any real economic action can only be answered by looking at how good the theories established with these factors prove themselves in practice. [...] For social science and therefore for economic theories the variation of the socio-cultural context in which the theories are tested is of utmost importance. What follows is, that the general relevance of economic methodologies can be tested by applying economic theories to socio-cultural contexts for which they are originally not intended, e.g. to the so-called developing countries. Studies in this context often show that one has to resort to methodologies that are not part and parcel of mainstream theoretical economics [...].“ (Albert 1965, p. 423 f., translation of the original text)

³ Some noticeable exceptions exist in the research areas mentioned above (e.g. oil and gas, trade).

1.1.3 Data Problems: Limited Applicability of Mainstream Methods and Instruments

Another set of factors deterring German mainstream economists from dealing with research on the Middle East are the framework conditions of research in the region, first of all the limited availability and accessibility of data and the manifold restrictions concerning surveys and large-scale interview campaigns in the respective countries. For example, “in its presentation of the Human Development Report for Egypt, the Institute of National Planning ... underlined that ‘there are enormous problems in even the most basic indicators in Egypt’ ... The USAID Privatization Project reiterated ‘... that a large amount of current important data and information is not available. This data covers a wide scope from the private sector’s share in investment and trade, to the unemployment rate and average wage rates ... Despite the importance of this data, very few attempts were actually carried out to obtain for policy makers and other parties these important sets of data.’” (Weiss, Wurzel 1998, p. 11). In 2007, the head of the Egyptian Federation of Industry’s Industrial Modernisation Centre (IMC) did not have any figures on the number of jobs created by the FEI’s member firms. Mainstream economics has been based more and more on advanced mathematical models, applied in the form of statistical testing of hypotheses with the help of computer simulations for which huge data sets are required. Although econometrics – the related methodological approach – is gaining in importance world wide⁴, it cannot be used as a major research tool for research on the Middle East, due to the still limited quantity and quality of data. As a result, the Middle East is under-researched by the mainstream because quantitatively oriented mainstream economists rarely work on the region (with only a few exceptions, for example input-output and trade simulations or oil market analyses, often relying on somewhat more accessible data or estimations).

1.2 The Middle East Economic Research Community in Europe

1.2.1 A Specific Profile

For the reasons mentioned above, the neo-classical paradigm, while still dominating economic research and teaching in Germany and in Europe in general, is not so influential in the area of economic research on the Middle East. With very few exceptions, European economic research on the region is either done by economists who cannot be said to be members of the mainstream economic research community or by researchers who have a primarily non-economic background, for example, political scientists, (economic) geographers and sociologists. This implies that differences in the choice of research issues, theories and methods between economic research on the Middle East and general economic research to a larger degree result from the particular perspectives of the members of the respective research communities. Empirical findings suggest that the share of critical intellectuals with a rather non-orthodox perspective – not only with regard to the discipline of economics but also in a broader philosophical, social and political sense – is significantly higher among economic

⁴ An illustration for the narrow-mindedness that, quite often, is a by-product of the strong stress on quantitative methods (combined with more or less severe data problems) is the attempt of a former colleague at one of the leading German economic research institutes to “explain” the rather complex development problems of the East German economy after the German unification by just one variable, “provision of infrastructure”. In Germany at least, it is possible to obtain a Ph.D. with such a kind of analysis.

researchers working on the Middle East than among an average sample of economists. In German and European economic research on the region there is a clear dominance of non-conformists vis-à-vis mainstream economists – the opposite of what is true for most other economic research fields in Europe (except other economic area studies and similar marginal domains).

1.2.2 Institutional Affiliation of European Economic Research on the Middle East

1.2.2.1 Institutional Structures

Another important factor explaining the patterns concerning the choice of research issues, theories and methods of Middle East economics is institutional affiliation. In (West-) Germany, as in a number of other (mostly, bigger) European countries, the institutional landscape consists of (i) specialised area studies research institutes such as the former German Orient Institute, DOI⁵; (ii) area-specific university institutes, working groups or chairs within the faculties of the mother discipline of economics or management; (iii) a limited number of large, independent economic research institutes as well as (iv) various smaller institutions which do self-initiated research on a wide range of issues, and which are either publicly or privately financed, such as the German Development Institute, GDI, and the Center for Development Research, ZEF, in Bonn, the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, SWP, in Berlin or research units of ministries, bigger NGOs and the like.⁶

In most of these institutional bodies economic research on the Middle East is not very important: The major six German independent economic research institutes – some of them in their best times with up to 120 staff – have been doing substantial research on the Middle East only in exceptional cases, if at all. For example, according to the DIW's public relations department, the German Institute for Economic Research, DIW, in Berlin, between 1980 and 1990 did not produce a single publication on the Arab world (not even a two-page article in its weekly newsletter), while the total registered number of the institute's official publications was 680. This situation again reflects the lack of interest of mainstream research in Middle East economic affairs as mentioned above. The few cases in which economists of the major economic institutes have been working on the region are either explained by extraordinary funding opportunities linked to major political events (e.g. the Oslo Peace Accord in the early 1990 that led to a series of contract research activities of the Ifo Institute for the Federal

⁵ The former German Orient Institute (DOI) in Hamburg, together with a number of other area studies research units, has been restructured and renamed. It is now called the Institute of Middle East Studies (Institut für Nahost-Studien) of GIGA, the German Institute of Global and Area Studies.

⁶ In the smaller European countries, the institutional landscape usually consists of a national area studies research centre and some university institutes, complemented by a limited number of public or semi-public research and education institutions of different kinds such as diplomatic academies, institutes of international relations, academies of sciences, etc., dealing with more or less systematic economic research on the Middle East.

An analysis of the four decades of systematic multi-disciplinary research on the region in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR), that in terms of institutional structures was much more similar to the Anglo-Saxon area studies model than to the West German structures, goes beyond the scope of this paper. See, for example, the various contributions in Krauth, Wolz 1998 – on Middle East studies in particular Hafez, Höpp in this volume – as well as Hopfmann, Krause, Schilling 1992, Barthel 1993, Pomerening 1993, Robbe 1993 and Winter 1993.

Ministry of Economics⁷) or just by the personal interest of individual scientists based at the respective institutes (as a couple of publications of researchers at the Kiel Institute for World Economics or at the DIW in the late 1990s show). Only the Ifo Institute in Munich, i.e. *one* of the six independent German economic research institutes, had a number of bigger research projects and regular publications dealing with the Middle East, in particular during the period from the late 1980s to the mid-1990s.

The specialised area studies institutes usually have a strong focus on the domestic, regional or foreign politics of their respective areas or countries and rarely work on “hard” economic issues. Other organisations which do self-initiated research on area-specific issues have been dealing with economic topics linked to the Middle East only sporadically. However, for both groups of institutions, economic research is a secondary issue, if at all. It is not even guaranteed that there is an economist among their staff. Even in larger institutes with a number of economists in various departments, this does not mean that the Middle East is automatically covered (take, for example, SWP and its Middle East and North Africa group).

Only a handful of area-specific institutes, working groups or chairs at German universities have been doing continued and consistent research on proper economic issues concerning the Middle East. However, among the 230 German universities (as of 2006, including universities of applied sciences which teach economics, but excluding art schools and the like), systematic economic research on the Middle East has only taken place at little more than half a dozen of them, mainly in Berlin, Bochum, Bremen, Erlangen-Nürnberg, Leipzig, Mainz and (with a strong political science background) Tübingen.⁸ In addition, it were primarily those departments which had their budgets cut recently. One prominent example has been the prestigious chair for Economics of the Near East formerly held by Professor Dr. Dieter Weiss at the Institute for International Economics, Free University of Berlin. This chair has been closed in 2002 after the professor’s retirement – despite the fact that generations of its graduates made successful careers in national and international organisations, in academia as well as in international business and politics (see Wippel, Cornelssen 2001).⁹

Finally, another “institutional structure” relevant here is the one of the “non-institutionalisation” of research activities, i.e. the work of non-employed or underemployed researchers as a consequence of lacking job opportunities and resources for scientists active in the field. Wippel (2005a) highlights that a lot of valuable research, in particular by younger researchers, has been done without proper institutional affiliation at all or based on dissatisfying (in many respects) and often precarious contract relations. Others are sustaining themselves with jobs

⁷ “After decades of virulent conflict, the first signs of a new development have emerged after the signing of the Gaza-Jericho Agreement on 13 September 1993 that has already drastically altered the external appearance of the Middle East. ... In autumn 1993, the Federal Ministry of Economics commissioned the Ifo Institute with a first stock-taking examination of regional cooperation in the Middle East.” (Halbach et al. 1995a, p. 1).

⁸ At the University of Bremen, for example, the Sudan Economy Research Group has been regularly working on the Sudan, a country that has been widely under-researched in Europe, and publishing numerous economic research reports and discussion papers since 1984.

⁹ This last round of closures seems to be only the second stage of a continued dismantling of area-specific research institutions in the German university landscape – after the first stage of the nearly complete destruction of the interdisciplinary area studies centres at the former East German universities (not to forget also the former Academy of Sciences in Berlin, Capital of the German Democratic Republic, that had been eliminated immediately after German unification).

not (or not closely) related to their research activities on the Middle East. These are than pursued as a kind of hobby during the evening hours or at weekends.

1.2.2.2 The Impact of Institutional Affiliation and Funding Schemes

The institutional setting in which economic research on the Middle East takes place is important in two respects. First, the limitations in terms of positions, funding and institutional structures clearly express the lack of interest shown by the mainstream economic research community and by relevant decision-makers in public and private policy bodies for a consistent and systematic economic research on the region.

Second, the given institutional framework has a direct and an indirect influence on which research is done and how it is done. This sounds trivial. However, with regard to “area studies economics” the matter is more complex than it appears to be at first sight. For a researcher at one of the big economic research institutes (or at a university’s economics faculty where there is no support for area-specific economic research) it means that he/she is always confronted with a lack of understanding for his/her “spleen”, with distrust and with the suspicion of colleagues and/or supervisors. In practice, this means that he/she has to do the expected routine mainstream research work first in order to justify his/her employment at the institute or faculty. All he/she does in terms of area-specific research has to be disguised as part of that routine work – or any respective activities simply are additional efforts, leading to longer working hours. For example, an analysis of Arab countries’ innovation and technology policy, under such circumstances, should be framed as being part of a larger comparative project on the same issue in a European context (only possible in case that the researcher in his/her regular work has to deal with industry or technology policy). Or the analysis could be presented as research on a “European topic”, i.e. in the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership (Barcelona Initiative). Such tricks, however, are nothing but manipulative, second-best options to justify the researcher’s particular research activities vis-à-vis the majority opinion in an adverse environment. Research issues which cannot be sold in this way to presidents of institutes, deans of faculties or their research boards, heads of departments or professors supervising master or PhD theses, quite often, will simply not be dealt with.

Third, throughout the last couple of decades, in Germany there have been very few funding programmes or budgets explicitly geared toward economic research on the region. Funding, that has been successfully utilised to finance economic research on the Middle East usually had been intended primarily for other issues. Here again, creative reframing or disguising of research projects helped to get access to the funds, often with the more or less open understanding and support by individuals in the respective funding agencies or decision-making bodies: When a lot of money was available for economic research on Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) in the context of their “transition” to market systems, economic research projects on the Middle East were designed in ways to fit into the transition debate. Prior to this period, during the times of the cold war, economic research on the region was sometimes presented in ways that made it fit into the larger issue of regional conflict before the background of the East-West confrontation. In the post-9/11 world, potential economic research projects are presented in terms of “stability” and “security” of countries and/or the authoritarian regimes in the Middle East. Although scientists can be quite flexible

and adaptable in writing up their research proposals as long as there is a chance to get access to funding, many relevant and interesting research ideas, in such an environment, will hardly get institutional and financial support – and, therefore, often will not be realised.

2 The Choice of Research Topics, Methods and Theories

2.1 The Spectrum of Research Topics

2.1.1 Factors Contributing to the Choice of Research Topics

The concrete choice of research issues is a result of complex and not always totally conscious decision processes involving various factors of influence as well as different categories of actors. As has been shown, the institutional environment given has a strong and direct influence. In Germany but also in some other European countries and on the EU level, this influence, often, is a very limiting one. The funding schemes available, to a certain degree, express the relevance and importance of the supported (or suppressed) issues as perceived by the funding agencies and/or by the experts they consult. These “experts”, quite often, have a conservative mainstream background. The staffing of commissions to evaluate research institutes in Germany is notorious for bringing in people who represent exactly those scientific and methodological approaches which to overcome the specialised institutes outside the traditional university structures once have been established for!¹⁰

Depending on the preferences of the funding boards’ members or the contracted experts, funding institutions can increase tendencies of de-linking economic research on the Middle East from general economic research. For example, the call for Germany’s independent economic research institutes to concentrate on their so-called “core competences” (in the light of an increasing scarcity of funds for independent research) led to an almost complete abolition of development-related economic research at those institutes. Departments explicitly dealing with developing countries in general and/or specific world regions were closed. As a result, the gap between the mainstream and “area studies economics” has widened further.

An additional aspect is that the formerly application-oriented institutes recently came under strong pressure (again, owing to external monitoring missions staffed with conservative university professors) to produce more “real science” in the sense that their research, first of all, should lead to publications in a number of selected refereed journals – the traditional strongholds of the mainstream. This does not only collide with the initial mission defined for the institutes but also drives out most of the potential research activities of the area studies economics type.

With regard to the choice of research topics, particular fashions – distortions of collective perception and collective action – may also have some influence, and this not only in the short-term. Fashions feed back on the institutional setting in the long-term as well as on the

¹⁰ In the field of economics, independent research institutes had been created with government support to serve as institutional structures for modern, application-, i.e. policy-oriented research on relevant economic topics – as opposed to the ivory tower-like and extremely abstract research usually done at the traditional economics faculties of German universities.

funding mechanisms available in the medium-term. A recent example is the availability of substantial amounts of money in Germany and other European countries for research linked to the phenomena of political Islam, radical Islamism as well as “Islamic” violence and terrorism. This is in strong contrast to the funding opportunities and institutional support for other Middle East-related research issues. Even job opportunities for young researchers in the field shift from university faculties and research institutes to security and intelligence bodies on the state and federal level.

However, differences in terms of agendas for economic research on the Middle East as compared to mainstream research still result to a wide extent from the specific research interests of individual scientists, including their personal judgements on which research topics and issues are relevant (see also below). When compared to the respective knowledge of an average mainstream economist, the judgment of the typical area studies economist, of course, results from a much deeper understanding of the region as well as from a better awareness of the economic problems and challenges the societies in the Middle East are facing.

Finally, as the following example may illustrate, pure chance may play a role when it comes to thematic selectivity: The forerunner of today’s Center for Modern Oriental Studies (ZMO) in Berlin was established in the early 1990s – to save some of the knowledge embodied in a handful of Middle East researchers from former East German area studies institutes. Suddenly two publicly funded institutes potentially dealing with the contemporary Middle East co-existed: the newly established predecessor organisation of the ZMO in Berlin and the old and well-known Orient Institute in Hamburg. While nobody would ever have questioned the right of other (West German) research centres, university staff or anybody else to work and publish freely on contemporary affairs of the Middle East, the implicit and explicit task definitions for the ZMO and its forerunner institution right from the start had been somewhat restrictive as they should focus on historical issues (usually phenomena situated in the times before the end of World War II) and/or on historical and regional comparative research, primarily on the interaction of Muslim societies in different parts of the world among each other as well as with their non-Muslim neighbours. In other words, the institute should not work on the most prominent topics linked to the contemporary Middle East proper. The consequence of the resulting institutional and funding arrangements is that a researcher interested in the economics of the Middle East at the Hamburg DOI may well deal with the economies of today’s Morocco or Palestine, but, the same person employed at the Berlin ZMO would have to confine his research to Morocco under the French mandate, to the links of Moroccan traders to Muslims in Indonesia in the 17th century or to Palestine under the late Ottoman reforms.¹¹

¹¹ Even if these implicit and explicit restrictions seem to have been handled sometimes rather flexible in practice, the vitas and publication lists of German Middle East researchers which have been employed for a while at the ZMO before and/or after assignments at other places clearly show the impact of these accidental institutional rigidities on the focus of their scientific work – and, sometimes, on their career path in general. In recent years, admittedly the ZMO’s strong focus on historical research topics has been overcome to some degree. However, the thematic orientation still excludes substantial economic research on the region as the overwhelming majority of the researchers at the centre comes from disciplines such as anthropology and history.

2.1.2 Are There Any Clear Patterns in the Choice of Research Topics?

As for the spectrum of topics of European economic research on the Middle East, almost all potential issues of economic research have been addressed in one form or the other during the last couple of decades, except pure theoretical problems of the discipline which are usually dealt with in highly abstract form. There are, however, some particular patterns to be found.

2.1.2.1 General Scientific Research on Middle Eastern Economic Systems vs. Application-Oriented Analysis

One line of sub-division of the research activities (and the related publications) can be established between general scientific research on economic systems as such in the Middle East on the one side and application-oriented research activities with a less abstract, more practical focus on the other. The first sub-group of activities can be characterised as classical research for the sake of knowledge production. Even if it quite often includes substantial (and sometimes remarkably deep) empirical investigations, its general feature is a higher level of abstraction and the positioning of the activities in a larger context that is given by the respective ongoing scientific debates. The point of departure, often, is a research question that has been emerging at a certain point of the academic discussion – one of the usual ways how science moves on. Examples are topics such as the general development prospects of oil rich countries (see the many contributions on oil states, rentier states, etc. since the 1980s), the issue of regional economic cooperation among Arab countries or the reaction (or non-reaction) of countries in the Middle East to the process of globalisation and the resulting economic and social pressure.

The second sub-group consists of activities undertaken with a higher degree of application-orientation. Here, the starting point can be a practical question or challenge that national policy-makers, bi- or multilateral donors, aid and cooperation agencies or other interested actors may face. Many research activities have been taking place in the framework of direct advisory and consulting activities for various policy bodies, as in the case of the German Development Institute. This shows that also with regard to the region under study economics indeed may serve as a science of government – be it an instrument for the governments in the countries of the Middle East or for those national, supra- or international governance institutions which exert external influence on the countries of the region (including creditor and donor organisations). The spectrum of topics, among others, includes social security systems in Arab countries, trade patterns of countries and country groups, concrete export promotion instruments or the utilisation of remittances for local investment and community development in the receiving economies. Many of the contributions touch typical questions usually dealt with in development economics or discussed in the development debate in general: industrialisation, agriculture, health, education, micro-finance as well as intra- and inter-regional cooperation, urbanisation or infrastructure-related problems and the like.

2.1.2.2 Focus on Topics of Economic, Political and Social Relevance for the Societies Concerned

As mentioned above, economic research that is dealing with purely theoretical problems is almost entirely missing from the spectrum of European economic research on the Middle East.¹² It seems that such very abstract research is largely absent because European researchers dealing with the region usually pick topics which have a relatively high degree of economic, political and social relevance for the societies under study. It should be noted that also the topics of the kind of research that has been called “general scientific research on Middle East economic systems” (or “research for the sake of knowledge production”) above, has close links to the economic, political and social reality of the countries in the Middle East. Both kinds of Middle East-related economic research – directly application-oriented activities *and* general scientific research – are concerned with concrete, real-world objects of analysis and not with the abstract model-worlds so much detached from reality that “sophisticated” mainstream theory often deals with.

2.1.2.3 Thematic Selectivity – Some Empirical Findings

The definition of topics involves the personal profiles and subjective preferences of individual scientists, the (often equally subjective) perceptions and perspectives of different external actors regarding what is relevant, as well as aspects such as institutional affiliation and funding opportunities. However, looking at the topics of economic research on the Middle East throughout the last decades, one can identify some obvious patterns.

Regarding thematic selectivity, first it turns out that some topics and issues feature much more prominently than others and that there are different clusters of importance within the overall spectrum when compared to economic research on Europe – even if, for reasons already mentioned, one excludes purely abstract research from the potential portfolio. Political and institutional framework conditions of economic activities, for example, feature much more prominently among research issues chosen by Germans and other Europeans working on the economies of the Middle East than in average economic research on Europe. The contributions to a book on globalisation in different world regions (Barrios et al. 2003) illustrate this quite well: Besides two chapters on the cultural and political implications of globalisation for Middle Eastern societies, the chapter on the *economic* aspects of globalisation in the Arab world almost exclusively deals with the *socio-political* conditions which lead the authoritarian Arab regimes to try to resist economic globalisation processes – but not with the core economic mechanisms and consequences of globalisation (see Beck 2003b). The interest in the institutional and political structures impacting on the economic systems in the region culminates in analyses on the necessity and possibility of (full-fledged or partial) system transformation, including potential outcomes of such transitions (see e.g. Pawelka 1985, Schmid, Pawelka 1990, Weiss 1992c, Hopfinger 1996, Albrecht, Pawelka, Schlumberger 1997, Weiss, Wurzel 1998, Wurzel 2000a, Schlumberger 2005). By contrast, the possibility that Western European economic systems may need to undergo substantial system

¹² This kind of research almost entirely falls in the domain of the mother science’s mainstream or takes place at the contact point of mainstream economics with other disciplines and research traditions than area studies (e.g. psychology and behavioural sciences, game theory or chaos theory).

transformation as well is not an issue for economic research. Other prominent issues are cultural aspects impacting on economic processes in the Middle East, in particular the role of religion – an issue that is also not very important in economic research on Germany (and Europe at large) and is usually left to small circles of scientists and practitioners interested in business ethics and related “philosophical” matters. Further, various forms of government failure (even if not explicitly named so) and misguided government intervention as well as restrictions to competition (often focused on obstacles to free trade) in the Middle East are dealt with.

On the other hand, certain sub-areas of research featuring prominently in a German and European context are more or less absent from economic research on the Middle East, for example regional economic policy within individual countries of the Middle East, research into the business cycle of individual countries or the region as a whole¹³, anti-trust and competition policy, environmental economic themes as well as regular scientific investigations concerning the development of particular markets or industries – except oil and gas, of course.

Second, the importance of the different clusters of topics changes over time – some “top sellers” decline while at certain points of time, new stars are rising. However, disregarding all internal and external changes of the last four or five decades, one issue has always been among the most important topics: oil and gas. Not very surprisingly, virtually anything has been and is being discussed within this domain, using a great variety of methodological and theoretical approaches – from “hard” economic analysis of the market (including sophisticated equilibrium models, econometric applications of monopoly theory, etc.) to softer reasoning on the role of oil and gas for development in general or for specific fields such as industry, infrastructure, the urban economic fabric and the like. Oil and gas can be linked to anything that matters economically and politically in the region: war and peace, social stability, imports and exports, migration, economic cooperation and conflict, infrastructure, the environment, etc. Unlike oil and gas, most other issues – after a period of high importance – usually experienced a loss of attractiveness for the research community.

Looking back, it turns out that in the first decades after World War II, many publications have been rather descriptive, including only vague predictions and policy recommendations. The Arab world, at first, had to be discovered as an object of modern economic research with primarily descriptive work only to be followed with some time-lag by more analytical approaches.

The 1950s and 1960s did not only see the usual modernisation-theoretical discourse that was dominating the development debate at that time, but also the first radical attempts of leaders of the newly independent states in the region to undertake “development” in practice. Nasser’s increasingly “socialist” course and some of its key measures attracted the interest of researchers working on the Middle East as later did the socialist experiments in Algeria, Tunisia, Syria, Iraq and South Yemen (e.g. Weiss 1964, Alkazaz 1981, Meyer 1987). The bipolar world system of the Cold War era provided the major framework for parts of the

¹³ In Europe, major economic research institutes have been established initially to monitor the cyclical ups and downs of the national economy or parts thereof, i.e. particular sectors and industries.

research on the economies as well as for the related conclusions and policy recommendations provided (e.g. Hoepfner 1973c, 1980b).

After the first oil price shock in the early 1970s, oil turned out to be *the* central question. The earlier rather descriptive way to deal with the issue (Nasr 1967) soon was complemented by more analytically oriented research (Hoepfner 1973b, 1973d, Alkazaz 1974 and 1975, Ehlers 1978). In the early to mid-1980s, the research field was broadened again: now the consequences of the oil wealth for the exporting economies – and other economies in the region benefiting directly and indirectly from it, too – were studied, culminating in the conceptualisation of the category of the “rentier state”, initially by a group of European and Middle Eastern researchers linked to the Rome Institute of International Affairs (IAI) that has been followed by many contributions, in particular by German authors, during the following two decades (see the numerous contributions of Beck, Boeckh, Pawelka, Schlumberger, Schmid, Wurzel as well as Schliephake 1990, Biegel 1992 and Weiss 1999b).

At about the same time, the first strong symptoms of a structural crisis of most of the economies in the region came to light, in some cases linked to the international debt problem. This period saw the first wave of research and publications centred on the need for economic reform and the difficulties of the reform process in the region (an early example is Möller et al. 1980). Sometimes, these phenomena were studied already in the context of the rentier state paradigm (e.g. Weiss, Wurzel 1998, Wurzel 2000a, Wils 2003, Gräfe 2003, Roll 2006).

The apparent unwillingness or inability of most countries’ ruling regimes to undertake fundamental economic change and to deliver positive development results gave a boost to research dealing with cultural features which were thought to strongly impact on economic decisions and processes in the countries of the Middle East. As will be shown below (see section 3.1), different strands of research employed different degrees of essentialism and culturalism – from rather primitive applications of old Orientalist stereotypes to careful and intelligent attempts to go beyond the boundaries of traditional economic thinking by incorporating recent results of other social sciences into explanations of economic phenomena in the Middle East.¹⁴ This trend was supported by the economic events following the Islamic revolution in Iran (see e.g. Ehlers 1980 and Korooshy’s contributions), the obvious rise of politically relevant Islamic movements in many countries of the Middle East and the first real arrival of the discourse on “the Islamic economy” in Western academic circles (see Nienhaus’ publications).¹⁵

With the late 1980s and earlier 1990s a whole wave of Stabilisation and Structural Adjustment Programmes (SSAPs) imposed by the IMF and the World Bank on countries in the region renewed the interest in the process of economic reforms: In the 1990s, parallel to the

¹⁴ For the latter approach see in particular the publications of Volker Nienhaus and Dieter Weiss and of their numerous students and disciples (as represented, for example, in Wippel, Cornelssen, 2001 and under www.klaus-schwarz-verlag.com/schiler/diskussion.htm). Other examples include Gottstein 1986, Alkazaz 1985 as well as various contributions by Wippel.

¹⁵ The interest in “Islamic models” of the economy never really vanished. With the increasing importance of the region and of “the Islam” for the average European citizen after 9/11 and other terror attacks, in particular in Europe, Islamic concepts of state, society and economics seem to have returned as prominent issues of debate and research after only a short period of decreased public and academic interest (see Nienhaus e.g. 1981, 1982, 1995, 2004 as well as Roßkopf 1991, Wippel 1994, 1995, 1997, 2002).

intense research into the transition of the centrally-planned economies of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, a number of research projects and publications dealt with Middle Eastern economic reforms (e.g. Matthes 1988, Weiss 1992a and 1992b, Nour 1995, Hopfinger 1996, Meyer 1996, Poelling 1996, Wiesebach 1996, Weiss, Wurzel 1998, Wurzel 2000a, Wünsch 2001, Albrecht 2002, Wils 2003, Nunnenkamp 2004, Wurzel 2004a, Albrecht 2005).

In addition, the seemingly promising peace process for Israel/Palestine in the early 1990s, brought about a brief period of hope that the economic development of the region could be freed from conflict-related restrictions. A number of researchers analysed the economic potential of countries in the region (primarily of the Mashreq) as well as opportunities for cooperation in trade, investment, production etc., and the potential role of external donors and creditors in this context (see e.g. Halbach et al. 1994, 1995a, 1995b, Alkazaz 1995, Weiss 1995b). This kind of research overlapped in part with activities to explore the opportunities and potential consequences of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership project launched by the EU as the “Barcelona Process” in 1995 (e.g. Nienhaus 1997, Wippel 1999, Wurzel 2000b, Jünnemann 2002, Löwe, Wurzel 2002, Wurzel 2002, Brach 2006).

Further, issues of Arab economic cooperation – or regional south-south-cooperation and sub-regional integration in the wider sense – seemed to become relevant whenever such projects (e.g. GAFTA, GCC and UMA) were announced or developed some new momentum. In the scientific debate, these projects were often linked to other issues relevant at that time, such as the question of Euro-Arab development cooperation, the Middle East peace process, the Euro-Mediterranean partnership project or issues of reform credibility, i.e. the potential of such cooperation agreements to enhance the reform drive and its sustainability (e.g. Hoepfner 1972 and 1977, Matthes 1989, Bahadir 1990, Alkazaz 1992, Englert 2000, Matthes 2001, Roll 2004, Wippel 2005b and 2005c).

At the end of the 1990s, the illusion that the authoritarian regimes of the region would undertake substantial structural economic reforms turned out to be unjustified – even for many of the formerly very optimistic observers. Since the early 1990s, some researchers have been dealing with the politico-economic reasons which could explain the general unwillingness of the authoritarian regimes in the region to substantially reform their economies. However, before new attempts to explain what had gone wrong with the economic reform programmes could have been undertaken on a larger scale, the events following the terrorist attacks on September 11th, 2001, shifted the focus of larger parts of the research community to the impact of Islamist terrorism on economic developments in the region and elsewhere. As a side effect of “9/11” and the following increase of what has been portrayed by some as traditional tensions between “Islam” and “the West”, a number of economists – exclusively from the mainstream and without any knowledge of the region – began to establish something they called the “economics of terror” or the “economics of political violence”, with rather disconcerting results (see section 3.1 below).

After the dust had settled a bit, economic researchers on the Middle East returned to the question why major parts of the region continued to lag behind other developing regions in terms of economic and socio-economic development, why it did not take part in globalisation as other developing regions did (see e.g. Beck 2003), and why all the reform programmes that had been presented with so much fanfare during the last 10 to 20 years did not produce any

substantial positive outcomes (Werenfels 2002, Gräfe 2003, Wurzel 2003a and 2004a, Schlumberger 2005, Roll 2006). Now, more than twenty years after the first SSAPs had been imposed on the region, a whole number of researchers joins the effort to conceptualise the lack of fundamental economic change as the logical outcome of political power considerations on the side of the authoritarian regimes in the Middle East.¹⁶ These efforts often make explicit reference to the rentier state approach, in particular after the first Arab Human Development Reports of the UNDP have explicitly acknowledged that the rentier state paradigm is a useful concept to link the region's economic problems to a whole range of political, social and cultural factors relevant for economic structures and processes (UNDP 2002, 2003). However, quite surprisingly, the interesting question to what extent Islamic models and concepts of economic development might serve as suitable counter-models to the rentier mode (Nienhaus 2004) has not yet met a wider discussion.

With the announcement of new reform attempts in a couple of countries in the Middle East at about the middle of the first decade of the new millennium, research began to focus on the particular features of these processes, sometimes in comparison with the earlier reform periods. Often the analysis has been linked to the discourse on the relation of political authoritarianism and (economic) change – or the lack thereof (Nunnenkamp 2004, Schlumberger 2005, Roll 2006, Wurzel 2007, Zorob 2007).

In part, this account on the main fields of economic research on the Middle East throughout consecutive periods of time is also reflecting the importance particular issues have gained during certain stages of the general (economic) development debate. However, the emergence and decline of specific topics in economic research on the Middle East has not necessarily been synchronous with the parallel changes in the general development debate. The importance of some issues was “discovered” much earlier in the discourse on economic development in the Middle East than in general development research. A prominent example is the problematic impact of the abundance of exportable natural resources on domestic economic development in the wider sense that has been so obvious in some of the oil-rich Arab states. Large-scale intra-regional labour migration and remittance flows have been phenomena particularly visible in the Middle East, too. Another example is the problem of increasing water-scarcity in a region with already limited opportunities for agriculture and a high population growth rate (particularly important for economic geographers and agricultural economists) with all its wider potential consequences. In these cases, the very nature of the empirical phenomena – high visibility, high importance from an international economic and political or strategic perspective (i.e. Western self-interest) and, thus, a substantial “relevance” – provoked early research activities.

Other issues and research traditions have been first established in the debate on other world regions or the third world in general and have been applied to the Middle East only with some time lag. Among these “late arrivals” are, for example, issues like fiscal policy reform, trade liberalisation, strategies and measures to increase productivity and competitiveness (including science, technology and innovation policies) as well as successfully implemented projects of economic south-south cooperation and globalisation issues in general. The explanation for the

¹⁶ At the same time, the apparent economic success of some Gulf emirates such as Dubai, Abu Dhabi and Qatar, which seem to represent a strong contrast to the general economic malaise in the rest of the Arab world, caught the interest of some economic researchers (initially of a number of economic geographers).

rather late interest for these issues on the side of German and European researchers in most of the cases is that the phenomena to be studied were only of minor magnitude and importance. Despite all rhetoric, after the times of Nasser and other Arab nationalist leaders Middle Eastern governments did not undertake substantial economic policy reforms (with real outcomes) until recently. Deliberate policies to increase productivity and international competitiveness with large-scale, systematic approaches, with a few exceptions, are still lacking. Despite oil exports and the dramatic import-dependency of many economies concerning other goods, according to most measures, the Middle East is under-globalised, in particular compared to other developing regions. In other words, with regard to such topics, it was neither a kind of negative thematic selectivity resulting from “Western” self-interest nor ignorance that led to the neglect of certain issues in German and European economic research on the region – but simply the absence of the very object of study.

However, in this context it is quite remarkable that one theme that has been very prominent in non-orthodox development economics for decades and that has returned recently in the globalisation-critical debate seems to be totally missing from contemporary German economic research on the Middle East: the impact of the international economic order – and Europe’s role in it – on the internal economic situation in Middle Eastern countries. The absence of this topic may be linked to a particular kind of thematic selectivity – the implicit or explicit decision of European researchers working on the region *not* to reflect on the role that “their” societies play in obstructing economic development in the Middle Eastern part of the “Global South”. While there are publications on the negative influence of Western industrial societies on the socio-economic and politico-economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa or parts of Latin America and Asia, contributions dealing with such issues in the Middle Eastern context can hardly be found. A possible explanation may be that the state of domestic affairs and policy-making – in particular concerning economic affairs and economic policies – in many countries of the Middle East has been so miserable that the focus of even the most “critical” of the Western researchers has been on *internal* obstacles to economic development – and not on the external factors which quite often underlay the destructive behaviour of the local elites. One of the rare exceptions in this regard seems to be the economic dimension of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership project. In this context, a number of European researchers have been criticising not only the unwillingness and inability of Middle Eastern governments to prepare their countries for this kind of (asymmetric) regional integration but also the European policies which often have been insufficient and sometimes counterproductive (e.g. Neugart, Schumacher 2004). Another explanation may be that European economic researchers on the Middle East primarily focus on the role that the USA has been playing in the region – together with international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF in which the US government also has strong influence.

Besides these general trends concerning thematic selectivity in economic research on the Middle East, there also have been some more *specific issues* which enjoyed particular importance either during certain, limited periods of time or even throughout the whole of the last two or three decades. One example is the problem of massive internal and intraregional labour migration with its consequences for both the sending and receiving economies concerned (e.g. Meyer 1986b). Further, the general demographic situation in the region and its impact on economic development is occasionally dealt with until today. Also regional economic development problems have been analysed sporadically (e.g. Meyer 1988, 1989, Knaupe, Wurzel 1995, Wurzel, Knaupe 1996). Another topic that has been attracting continuous attention

throughout the last two decades is the relation of education (in the widest possible sense) and development in the Middle East, including the deficits of the science and technology systems and the lack of technological capabilities – an issue often linked to the socio-political and socio-cultural framework conditions for science, technology and innovation in the countries of the region.¹⁷ Some specific areas of economic activity, such as tourism (e.g. Kohl 2003), or general framework conditions of economic development, such as water scarcity (e.g. Schiffler et al. 1994, Schiffler 1996, Barthel 1996, Steinbach 1998), have been regularly on the research agenda for longer periods, too. With the outbreak of the second Intifada in September 2000, the economic consequences of Israeli occupation and suppression came to the focus again.¹⁸

Other research has been done in more or less systematic ways as a result of consultancy activities or contract research for public policy bodies such as ministries, councils, commissions, etc. In this context, researchers did follow the choice of research topics as *defined by government agencies* as their “clients and customers”. Examples for Middle East area studies economics as a “science of government” are numerous sector studies (e.g. Hoepfner 1976, Gälli, Alkazaz 1986, Reinhardt et al. 1989, Theobald 1996, Loewe 2000), studies on particular cooperation projects (as an early example, see Claus, Rügner 1969, further e.g. El-Nagar 1981, Zeuner 1996) or on regional economic development prospects in the Middle East against the background of a potential peace settlement (Halbach et al. 1994, 1995a, 1995b). With this regard, the specific modes for the production of knowledge are determined by the internal institutional features, including the general orientation of the concerned public policy bodies (usually the Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development and the Ministry of Economics), but also by additional organisational characteristics such as the institutional self-interest of certain government agencies or sub-units within them. Other factors of influence may have been certain perceptions on the side of influential politicians and civil servants on what matters, pressure from the implementing organisations in the area of technical and financial development cooperation or the wider political climate in society with regard to particular issues (e.g. oil prices and energy security, Middle East peace process, EU foreign policy or trade initiatives, etc.).

¹⁷ See, for example, the early publications on the issue by Weiss as of the 1980s, followed by regular further contributions to this debate till today. A complete publication list of the author up to 2001 is available in Wippel, Cornelssen 2001. Other examples include Ghose 1999, Knaupe, Wurzel 1994, Wurzel 2000b, Wurzel 2001, Löwe, Wurzel 2002, Koehler, Wurzel 2003, and Wurzel 2003.

¹⁸ With regard to Palestine, inquiries into the functioning or non-functioning of a “national” economy under continued violent occupation by a neighbouring country – that has been lasting for more than 40 years – can also be understood as the construction of a specific object of research in contemporary economics (at least, if one disregards the short-lived attempts of occupation powers such as Fascist Germany during World War II or the somewhat longer lasting strategies of the former European colonial powers to base the economic handling of conquered territories on systematic economic analysis). On Palestine’s economic problems see for example Hamad 1995 and Zaghah 1995. Since the 2006 economic boycott of major Western powers and Israel against the democratically elected Hamas government, the severe economic recession in the Gaza strip that had already set in with the beginning of the second Intifada has been discussed (e.g. Zorob 2006).

2.2 The Choice of Research Methods and Instruments

2.2.1 The Lack of Data and its Consequences for the Methodological Approaches

The lack of comprehensive and reliable data is one factor that has been influencing not only the choice of topics of European economic research on the region but also the choice of methods and instruments. The quantity and quality of economic data on the region has been improving somewhat recently. However, with a higher level of sophistication in data production and presentation also the attempts of ruling regimes to manipulate the figures in order to realise particular policy objectives get more sophisticated. In some cases, directly fiddled figures are released to the public. For example, Egyptian figures on major macroeconomic indicators delivered to the external world such as the IMF and the World Bank or foreign business journalists often differ strongly from figures on the same indicators for the regime's domestic use (author interviews, Cairo). In other cases, the calculation methods employed are bluntly manipulated in order to produce results favourable for the regime.¹⁹ The official images and representations of economic and social affairs put forward by mainstream scientists and governments in general have been criticised for decades.²⁰ Sometimes, official figures and findings have been revised by scholars from the region in order to show how misleading the official data and their use are.²¹ For both reasons – the still rather limited availability of comprehensive data and the increased manipulation attempts in parts of the region – economic research on the Middle East still faces many problems.

In this regard, it is important to point out that German (and other Western) researchers are at a certain disadvantage vis-à-vis their colleagues in the region. For example, Arab researchers, based and well-connected in their home countries, may have a kind of personal, privileged access to primary data that is internally available but officially not accessible. Such data can be accumulated in national statistical offices, the central bank, in ministries or in institutes of planning and the like and will be made available through the scientists' own work in these places or through colleagues and friends employed there. By contrast, for a foreign researcher this opportunity exists only to a limited degree, if at all. On the other hand, in cases where foreign agencies such as national development and aid organisations, the EU or UN organisations produce their own data for project purposes only, European researchers who have the

¹⁹ For example, in early 2007 the leading economic analyst of the prestigious Al-Ahram Center for Strategic and Political Studies published an article in the Al-Ahram daily on how the government recently has been systematically falsifying economic figures released to the public. Among others, the official unemployment rate for 2006 was calculated by using the same number of employable Egyptians as in 2005 as the denominator – ignoring the fact that in the meantime about 600,000 to 800,000 new entrants in the labour market were joining those already looking for a job.

²⁰ For a fundamental critique see Mitchell 2002.

²¹ Fergany, for example, “has argued that the most used poverty line measure, the cost of a minimum basket of commodities, underestimates the extent of poverty in Egypt and elsewhere in the Middle East. Using that measure, poverty in Egypt doubled between 1990 and 1996 to 44 per cent – about 30 million people. Using the crude US\$1 day measure, he demonstrated that from the 1991 Egyptian official Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), 88 per cent of the population would be considered poor – levels of 94 per cent in the countryside and 80 per cent in the towns. He actually estimates that a majority of the population lived on less than half the measure of US\$1 a day. Using the 1995 survey in constant 1990 prices, he estimated that 90 per cent of Egyptians were poor with rural poverty pervasive with a greater relative rise in urban poverty (Fergany, 2002: 213-224, 1995). These figures are at odds with those presented by the government of Egypt's statistical office, CAPMAS and FAO that consistently seem to downplay the country's level of poverty.” (Bush, 2007, pp. 264 f).

necessary *wasta* (colloquialism for one's influence or connections used to get things done) may benefit from these data more than their Arab colleagues, for example.

Facing severe data problems, researchers have no choice but to design their analysis in terms of methods and instruments in ways that limit the negative impact of these conditions. Basically, two strategies exist to cope with the problem:

(1) Those, who have the necessary time, institutional backing (at home and in the Middle Eastern countries under study) and other necessary resources, will attempt to collect their own data through extended field research. This may take place in the form of surveys, interviews, participative observation and/or representative in-dept case studies, usually supported by other methods of gathering data. So-called expert interviews, at least in some areas of research, may also play a crucial role. (However, here clearly exists the danger that a few well-known and well-connected experts willingly or unwillingly accumulate an extraordinary authority in terms of definition and interpretation power so that they can shape the perception of a wider community and are in a position enabling them to prioritise and suppress certain issues and discourses.) Typical examples for such field research are investigations on developments in rural areas (e.g. Ehlers 1975, Meyer 1984, Meyer 1986a, Trenk, Nour 1992, Meyer 1996, Müller-Mahn 2001) or patterns of urban economic activities and their change (Meyer 1986b, Schliephake 1989, Biegel 1990 and 1992, Knaupe, Wurzel 1995, Wurzel, Knaupe 1996). Also belonging to this type of empirical approach is the eclectic collection of bits and pieces of primary and secondary data through extended field studies in order to (hopefully) eventually be able to put it together and arrive at a larger – but essentially micro-data based – picture. Examples for this approach are studies on privatisation of state assets in Arab countries, financial sector reform, Islamic banking and investment funds, the development of new industrial sites as well as the role of remittances or tourism for local development. Another possibility to do field research are internships of (usually younger) researchers in European development agencies, chambers of trade and commerce or NGOs and UN organisations active in the country to be researched. Topics of research usually are linked to the projects of the respective host organisation, for example public-private partnerships, particular institutional framework conditions of economic activities, education and SME support, informal production structures in urban quarters, micro credit or trade and regional investment patterns.

Quite naturally, such research designs will be shaped by the challenge that data collection poses and by cross-checking and processing of the primary information obtained. On the one hand, the empirical activities are an important and very valuable part of research. On the other hand it often may consume so much resources, time and energy that a kind of empirical bias sometimes will still be visible in the final product (the master or PhD thesis, the publication). In terms of instruments, such empirical economic research will strongly rely on the established methods and tool-kits of social research as developed in disciplines such as sociology, psychology, and anthropology. The above-mentioned non-traditional (non-economic or “not economics only”) background of many European scientists doing economic research on the Middle East may be quite helpful in this regard.

Consequently, the necessity and importance of primary data production in an unsupportive environment is one of the main features distinguishing economic research on the Middle East from economic research on average European countries in terms of instruments and method-

ology. Field research, therefore, is a mode of analysis that is used relatively more than desk-top research when compared with economic research on Europe. This also includes, that sources of knowledge such as interviews and (usually unofficial) surveys conducted by the researchers play a particularly important role – as does anecdotic evidence of the case study type – in order to partially compensate for the lack of comprehensive and systematic data. For Schlumberger, an extraordinarily high degree of informality in economic exchange in the Middle East together with a far-reaching dominance of informal over formal rules (by contrast to the Western model of the market economy) and the fact “that formal rules and informal norms and values contradict each other“ (Schlumberger 2005, p. 367) imply a particularly important role of social science analysis in any research on the region’s economies – and of the related research methods, respectively. Schlumberger further insists that even “innovative“ approaches such as the economic mainstream’s “new institutionalism“ do not help to overcome the problems which result from the high degree of informality that characterises economic relations and activities in the concerned societies.

(2) However, for other researchers, the collection of necessary data through self-coordinated, extended field research is not an option. Many scholars, therefore, limit their research design, including methodological approaches and instruments, right at the outset in such a way that they can produce meaningful results despite the data problems. Here, choice of topics and methodological selectivity are closely inter-connected. Dealing with general questions of economic structures or with the broader political economy of a country, for example, may be a way to avoid difficulties linked to data and information problems. In such cases, the analysis takes place on a level of abstraction where comprehensive micro-data is either not necessary at all or only employed as an illustration of certain statements rather than as proof for concrete hypotheses. However, since also data regarding macro-economic aggregates such as growth, inflation, budget figures etc. is often incomplete or incorrect, this does not mean that all the problems linked to the availability of data really could be prevented this way: “In 1998, when asked what the country’s inflation rate was, neither the Governor of the Central Bank of Libya nor his director of research knew the answer. [...] At the end of the twentieth century, the official population figure for the entire Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was a state secret; half the total volume of economic transactions in Egypt went unrecorded” (Anderson 2003, p. 89). Therefore, large bilateral donors like USAID collect data of their own, but “even the World Bank and IMF have differed widely in their estimates of annual real GNP growth with figures ranging from 1 per cent to between 3 and 4 per cent for the early 1990s” for Egypt (Weiss, Wurzel 1998, p. 11).

2.2.2 Other Factors Impacting on the Choice of Research Methods and Instruments

There are, of course, areas for which more and better data is available than for others. Trade statistics, for example, often are much better than data on household income or production structures in the informal economy. However, despite the availability of at least some useful data, the majority of German researchers on the economies of the Middle East prefer *qualitative* ways of analysis and presentation of their findings. This, again, may be linked to the particular features and preferences of individuals and groups of scientists. At the same time, approaches to transfer the mind-set and tool kits of the neo-classicists to research on Middle Eastern economies are not taken seriously in the community. An example is the econometric

“modelling” of the Syrian economy by a German researcher in the 1990s. Due to the absence of much of the most basic data that would have been necessary to carry out a solid econometric simulation, he simply took a substantial amount of data from Jordan, assuming that the structures of two neighbouring economies would be roughly the same, disregarding, among others, any differences in the politico-economic organisation of the two countries, geography, availability of natural resources, external political and economic relations, etc.

Further, European researchers dealing with the economic development of countries in the Middle East prefer multi-dimensional explanations to one-dimensional ones, which means that usually a wider spectrum of explanatory elements and potential determinants of the processes under study will be considered. In general, both the topic chosen as well as the methods and instruments employed, thus, will be less reductionist than in an average mainstream setting. This, quite naturally, also implies that a broader analysis will be undertaken – in the sense that the authors will choose more complex research questions than do economists in average research projects in Europe on the respective career levels (master and PhD thesis level, for comparison).

2.3 Theories, Paradigms and Concepts

2.3.1 Empirical Findings Concerning Theories, Paradigms and Concepts

Analysing the contributions of German economic research on the Middle East, it is clearly visible that the authors in general refer to certain theoretical debates more than to others. First of all, it turns out that there is a very limited use of the standard terms, assumptions and styles of discourse which are typical for neo-classical mainstream economics. Approaches, categories and theoretical concepts of the mainstream debate are frequently replaced by terms and categories from other economic research traditions (such as non-orthodox institutional economics and classical or Marxian political economy). However, in many publications explicit reference to economic theory is only made sporadically, if at all. This means that many researchers do not clearly name or explain the theoretical foundations which their work is based on. As a consequence, in many cases the authors follow a rather pragmatic and eclectic approach – taking bits and pieces of concepts and traditions of thinking from here and there.

The obvious de-linking of economic research on the Middle East from the mainstream in terms of theoretical frameworks has been substituted and partly compensated for by a stronger link of Middle East area studies economics to development theory in general and to non-orthodox economic development theory in particular: The non-orthodox development community understood quite early that economic development must be seen as a multidimensional process – that it affects proper economic phenomena such as investment, growth, employment and income as well as social and political structures, institutional arrangements and systems of norms and values. In the respective discourses, it has been widely accepted that economies first of all are social systems and that economic and non-economic, i.e. social factors are as important for successful economic development as they are interdependent. Further, for non-orthodox development economists it has been clear right from the outset that the current economic situation in a given country or region is as much shaped by history and by the social, cultural and institutional features and political power structures as it is shaped

by “hard” economic elements such as the extent of investment and savings, of production, prices and international financial transactions. For most Middle East area studies economists, the functional mechanisms of economies as social systems can only be understood fully, if research manages to go further than just analysing seemingly simple economic rationales, causes and effects – an understanding that has been distinguishing non-orthodox development economics from mainstream economics till today.²²

The absence of the usual mainstream dominance allowed for the “survival” of earlier non-orthodox theories, paradigms and schools of economic thinking – often in explicit contradiction to the neo-classical orthodoxy – in the economic area studies domain. Examples are, among others, approaches in the tradition of the classical political economy (including different strands of Marxist and neo-Marxist thought), classical institutionalism, non-orthodox kinds of structuralism, and more or less modernised dependency approaches (sometimes rarely made explicit, but usually implicitly shaping the author’s research question and focus). In addition, the German Middle East economic research community takes up with ease new non-orthodox perspectives, concepts and approaches, often resulting from broader development studies (which, sometimes, are not very new in their core but resemble modernised and further developed versions of earlier non-orthodox paradigms).

German (and European) Middle East economic research did not have a substantial impact on the mother discipline of economics in terms of new concepts and theories – at least as long as one defines the discipline of economics in the way in which its mainstream representatives would do it. However, Middle East area studies economics in fact has been able to construct both, its *own* objects of research as well as its *own* concepts, paradigms and theories. The attribute “own” here means that economic research with a regional focus on the Middle East has put issues and concepts on the agenda which so far have been widely or totally ignored by the mainstream. This process of agenda setting and of creating original concepts and categories, in some cases, finally has been leading to the establishment of the community’s own paradigms and theories – in the sub-discipline of economic research on the Middle East.

The most prominent example is the concept of the “rentier state” – or “rentier economy”, to be more precise – in all its different (non-orthodox) forms of appearance. Taking the dominant role of oil for the economic development of the respective countries as a starting point of politico-economic analysis in the classical sense, first the very concept of the rentier state has been developed and further developed. Afterwards, in particular in Germany this concept has been used as an important reference point for a wide spectrum of research activities on issues of economic, politico-economic and socio-economic development (see references in section 2.1.2).

²² Even the so-called “new development consensus” – that allegedly brings together knowledge from both the non-orthodox and the mainstream economic development debate – in essence is little more than the recent acceptance of many facts and insights which have been produced in the heterodox camps already three or four decades ago by influential representatives of the mainstream. Now, this initially non-orthodox knowledge is being appropriated, distorted and reinterpreted by mainstream development economics in order to superficially modernise its own, increasingly irrelevant and inappropriate theoretical foundations. While most orthodox schools, in order to finally arrive in a roundabout way at these “new development consensus” positions, had to undergo painful learning processes after the obvious failure of their theories and paradigms, many non-orthodox approaches followed a development path that has been leading up the respective researchers much more directly to contemporary insights and positions (which is, of course, not to say that heterodox development thinking did not have its own problems, contradictions and aberrations).

Further, the obvious primacy of political over economic considerations (i.e. the absolute dominance of political aims over economic goals proper) on the side of many governments in the Middle East may soon emerge as an original research object for (political) economists working on the region. The apparent dominance of purely political incentives for action and non-action does not only contradict the classical Marxian structure-superstructure dichotomy but also most other descriptions and conceptualisations of contemporary societies built on capitalist economic systems. And, a consistent conceptualisation of this phenomenon *for individual states* of the region that goes beyond the paradigm of the rentier state is still lacking.²³ However, serious research on the issue would imply that the sub-discipline of Middle East-related economic research would have to develop an appropriate theoretical framework, too.

2.3.2 What Shapes Theoretical and Thematic Preferences – Methodological Constraints or the Researcher’s Background?

After what has been presented above (see in particular sections 1.1.3 and 2.2.1), it looks as if methodological constraints – mainly related to data problems – have an extraordinarily strong influence on the theories and concepts employed by the Middle East economic research community possibly even being the decisive element in shaping the sub-discipline’s broader theoretical orientation. However, this may be a misperception.

A Difficult Environment for Quantitative Mainstream Economics Creates Space for Non-Orthodox Approaches: It is true that, due to the limited availability of data, mainstream economists with their quantitative focus rarely work on the region and that “neo-classical imperialism” – the poisoning influence of reductionist mathematical methods on research questions and approaches – is more or less absent. This, of course, leaves more room for non-orthodox paradigms, while the choice of potential research issues, theoretical foundations and methodological approaches available widens substantially. Further, limitations concerning the application of neo-classical econometrics and the absence of the dominating mainstream theory give researchers with other theoretical and disciplinary backgrounds a stronger position in defining research topics and priorities as well as in putting forward categories and concepts.

Negative Methodological Selectivity – Pros and Cons: However, the related methodological selectivity of German economic research on the Middle East is, first of all, a negative one – the rejection of the neo-classical approach with its strong focus on quantitative methods. In this regard, theoretical and methodological selectivity are linked very closely, at least in that negative sense of a rejection of the orthodoxy, its theories and its methods and instruments.²⁴ A clear disadvantage of rejecting the mainstream, of the absence of mainstream economists and of the widely practised eclecticism and pragmatism is that it prevents the absorption of mainstream methodological innovations by Middle East economists. Such methodological innovations arrive very slowly in the research community, if at all. Many researchers follow a rather pragmatic and eclectic approach that is usually not based on the latest developments in

²³ For an explanation of the secondary role of economic considerations in the *regional* political context, see Perthes 2000.

²⁴ It still has to be analysed further, whether the region, therefore, might be over-researched with qualitative methods and approaches – and which deficits and weaknesses this may entail.

the mother discipline of economics. Where methodological foundations are explicitly mentioned, they are often rooted in research areas outside standard economics, such as non-orthodox political economy or non-orthodox institutionalism, economic geography, economic sociology and psychology (survey and sampling techniques, participative observation), etc. This situation implies the need to borrow and adapt methods, instruments, concepts and categories from other research disciplines than economics. But, the need to borrow and adapt methods, instruments and concepts also opens the way for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research approaches. Middle East area studies economists work more inter- and multi-disciplinarily than mainstream economists. The “de-linking” of economic research on the Middle East from the rigidities and constraints, as well as from the innovations linked to mainstream economics, thus, has both positive as well as negative effects in terms of creativity and further development of the (sub)-discipline.

The Final Reason for Thematic and Methodological Selectivity – Limits to Practicing Quantitative Economics or the Researchers’ A Priori Preferences? A consequence of what has been presented above – disinterest of the mainstream and a stronger role of multi- and interdisciplinary research – could be that, quite naturally, there should be a high “demand” for non-orthodox approaches and methodology. Both aspects together could well explain the most striking feature of the sub-discipline’s thematic and methodological selectivity – the dominance of non-mainstream research methods and instruments.

However, it is also possible to explain the reluctance to apply standard economic methods and instruments with the profiles and preferences prevailing among the members of the Middle East economic research community: Instead of linking the dominance of non-mainstream methods to the mainstream’s disinterest in the region, the *alternative explanation* would be that a bigger number of Middle East economic researchers has a strong individual bias against standard economics in general and the related quantitative methods in particular (see section 1.2.1). In other words, according to this perspective, most of the Middle East area studies economic researchers, right from the beginning, would never consider standard economics as the appropriate methodological foundation for their analysis – even in those cases where it offers strong advantages over other methods and instruments.

3 Essentialism and Economic Research on the Region

3.1 Essentialist Approaches – Periodic Disappearance and Return

As for the question of potential essentialist assumptions, one can surely say that the discipline of economics has by far one of the most universalistic approaches among the social sciences, independent of whether a researcher belongs to an orthodox or heterodox community. Therefore, in explaining differences between general German economic research and economic research on the Middle East potential essentialist assumptions about the region usually do *not* play a major role. It seems that most of the economists regularly working on the Middle East keep up the universalistic spirit of their mother discipline, despite – or because of – the fact that many also possess considerable non-economic knowledge of the region. Also the fact that a bigger number of researchers dealing with the economics of the Middle East have a back-

ground in other social sciences than economics has not been leading to a strong and persistent “essentialist turn”.²⁵

However, in certain contexts and at particular times, culturalist explanations for economic processes and their outcomes in the region have been quite fashionable. It seems as if such essentialist explanations, in modern economics in general, often have been the last refuge when other explanations could not be found. To a certain degree, this also applies to the area studies branch of economics dealing with the Middle East: At times, when new socio-economic phenomena emerged or when conventional explanations did not seem to make sense any longer, several researchers took the easy way of attributing the unexplainable (for example, the *apparently* irrational behaviour of economic actors in certain situations) to “cultural” factors. There have been periods during which the Orientalist heritage – which is not only an intellectual legacy of area studies but also of development studies and economics proper – has been re-activated by some authors concerned with the economic development in the Middle East. Accordingly, with the rise of new, non-culturalist approaches and paradigms more suitable to analyse the previously unexplainable phenomena, essentialist perspectives tend to decline again: Earlier culturalist explanations are deconstructed and the relevant “cultural features” re-interpreted as being related to concrete politico-economic and socio-political structures.²⁶

Disregarding the cyclical ups and downs of essentialist approaches and culturalist explanatory patterns, there always are, of course, some economists who take “cultural difference” as the major point of departure for their research. Nevertheless, the impact of this tradition on German debates, nowadays, seems to be rather limited, at least as far as academic circles are concerned – and with the exceptions presented further below.

The generally limited role that essentialist approaches play when it comes to economic research on the Middle East does not mean that the research community does not have any interest in non-economic factors impacting on economic developments in the region. Quite the opposite is true: Since the early 1980s, prominent members of the German Middle East area studies branch of economics have been dealing with the socio-cultural, socio-political and historical framework of economic action as well as with the respective institutional expressions in the form of norm and value systems, beliefs, modes of socialisation or patterns of social embeddedness in the societies under study.²⁷ These efforts have been characterised by a constant search for new perspectives, for innovative links between elements already known and for interesting new empirical findings – often produced during the extensive fieldwork done by graduate students, strongly encouraged by their professors.²⁸ At the same

²⁵ See, for example, Hüsken 2006, who undertakes a rigorous ethnological analysis of *German* development aid organisations and their “exotic” rites, discourses, and taboos – instead of the usual ethnological research on “exotic” behaviour of “the other” in the global south.

²⁶ One example is the notion of the so-called “rentier mentality” – explained earlier by some as an inherent feature of the “Bedouin tribal society” – that nowadays is being understood primarily as the (economically rational) behavioural consequence of the prevailing rentier mode of production and distribution in many parts of the Middle East.

²⁷ With the application of sociological network theory, these issues recently gained new importance in the international debate on economic reforms in the Middle East. See, for example, Heydemann 2004.

²⁸ Within this framework and based, among others, on well-prepared field research missions of their students, Dr. Hüsken (an ethnologist at Prof. Elwert’s chair for Ethnology) and PD Dr. Trenk (with degrees in both

time, these efforts strongly tried to avoid – and often explicitly rejected – traditional Orientalist assumptions and explanatory patterns.²⁹ The definition of important relevant categories, such as “culture”, “norms” or “tradition”, was neither static nor essentialist: “Japan has demonstrated how to build successful development on core elements of revered old values and virtues. Similar phenomena can be studied in other parts of the world. Their message is: Only if the timeless essence of creativity is tapped within one’s own culture, modernity is not paid by a loss of identity. ... Culture has never been a static concept. Its strength lies in its adaptive capacity. Man is adaptive to technical and institutional innovations.” (Weiss 1992a, p. 8 f.) In striking a balance between proper economic analysis and the inclusion of anything “non-economic” while leaving behind essentialist simplification, some researchers at a few German universities implanted a stimulating spirit of intellectual curiosity and creativity into generations of students that left its imprints on Middle East research till today (as it shaped the approaches of numerous practitioners in various Middle East and development-related fields).

However, the ghost of Orientalism is still haunting. In the aftermath of “9/11”, some German mainstream economists began to engage in something they called the “economics of terror”, trying to explain the apparent tensions between “the West” and “the Islamic world” or “the clash of civilisations” in their own way. Often, these activities led to extremely disconcerting results – implicitly reviving the worst Orientalist stereotypes, threat scenarios and dull fears associated with this tradition of thought.

One example is “*The Analysis of Terrorism from an Economic Perspective*” (von Hauff 2004), a chapter in an edited volume (title translated from German as all following quotations). According to the introduction, the author attempts to analyse the reasons for (Islamist) terrorism with the help of economic methods. What follows is a shockingly simplistic and uninformed attempt to employ economic mainstream paradigms in order to explain why radical Islamic leaders (!) undertake terrorist attacks – with the silent consent or open support of the majorities of their societies or constituencies:

The basic assumptions are that there are increasing tensions between the “Western” and “the Islamic world” (p. 44), but “latent conflict” had already existed, during the times of the cold war only covered by the East-West confrontation (p. 46), and that “the religious commandment to act in a terrorist way is the most important feature of contemporary terrorism” (p. 43). Next, it is taken for granted that religion, i.e. Islam, provides the basic rules for economic action in the Islamic world (p. 49), thus leading to essentially different economic models and value systems than in the West (p. 49 f.). Further, the author assumes that institutions matter, that “culture” is an “institution” and that “culture” is the major determinant for people’s action in Islamic countries: “all other levels such as law and economic systems are derived from it and are secondary to it” (p. 52). The author then goes on to reason that external pressure to establish market economies in Islamic countries, in part resulting from globalisation but also from the economic superiority of the West, will provoke counter-reactions of

ethnology and development economics at Prof. Weiss’ chair for Economics of the Near East), for example, strongly contributed to the development of a particular concept of economic anthropology at Berlin universities and research centers (*Berliner Wirtschaftsanthropologie*). For a summary of the methodological approach and some of the results see Trenk, Weiss 1992.

²⁹ See, for example, Nienhaus’ publications on Islamic economic thinking or Weiss’ contributions on norms, values and structural change in economic development.

Muslims desperate to defend their “culture”. It takes von Hauff just one more sentence to conclude that “the motivation for terrorism carried out by Muslims can therefore also be explained from an economic perspective” (p. 53).

The next paragraph of the text employs the so-called principal-agent “theory” to explain that religious leaders may “build-up fundamentalism” in order to receive material and immaterial contributions from their followers (the members of the religious community) and that this may probably result in acts of anti-Western terrorism: Religious leaders are understood to be the agents of the community (who employs these agents in order to realise some of the community’s aims). The agents’ task is to establish and enforce religiously motivated rules and regulations the existence and observance of which is described as a major need of the community (German: *Bedürfnis*). Defending the community’s culture – “if the occasion arises through terrorist attacks” (p. 55) – is part of that task definition. In other words, the community’s need – the defence of its culture against external influence – will be satisfied, as one way, by terrorist attacks on a foreign culture. The material and immaterial resources which the community transfers to its religious leaders are meant to be used for such attacks against “the West”. The “need” or “want” on the side of the community for the protection of its culture – according to von Hauff – directly implies a demand for terrorism. As the agents of the community, the religious leaders satisfy this demand – and give the community what it wants: the death, suffering and fear of Westerners. On pages 56 and 57 we further learn that a larger number of followers of the religious leaders can provide them – von Hauff’s potential terrorists – with more material and immaterial support which, in turn, “increases the probability of terrorist attacks” (p. 57).

In short: According to von Hauff, Muslims are fundamentally different from Westerners because all they do is primarily determined by religion. Religion makes up the core of their culture. Western models of market economy are an external threat to that culture as they are not in line with Islamic values. The protection of their culture (religion) is the primary concern of all Muslims – it even is a kind of basic need. Islamic communities assign the task to defend their culture to certain actors, their religious leaders. In order to protect the community’s culture, these religious leaders, among others, carry out terrorist attacks – if the occasion arises. This kind of action satisfies the needs of the community and therefore, it will continue to provide resources to their agents = religious leaders = terrorists. Finally, the more followers of religious leaders there are (i.e. the more Muslims), the more their agents can be provided with resources, and the higher “also the probability of terrorist attacks” (p. 57) – the more Muslims, the more terrorism against the West. Thus, while the author claims to present economic explanations for Islamist terror against “the West”, he actually resorts to nothing but cultural “explanations” as – according to his assumptions – anything economic is determined by (Islamic) culture.

It is not very surprising that the author, according to vita and publication list on his website, does not have any deeper knowledge on the Middle East – and that the article mentioned above apparently marks his first ever “academic” contact with this part of the world.³⁰ On the contrary, this fits quite well with what can be said about nearly all of the mainstream econo-

³⁰ The author, one of the two editors of the book in which the article dealt with has been published, is a German university professor of economics. He has been working on a wider range of issues which were fashionable at particular times, with some focus on environmental issues.

mists which jumped on the issue of “Islam and the West” during the last years, usually producing dangerously simple-minded contributions, while not even sensing how sub-standard their whole effort looks from the perspective of specialists, or just common sense.³¹ However, it comes a bit as a surprise that the second editor of the book – a Parliamentary Secretary of State for the German Federal Minister of the Interior and Vice Chair of the German Social Democrat Party since 2003 – accepted to publish such a text under her name.

3.2 The “Middle East” as a Distinct Region

The most important points of departure for the identification of “the Middle East” as a region that can be distinguished from other parts of the world seem to be the geographical location of the respective countries, the specific challenges the economies in the Middle East are facing and their development level in general – complemented by specific historical and cultural commonalities such as language and religion. In addition, certain socio-economic and politico-economic structural characteristics seem to overlap quite well with some geographic features, e.g. oil states at the Gulf, the importance of oil-related income throughout major parts of the region, but in particular in the Arab East, etc. All in all, the definition of the region by the European Middle East economic research community seems to be basically a *pragmatic* undertaking, even if some trends of culturalist or pseudo-culturalist explanations have been emerging repeatedly during certain periods. This also holds true for further subdivisions of the region, for example the Gulf countries versus the rest of the Arab East or the North African Arab states versus different other sub-regions. In other contexts, the Nile valley countries or the region depending on the waters of the Jordan and the Yarmuk rivers will be defined as sub-regions, for example when it comes to the economics of water or agriculture. When a solution for the Israeli-Arab conflict seemed to be in reach in the early 1990s, the “sub-region” consisting of Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria (sometimes also Egypt) turned into a separate object of research. Other sub-divisions follow the definitions of Middle Eastern governments, for example in research on regional or sub-regional cooperation schemes such as the Arab Maghreb Union (UMA) or the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). Also the identification of the so-called Southern-Mediterranean partner countries of the European Union, which make up a (newly-constructed) collective object of studies, is driven rather by a pragmatic foreign policy approach than by a kind of essentialist assumption.

4 The “Other” and the Opportunity to Fundamentally Criticise the Established Politico-Economic System – of the “Other”

From what has been said above about personal profiles and preferences of individual scientists and the bias against the use of standard economic models in the Middle Eastern context, one could conclude that young researchers, disliking the sterile, scholastic atmosphere in mainstream economics, often deliberately “migrate” to different kinds of area studies economics, just to escape the conservative mainstream environment prevailing in the conventional economic research landscape. Area studies are domains of economic analysis where

³¹ See, for example, also the confusing chapter by Ahrens and Hinsch in the same volume (Ahrens, Hinsch 2004).

one can still deal with other things than “subjective, individual benefit curves”, “consumer rent”, the “equilibrium” on “perfect markets”, the assumption of “diminishing returns” of the “factors of production” and the like – even if this comes at the price of anything but bright career prospects for most of these intellectual migrants.³² Further, in Germany as in other European countries, nowadays it is almost impossible for a young researcher to criticise the basic paradigms of socio-economic organisation of the “Western” society – at least, if he/she plans to continue an academic career in economics. A fundamental analysis of ownership patterns, the distribution and acquisition of wealth, or the influence of economically powerful groups on economic decision-making and of business interests on politics is considered inappropriate, as long as this concerns one’s “own” society.

By contrast, in “the West” it is well-accepted to explore the same phenomena for the societies in the Middle East, often with rather drastic conclusions and implications: An overcoming of the established socio-politico-economic system and a substantial re-distribution of power and access to resources in the countries of the Middle East can be advocated openly and quite aggressively by Western scholars, all, of course, for the sake of “modernisation” and “development” in the respective Middle Eastern societies.³³ In so far it is possible indeed to undertake a fundamental critique of economic and political structures associated with contemporary capitalism (albeit in its distorted Middle Eastern variant) – but only in the refuge of the “area studies island” to which the Western economist can travel, if he/she is in the mood to substantially evaluate the established order.³⁴

³² Such tendencies of a conscious escape of young scientists from the conservative research environment dominated by the mainstream further increases the divergence between area studies economics and the economic mainstream, possibly setting in motion a circular, self-enforcing causal chain.

³³ This may even culminate in a kind of scientific legitimisation of calls for regime change to be engineered by external actors in the region.

³⁴ During the 1930s and early 1940s, a whole number of German economists turned away from dealing with the economy of their home country and began to analyse the economic affairs of more distant places, for example the development prospects of the still largely agricultural economies on the Balkans. These activities are not only a historical precursor of modern economic development research but may also serve as an example for a particular kind of “internal emigration” of scientists rejecting the dominant discourse at a certain place and time. <http://www.wiso.uni-hamburg.de/index.php?id=6143>

5 References

- Ahrens, J & J Hinsch: Der Konflikt zwischen Islam und westlicher Welt – Zur Bedeutung von Vertrauen und Institutionen, in M Hauff & U Vogt (eds.), *Islamische und westliche Welt. Warum Politik, Wirtschaft und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit ihre Kooperation neu orientieren müssen*, Metropolis-Verlag, Marburg, 2004, pp. 307-333.
- Albert, H: Modellplatonismus – Der neoklassische Stil des ökonomischen Denkens in kritischer Beleuchtung, in Topitsch, E (ed.), *Logik der Sozialwissenschaften*, Köln, Berlin, 1965, pp. 406-434.
- Albrecht, H, P Pawelka & O Schlumberger: Wirtschaftliche Liberalisierung und Regimewandel in Ägypten, in *Welt-Trends*, WeltTrends e.V. and Instytut Zachodni, Poznan, No. 16, 1997, pp. 43-63.
- Albrecht, H: 1001 Reform im Jemen: Wirtschaftsreformen, Staat und Machterhalt, Lit-Verlag, Münster, Hamburg, London, 2002.
- Albrecht, H: Wirtschaftskrise und Strukturanpassung: die Jemenitische Methode, in Wippel, S (ed.), *Wirtschaft im Vorderen Orient: interdisziplinäre Perspektiven*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2005, pp. 54-76.
- Alkazaz, A: Zur Problematik der Ölpreisdeterminanten und ihrer Tendenzen: eine Analyse aus arabischer Perspektive, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 15, No. 4, 1974, pp. 153-160.
- Alkazaz, A: Oil problems seen from the Arab point of view, in *Intereconomics: review of European economic policy*, Hamburg Institute of International Economics (HWWA), Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, No. 7, 1975, pp. 206-207.
- Alkazaz, A: Die Entwicklung der irakischen Wirtschaft: Baath-Strategie in der Praxis, Orient-Institut (DOI), Hamburg, 1981.
- Alkazaz, A: Die Islamisierung des Banken- und Finanzierungswesens in Pakistan und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Spar- und Investitionstätigkeit, in *Orient*, Deutsches Übersee-Institut, Vol. 26, No. 4, 1985, pp. 601-623.
- Alkazaz, A: Exporte und Exportpolitik der arabischen Staaten in Importe aus der Dritten Welt, Deutsches Übersee-Institut, Hamburg, 1987, pp. 16-60.
- Alkazaz, A: Auf dem Weg zur Arabischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft, in U Steinbach (ed.), *Arabien: Mehr als Erdöl und Konflikte*, Leske und Budrich, Opladen, 1992.
- Alkazaz, A: Ökonomische Stabilisierung der Nah- und Mittelostregion: kritische Untersuchung der im Rahmen des Friedensprozesses angewandten Strategien und Alternativen, in *Journal für Entwicklungspolitik*, Mattersburger Kreis für Entwicklungspolitik an den Österreichischen Universitäten, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1995, pp. 421-455.
- Anderson, L: *Pursuing Truth, Exercising Power. Social Science and Public Policy in the Twenty-first Century*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2003.
- Bahadir, SA: Wirtschaftliche Integration der arabischen Golfstaaten: Probleme und Perspektiven des Golf-Kooperationsrates, in P Pawelka (ed.), *Arabische Golfstaaten in der Krise*, RG Fischer, Frankfurt/M, 1990, pp. 118-147.
- Barrios, H, M Beck, A Boeckh & K Segbers (eds.): *Resistance to Globalization. Political Struggle and Cultural Resilience in the Middle East, Russia and Latin America*, Lit-Verlag, Münster, Hamburg, London, 2003.

- Barthel, G: Die Asien-, Afrika- und Lateinamerikawissenschaften in der ehemaligen DDR – Versuche eines Resümees, in Hochschule Ost, No. 5, 1993, pp. 5-13.
- Barthel, G: ,Wassermangel im Vorderen Orient – Konfliktstoff mit wachsender Dimension, in Asien, Afrika, Lateinamerika, No. 24, 1996, pp. 537-545.
- Beck, M: Die Erdöl-Rentier-Staaten des Nahen und Mittleren Ostens: Interessen, erdölpolitische Kooperation und Entwicklungstendenzen, Lit-Verlag, Münster, 1993.
- Beck, M: Die erdölpolitische Kooperation der OPEC-Staaten: Eine Erfolgsgeschichte, in Orient, Deutsches Übersee-Institut, Vol. 35, No. 3, 1994, pp. 391-412.
- Beck, M, A Boeckh & P Pawelka: Staat, Markt und Rente in der sozialwissenschaftlichen Diskussion, in A Boeckh & P Pawelka (eds.), Staat, Markt und Rente in der internationalen Politik, Leske und Budrich, Opladen, 1997.
- Beck, M: Friedensprozess im Nahen Osten: Rationalität, Kooperation und politische Rente im Vorderen Orient, Westdeutscher Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2003a.
- Beck, M: Resistance to globalization and limited liberalization in the Middle East, in H Barrios et al. (ed.), Resistance to globalization, Münster, 2003b.
- Biegel, R: Politische und wirtschaftliche Steuerungsfaktoren der Stadtentwicklung von Amman/Jordanien. Die Rolle der Metropole in einem Rentenstaat, Tübingen, 1990.
- Biegel, R: Amman: Die Entwicklung einer Metropole im Rentenstaat Jordanien unter dem Einfluß externer und interner Steuerungsfaktoren, in Mitteilungen der Fränkischen Geographischen Gesellschaft, Vol. 38, 1992.
- Boeckh, A & P Pawelka (eds.): Staat, Markt und Rente in der internationalen Politik, Leske und Budrich, Opladen, 1997.
- Brach, J: Ten Years after: Achievements and Challenges of the Euro-Mediterranean Economic and Financial Partnership, GIGA Working Papers No. 36, Hamburg, 2006.
- Bush, R: Mubaraks legacy for Egypts rural poor. Returning land to the landlords, in AH Akram-Lodhi, M Saturnino, Jr Borrás & C Kay (eds.), Land, Poverty and Livelihoods in the Era of Globalization: Perspectives from Developing and Transition Countries, Routledge, London, 2007, pp. 254-283.
- Claus, B & MP Rügner: Evaluierung von Gewerbeschulen - Fallstudie: Die iranisch-deutschen Gewerbeschulen in Teheran und Tabriz (Iran), Berlin, 1969.
- Ehlers, E: Traditionelle und moderne Formen der Landwirtschaft im Iran, Geographic Institute of the University of Marburg, Marburg/Lahn, 1975.
- Ehlers, E: Die Erdölförderländer des Mittleren Ostens 1960-1976: zum Wert- und Bedeutungswandel einer Wirtschaftsregion, in Die Erde, Gesellschaft für Erdkunde, Berlin, Vol. 109, Nrs. 3/4, 1978, pp. 457-491.
- Ehlers, E: Iran: Wirtschafts- und sozialgeographische Aspekte einer islamischen Revolution, in Geographische Rundschau, Westermann, Braunschweig, Vol. 32, No. 1, 1980, pp. 2-15.
- Englert, A: Die Grosse Arabische Freihandelszone – Motive und Erfolgsaussichten der neuen Initiative für eine intra-arabische Integration aus arabischer Sicht, Diskussionspapiere No. 73, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 2000.
- Fergany, N: Poverty and unemployment in Rural Egypt, in R Bush (ed.), Counter Revolution in the Egyptian Countryside, Zed Books, London, 2002, pp. 213-224.
- Gälli A & A Alkazaz: Der arabische Bankensektor, Weltforum-Verlag, München, 1986.
- Ghose, UM: Entwicklungspolitische Defizite der höheren Bildung in Palästina, Diskussionspapiere No. 68, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1999.

- Gottstein, K (ed.): *Islamic Cultural Identity and Scientific-Technological Development*, Baden-Baden, 1986.
- Gräfe, S: *Privatunternehmer und Unternehmerverbände im Prozess wirtschaftlicher Liberalisierung – Klientelstrukturen, Patronage und Aneignung von Renten im ägyptischen Saatgutsektor*, Diskussionspapiere No. 92, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- Hafez, K & G Höpp: *Gegenwartsbezogene Orientwissenschaft in der DDR und in den neuen Bundesländern: Kontinuität oder Neubeginn?* in WH Krauth & R Wolz (eds.), *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung. Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften im Umbruch*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 1998, pp. 95-164.
- Halbach, AJ: *Perspektiven Regionaler Wirtschaftskooperation im Nahen Osten. Empirische Analyse der Wirtschaftsbeziehungen vor dem Hintergrund einer umfassenden Friedensregelung*, Ifo research reports of the Department for Transition Countries No. 83, Weltforum-Verlag, München, Köln, London, 1994.
- Halbach, AJ in cooperation with A Alkazaz, J Gregory, H Helmschrott, T Röhm & D Strack: *Regional economic development in the Middle East: potential intra-regional trade in goods and services against the background of a peace settlement*, Ifo research reports of the Department for Development and Transformation Studies No. 84, Weltforum-Verlag, München, Köln, London, 1995a.
- Halbach, AJ in cooperation with H Awartani, D Brand, C Gassner, H Helmschrott & D Strack: *New Potentials for Cooperation and Trade in the Middle East. An Empirical Analysis*, Ifo research reports of the Department for Development and Transformation Studies No. 85, Weltforum-Verlag, München, Köln, London, 1995b.
- Hamad, Q: *Palästinensische Industrialisierung unter unvollständiger Souveränität: Das Beispiel Bekleidungsindustrie*, Diskussionspapiere No. 43, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1995.
- von Hauff, M: *Die Analyse des Terrorismus aus ökonomischer Perspektive*, in von M Hauff & U Vogt (eds.), *Islamische und westliche Welt. Warum Politik, Wirtschaft und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit ihre Kooperation neu orientieren müssen*, Metropolis-Verlag, Marburg, 2004, pp. 41-63.
- Heydemann, S (ed.): *Networks of Privilege in the Middle East: The Politics of Economic Reform Revisited*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2004.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Die wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Türkei, Iran und Pakistan im Rahmen der RCD: Möglichkeiten und Auswirkungen auf ausländische Investitionen*, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1972, pp. 172-175.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Aspekte der Agrarreform Irans*, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1973a, pp. 37-40.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Wohin steuert Irans Erdölpolitik?* in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1973b, pp. 40-41.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Neuere Entwicklung und Perspektiven der iranisch-sowjetischen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen*, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 14, No. 3, 1973c, pp. 136-142.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Zur Entwicklung der Erdölwirtschaft Irans von 1954-1973: Einführung und Dokumentation*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, 1973d.
- Hoepfner, RR: *Probleme des iranischen Verkehrs- und Transportsystems und seiner projektierten Entwicklung*, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1976, pp. 77-105.

- Hoepfner, RR: Wohin steuert RCD: Iran, Pakistan, Türkei, in *Aussenpolitik / Deutsche Ausgabe*, Bertelsmann, Bielefeld, Vol. 28, No. 2, 1977, pp. 227-235.
- Hoepfner, RR: Die iranische Revolution und die neue iranische Wirtschaftspolitik, Zukunftsperspektiven der Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen Iran und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, in *Iran in der Krise - Weichenstellungen für die Zukunft*, Neue Gesellschaft, Bonn, 1980a, pp. 183-196.
- Hoepfner, RR: Beziehungen der EG und des RGW zu den erdölfördernden Staaten des Vorderen Orients, in *Rechtliche und wirtschaftliche Beziehungen zwischen den Integrationsräumen in West- und Osteuropa*, Nomos, Baden-Baden, 1980b, pp. 477-481.
- Hopfinger, H: Economic Liberalization and Privatization in a Changing World, in H Hopfinger (ed.), *Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples*, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 7-10.
- Hopfmann, A, A Krause & H Schilling: Entwicklung und Abwicklung. Eine Dokumentation zu Entstehung, Werdegang und Beseitigung regionalübergreifender Dritte-Welt, in *Utopie konkret*, (Karl-Marx-) Universität Leipzig, Nrs. 21/22, 1992, pp. 143-155.
- Hüsken, Th: Der Stamm der Experten. Rhetorik und Praxis des Interkulturellen Managements in der deutschen staatlichen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, Transcript-Verlag, Bielefeld, 2006.
- Jünemann, A: Six Years After: Reinvigorating the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, in CH Hanelt, F Neugart & M Peitz (eds.), *Europe's Emerging Foreign Policy and the Middle Eastern Challenge*, München, Gütersloh, 2002, pp. 59-78.
- Knaupe, H & UG Wurzel: Potential Building – Private Ansätze zur Reform des ägyptischen Bildungswesens, Universitätsverlag Leipzig, 1994.
- Knaupe, H & UG Wurzel: Aufbruch in der Wüste – Die Neuen Städte in Ägypten, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M, 1995.
- Koehler, S & UG Wurzel: From Transnational R&D Co-operation to Regional Economic Co-operation: EU-Style Technology Policies in the MENA Region, in *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2003, pp. 83-112.
- Kohl, I: Wüstentourismus in Libyen – Folgen, Auswirkungen und lokale Wahrnehmungen. Eine anthropologische Fallstudie aus der Oase Ghat, Diskussionspapiere No. 94, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- Kooroshy, J: Islamische Wirtschaftsordnung im Iran? Eine kritische Zwischenbilanz, in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 34, No. 42, 1984, pp. 16-27.
- Kooroshy, J: Agrarverfassung der Islamischen Republik Iran, in *Orient*, Deutsches Übersee-Institut, Vol. 28, No. 2, 1987, pp. 229-243.
- Kooroshy, J: Wirtschaftsordnung der Islamischen Republik Iran: Anspruch und Wirklichkeit, Discussion Paper No. 39, Deutsches Orient-Institut, Hamburg, 1990.
- Kooroshy, J: Ökonomischer Transformationsprozeß in der Islamischen Republik Iran: Wirtschaftsentwicklung seit 1989, in *Orient*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Nomos, Baden-Baden, Vol. 37, No. 2, 1996, pp. 281-295.
- Kooroshy, J: Die Folgen der Iranischen Revolution von 1979 für die Wirtschaft, in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, No. 19, 1999, pp. 39-46.
- Krauth, WH & R Wolz (eds.): *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung. Asien- und Afrikawissenschaften im Umbruch*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- Loewe, M: Systeme der sozialen Sicherung in Ägypten, Berichte und Gutachten No. 4, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Berlin, 2000.

- Löwe, P & UG Wurzel: On the Planned Euro-Mediterranean Free Trade Area: The Southern Mediterranean Countries Must Improve their Ability to Innovate, in *Economic Bulletin*, Berlin, Vol. 39, No. 3, 2002, pp. 99-106.
- Mattes, H: Wirtschaftsreform, staatlicher Sektor und Privatisierungsdebatte im Maghreb, Deutsches Orient-Institut, Hamburg, 1988.
- Mattes, H: Die Union du Maghreb Arabe (UMA): Hintergründe und politisch-ökonomische Perspektiven, in *Nord-Süd aktuell: Vierteljahresschrift für Nord-Süd und Süd-Süd-Entwicklungen*, Hamburg Institute, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1989, pp. 85-90.
- Mattes, H: Die Sahel- und Sahara-Staatengemeinschaft (SinSad): Instrument der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung, Konfliktvermittlung und regionalen Interessensicherung, Deutsches Übersee-Institut, Hamburg, 2001.
- Meyer, G: Ländliche Lebens- und Wirtschaftsformen Syriens im Wandel. Sozialgeographische Studien zur Entwicklung im bäuerlichen und nomadischen Lebensraum, *Erlanger Geographische Arbeiten*, No. 16, 1984.
- Meyer, G: Migration and Economic Development in the Old and Newer Quarters of Sanaa and Cairo, in *British Society for Middle East Studies* (ed.), *BRISMES Proceedings of the 1986 International Conference on Middle East Studies*, London, 1986a, pp. 385-394.
- Meyer, G: Arbeitsemigration, Binnenwanderung und Wirtschaftsentwicklung in der Arabischen Republik Jemen, *Jemen-Studien 2*, Wiesbaden, 1986b, p. 318.
- Meyer, G: Economic Development in Syria since 1970, in JA Allan (ed.), *Politics and the Economy in Syria*, School of Oriental and African Studies, London, 1987, pp. 40-62.
- Meyer, G: Wirtschaftsgeographische Probleme der Industrieansiedlung in den Entlastungsstädten der ägyptischen Metropole, in *Erdkunde*, No. 42, 1988.
- Meyer, G: Kairo – Entwicklungsprobleme einer Metropole der Dritten Welt, Köln, 1989.
- Meyer, G: The Impact of Liberalization and Privatization on the Agricultural Sector in Egypt, in H Hopfinger (ed.), *Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples*, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 121-146.
- Mitchell, T: *Rule of Experts. Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2002.
- Möller, A, K Billerbeck, C Heimpel, W Hillebrand, HH Taake & D Weiss: *Proposals for the Solution of the Most Important Structural, Economic and Financial Problems of the Arab Republic of Egypt*, Report to the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt A. El Sadat, Berlin, 1980.
- Müller-Mahn, D: *Fellachendörfer. Sozialgeographischer Wandel im ländlichen Ägypten*, Stuttgart, 2001.
- El-Naggar, A: *Zinslose Sparkassen – Ein Entwicklungsprojekt im Nil-Delta*, Al-Kitab-Verlag, Köln, 1981.
- Nasr, M: Mineraloelwirtschaft im Nahen Osten: ihre Bedeutung für die Nah-Ost-Länder und für Westeuropa, in *Sozialwissenschaftliche Schriften*, Forschungsinstitut der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, Hannover, 1967.
- Neugart, S, A Schuhmacher: Thinking about the EU's Future Neighbourhood Policy in the Middle East: From the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership to Barcelona Plus, in PC Hanelt, G Luciani & F Neugart (eds.), *Regime Change in Iraq: The Transatlantic and Regional Dimensions*, The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico die Fiesole, 2004, pp. 169-192.
- Nienhaus, V: Die islamische Wirtschaftslehre – Politik zwischen Pragmatismus und Utopie, in *Orient*, No. 22, 1981, pp. 50-68.

- Nienhaus, V: Islam und moderne Wirtschaft. Positionen, Probleme und Perspektiven, Styria, Graz, Wien, Köln, 1982.
- Nienhaus, V: Marktwirtschaft und Moral, Kapitalismus und Fundamentalismus: Probleme der wirtschaftlichen Systemtransformation in Entwicklungsländern, in U Steinbach & V Nienhaus (eds.), Entwicklungszusammenarbeit in Kultur, Recht und Wirtschaft, Opladen, 1995, pp. 119-134.
- Nienhaus, V: Euro-mediterraner Freihandel: Motor der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung? in Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Nrs. 39/97, 1997, pp. 12-18.
- Nienhaus, V: Der Islam – Bremse oder Motor der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung? in M von Hauff & U Vogt (eds.), Islamische und westliche Welt. Warum Politik, Wirtschaft und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit ihre Kooperation neu orientieren müssen, Metropolis-Verlag, Marburg, 2004, pp. 227-254.
- Nour, E: Die Rolle des Sozialfonds im Rahmen der Strukturanpassungspolitik in Ägypten, Diskussionspapiere No. 34, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1995.
- Nunnenkamp, P: Why Economic Growth Has Been Weak in Arab Countries: The Role of Exogenous Shocks, Economic Policy Failure and Institutional Deficiencies, Kiel Discussion Paper No. 409, Kiel Institute for World Economics, 2004.
- Pawelka, P: Herrschaft und Entwicklung im Nahen Osten, UTB für Wissenschaft, Müller Juristischer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1985.
- Pawelka, P (ed.): Arabische Golfstaaten in der Krise, RG Fischer, Bonn, Frankfurt/M, 1990.
- Pawelka, P: Der Irak als Rentierstaat, in Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg (ed.), Die Golfregion in der Weltpolitik, Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, 1991.
- Pawelka, P: Die politische Ökonomie der Außenpolitik im Vorderen Orient, in A Boeckh & P Pawelka (eds.), Staat, Markt und Rente in der internationalen Politik, Opladen, 1997.
- Pawelka, P & O Schlumberger: Staat, Bürgertum und Renten im arabischen Vorderen Orient, in Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Nrs. 39/97, 1997, pp. 3-11.
- Perthes, V: Vom Krieg zur Konkurrenz: Regionale Politik und die Suche nach einer neuen arabischnahöstlichen Ordnung, Nomos, Baden-Baden, 2000.
- Poelling, S: The Role of the Private Sector in the Syrian Economy. Law No. 10 for the Encouragement of Investment, in H Hopfinger (ed.), Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 155-164.
- Pommerenig, C: Vertretenes Schweigen – Afrikanistik, in Leipzig in Hochschule Ost, No. 5, 1993, pp. 33-36.
- Reinhardt, J, O Shamleh, & C Uhlig: Der Dienstleistungssektor ausgewählter Entwicklungsländer: entwicklungs- und handelspolitische Aspekte, Fallstudien Malaysia, Jordanien, Zimbabwe, Weltforum-Verlag, München, Köln, London, 1989.
- Robbe, M: Verlorene Visionen? Entwicklungsländerforschung in der DDR, in Hochschule Ost, No. 5, 1993, pp. 14-24.
- Roll, SJ: Die Süd-Süd-Integration im Rahmen der Euro-Mediterranen Freihandelszone – Integrationsperspektiven und Integrationsprobleme der arabischen Mittelmeerpartnerländer, Diskussionspapiere No. 95, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

- Roll, SJ: Zwischen Finanzsektorliberalisierung und Herrschaftssicherung – Der Aufstieg einer ägyptischen Investmentbank und das politisch-ökonomische Netzwerk im Hintergrund, Diskussionspapiere No. 98, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- Roßkopf, F: Die Entwicklung des Steuersystems im Iran nach der Revolution von 1979, Diskussionspapiere No. 9, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, 1991.
- Schiffler, M, H Köppen, R Lohmann, A Schmidt, A Wächter & C Widmann: Water Demand Management in an Arid Country. The Case of Jordan with Special Reference to Industry, Working Paper No. 10, German Development Institute (GDI), Berlin, 1994.
- Schiffler, M: Economic Instruments of Groundwater Demand Management. Theory, International Experience, and a Case Study of Jordan, Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Berlin, 1996.
- Schliephake, K: Wirtschafts- und Stadtgeographische Strukturen in der Türkei, in Syrien und Jordanien, Würzburger Geographische Manuskripte, University of Würzburg, Geographisches Institut, 1989.
- Schliephake, K: Natürliche Ausstattung und ressourcenorientierte Entwicklungskonzepte: Beispiele aus Saudi-Arabien und Qatar, in P Pawelka (ed.), Arabische Golfstaaten in der Krise, RG Fischer, Frankfurt/M, 1990, pp. 67-90.
- Schlumberger, O: Transition in the Arab world: guidelines for comparison, EUI Working Paper No. 22, Robert Schuman Centre, Domenico (FI), 2002.
- Schlumberger, O: Strukturreformen und patrimonialer Kapitalismus in der arabischen Welt, in D Messner & I Scholz (eds.), Zukunftsfragen der Entwicklungspolitik, Nomos, Baden-Baden, 2005, pp. 361-375.
- Schmid, C: Das Konzept des Rentier-Staates. Ein sozialwissenschaftliches Paradigma zur Analyse von Entwicklungsgesellschaften und seine Bedeutung für den Vorderen Orient, Lit-Verlag, Münster, Hamburg, 1991.
- Schmid, C & P Pawelka: Der moderne Rentierstaat im Vorderen Orient und seine Strategien der Krisenbewältigung, in P Pawelka (ed.), Arabische Golfstaaten in der Krise, RG Fischer, Tübingen, Frankfurt/Main, 1990, pp. 91-117.
- Steinbach, U: Die Türkei, der Nahe Osten und das Wasser: Verschiebungen des Kräftegleichgewichts, in Internationale Politik, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1998, pp. 9 – 16.
- Theobald, KJ: Trends in Privatization in the Industrial Sector in Yemen and a Case Study of the Yemeni Textile Corporation in Aden, in Hopfinger, H (Ed.), Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 245-260.
- Trenk, M & E Nour: Geld, Güter und Gaben – Informelle Spar- und Kreditformen in einem Dorf im Nil-Delta, Diskussionspapiere No. 16, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1992.
- Trenk, M & D Weiss (eds.): Studentische Feldforschungserfahrungen in Drittweltländern, Lit-Verlag, Münster, Hamburg, 1992.
- UNDP: Arab Human Development Report 2002. Creating Opportunities for Future Generations, New York, 2002.
- UNDP: Arab Human Development Report 2003. Building a Knowledge Society, New York, 2003.
- Weiss, D: Wirtschaftliche Entwicklungsplanung in der VAR (Ägypten) - Analyse und Kritik, Opladen, Köln, 1964.

- Weiss, D: Zur wissenschaftlichen Kooperation mit den Ländern des Vorderen Orients, in *Europa-Archiv*, No. 22, 1982.
- Weiss, D: Culture, Perception of Reality, and the Newly Emerging Planning Paradigm, in *Social Indicators Research*, No. 16, 1985a.
- Weiss, D: Aspekte der Re-Islamisierung der Wirtschaft im arabisch-islamischen Orient, in *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch*, No. 4, 1985b.
- Weiss, D: Die arabische Welt vor einer neuen wissenschaftlich-technologischen Kommunikationskrise? in *Orient*, No. 3, 1986.
- Weiss, D: Institutionelle Aspekte der Selbstblockierung von Reformpolitiken: Fallstudie Ägypten, in *Konjunkturpolitik*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 1992a.
- Weiss, D: Structural Adjustment Programs in the Middle East – The Impact of Value Patterns and Social Norms, *Diskussionspapiere No. 21*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1992b.
- Weiss, D: Economic transition from socialism to market friendly regimes in Arab countries from the perspective of Ibn Khaldun, *Diskussionspapiere No. 22*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1992c.
- Weiss, D: Entwicklung als Wettbewerb von Kulturen. Betrachtungen zum Nahen und zum Fernen Osten, *Diskussionspapiere No. 26*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1993.
- Weiss, D: Human Rights and Economic Growth, *Diskussionspapiere No. 33*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1995a.
- Weiss, D: European-Arab Development Cooperation and the Middle East Peace Process, *Diskussionspapiere No. 40*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1995b.
- Weiss, D: Kultur und Entwicklung: die ökonomischen Erklärungsansätze reichen nicht aus, in *Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 1998a, pp. 40-44.
- Weiss, D: Islamistische Bewegungen in Nahen Osten und in Nordafrika, *Diskussionspapiere No. 61*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1998b.
- Weiss, D: Entwicklungspolitik als Technisch-Wissenschaftliche Kooperations- und Kulturpolitik, *Diskussionspapiere No. 57*, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, *Das Arabische Buch*, Berlin, 1998c.
- Weiss, D: Kultur und Entwicklung: Entwicklung ist, was geschieht, wenn Kreativität sich entfalten kann, in RE Thiel (ed.), *Neue Ansätze zur Entwicklungstheorie*, Bonn, 1999a.
- Weiss, D: Entwicklungsblockierung durch geostrategische Renten: der Fall Ägypten, in *Orient*, Vol. 40, No. 3, 1999b, pp. 469-475.
- Weiss, D: Vor einer Neuordnung des islamischen Orients? Alte Kränkungen und neue Kooperationsperspektiven, in *Internationales Asien-Forum*, Arnold Bergstraesser Institut (ABI), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Asienkunde, Freiburg, Hamburg, Vol. 34, Nrs. 1/2, 2003, pp. 7-26.
- Weiss, D: Wege zu einer arabischen Wissensgesellschaft, in *Orient*, Vol. 45, No. 1, 2004a, pp. 75-90.
- Weiss, D: Freiheit, Wissen und Ermächtigung von Frauen in arabischen Ländern, in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 54, No. 48, 2004b, pp. 3-9.

- Weiss, D: Building the Arab Knowledge Society - Some Tentative Conclusions from the Donor Perspective, paper presented on the occasion of the Policy Dialogue "The Arab Human Development Report 2003 – Consequences for International Cooperation", UNDP & German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation, Berlin, 2004c.
- Weiss, D & UG Wurzel: The Economics and Politics of Transition to an Open Market Economy. Egypt, OECD Development Centre, Paris, 1998.
- Werenfels, I: Obstacles to Privatisation of State-Owned Industries in Algeria: the Political Economy of a Distributive Conflict, in *The Journal of North African Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2002, pp. 1-28.
- Wiesebach, H: Privatization and Economic Liberalization in Socialist Arab Countries from the Viewpoint of the German Government, in H Hopfinger (ed.), *Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples*, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 37-50.
- Winter, HD: Abwicklung und gegenwärtige Situation der Lateinamerikawissenschaften an der Universität Rostock, in *Hochschule Ost*, Vol. 5, 1993, pp. 29-32.
- Wils, O: Wirtschaftseliten und Reform in Jordanien. Zur Relevanz von Unternehmer-Bürokraten-Netzwerken in Entwicklungsprozessen, Deutsches Orient Institut (DOI), Hamburg, 2003.
- Wippel, S: Gott, Geld und Staat: Aufstieg und Niedergang der islamischen Investmentgesellschaften in Ägypten im Spannungsfeld von Ökonomie, Politik und Religion, Lit-Verlag, Münster, Hamburg, 1994.
- Wippel, S: Islam als "Corporate Identity" von Wirtschafts- und Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Eine Fallstudie aus Ägypten, Diskussionspapiere No. 38, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1995.
- Wippel, S: Islamische Wirtschafts- und Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen in Ägypten zwischen Markt und Moral, Lit-Verlag, Münster, 1997.
- Wippel, S: Entwicklungen und Probleme der euro-mediterranen Beziehungen aus marokkanischer Sicht, Diskussionspapiere No. 67, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1999.
- Wippel, S: Geschäfte zwischen Markt und Moral. Islam und Ökonomie: ethisches Wirtschaften ist ein globaler Trend, in Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (ed.), *Weltreligion Islam*, Bonn, 2002, pp. 46-50.
- Wippel, S: Wirtschaft im Vorderen Orient. Zu Potenzialen, Defiziten und Perspektiven der wissenschaftlichen Forschung in Deutschland, in S Wippel (ed.), *Wirtschaft im Vorderen Orient: interdisziplinäre Perspektiven*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2005a, pp. 7-32.
- Wippel, S: Regionale Integration im Maghreb: Wirtschaftliche, kognitive und räumliche Aspekte, in S Wippel (ed.), *Wirtschaft im Vorderen Orient: interdisziplinäre Perspektiven*, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2005b, pp. 112-141.
- Wippel, S: The Agadir Agreement and Open Regionalism: The New Forum for Integration on the Southern Shore of the Mediterranean in the Context of Multiple Regional Orientations, EuroMeSCo Paper 45, EuroMeSCo Secretariat at the IEEI, Lisbon, 2005c.
- Wippel, S & I Cornelissen (eds.): *Entwicklungspolitische Perspektiven im Kontext wachsender Komplexität*, Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Dieter Weiss, Weltforum-Verlag, München, Köln, London, 2001.
- Wünsch, A: *Innenansichten ökonomischer Restrukturierung*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt/M, 2001.
- Wurzel, UG: *Ägyptische Privatisierungspolitik 1990 bis 1998. Geber-Nehmer-Konflikte, ökonomische Strukturreformen, geostrategische Renten und politische Herrschaftssicherung*, Lit-Verlag, Hamburg, Münster, 2000a.

- Wurzel, UG: "The Missing Dimension" – Neuere Erkenntnisse systemischer Innovationstheorien und ihre Implikationen für die Euro-Mediterrane Wissenschafts- und Technologiekoooperation, Diskussionspapiere No. 79, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 2000b.
- Wurzel, UG: Technologie und Gesellschaft – Innovationstheorie und Technologiepolitik aus europäischer Perspektive, in H Fürtig (ed.), *Muslims and Globalization. Appropriation, Abgrenzung, Gegenentwürfe*, Ergon-Verlag, Würzburg, 2001, pp. 296-321.
- Wurzel, UG: Free Trade and Regional Co-operation in the Mediterranean, in CH Hanelt, F Neugart & M Peitz (eds.), *Europe's Emerging Foreign Policy and the Middle Eastern Challenge*, München, Gütersloh, 2002, pp. 79-121.
- Wurzel, UG: Stabilitätsanalyse Ägypten, in S Faath (ed.), *Stabilitätsprobleme zentraler Staaten: Ägypten, Algerien, Saudi-Arabien, Iran, Pakistan und die regionalen Auswirkungen*, Deutsches Orient-Institut (DOI), Hamburg, 2003a, pp. 119-158.
- Wurzel, UG: Why Investment in Civil Society is an Investment in Economic Development: The Case of the Southern Mediterranean, EuroMeSCo Papers No. 25, Lisbon, 2003b.
- Wurzel, UG: Patterns of Resistance: Economic Actors and Fiscal Policy Reform in Egypt in the 1990s, in S Heydemann (ed.), *Networks of Privilege in the Middle East: The Politics of Economic Reform Revisited*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2004a, pp. 101-132.
- Wurzel, UG: Die Überwindung von Entwicklungsblockaden in der arabisch-nahöstlichen Welt als Dialog- und Kooperationsfeld der Kulturen, in M von Hauff & U Vogt (eds.), *Islamische und westliche Welt. Warum Politik, Wirtschaft und Entwicklungszusammenarbeit ihre Kooperation neu orientieren müssen*, Metropolis-Verlag, Marburg, 2004b, pp. 65-98.
- Wurzel, UG: The Limits to Economic Reform in an Authoritarian State. Egypt Since the 1990s, Diskussionspapiere No. 100, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Klaus Schwarz Verlag, Berlin, 2007.
- Wurzel, UG & H Knaupe: Entwicklung der Entlastungsstadt Tenth of Ramadan in Ägypten - Erfolge und Fehlschläge in Industrie, Wohnungswesen und Infrastruktur, Lit-Verlag, Hamburg, Münster, 1996.
- Zaghah, A: A Monetary Alternative for the Palestinian Economy: A Palestinian Currency, Diskussionspapiere No. 39, Freie Universität Berlin, Volkswirtschaft des Vorderen Orients, Das Arabische Buch, Berlin, 1995.
- Zeuner, TH: Promotion of Small- and Medium-Scale Industry in Algeria. A Case Example, in H Hopfinger (ed.), *Economic Liberalization and Privatization in Socialist Arab Countries. Algeria, Egypt, Syria and Yemen as Examples*, Justus Perthes Verlag, Gotha, 1996, pp. 199-206.
- Zorob, A: Palästina: Wirtschaftliche Rezession und drohende humanitäre Katastrophe, in *Israel & Palästina – Zeitschrift für Dialog*. Deutsch-Israelischer Arbeitskreis für Frieden im Nahen Osten, No. 4, 2006, pp. 57-68.
- Zorob, A: Reform without Adjustment: The Syrian Style of Economic Opening, in H Fürtig (ed.), *The Arab Authoritarian Regime between Reform and Persistence*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, 2007, pp. 57-86.

Bisher erschienen:

(Die mit * gekennzeichneten Nummern sind unter der angegebenen Quelle erschienen und inzwischen nicht mehr im Klaus Schwarz Verlag · Berlin erhältlich.)

- Nr. 1 Ulrike Schultz: Die Last der Arbeit und der Traum vom Reichtum. Frauengruppen in Kenia zwischen gegenseitiger Hilfe und betriebswirtschaftlichem Kalkül. 1990. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 2* Marin Trenk: "Dein Reichtum ist dein Ruin". Afrikanische Unternehmer und wirtschaftliche Entwicklung. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Unternehmerforschung. 1990. [erschieden in: *Anthropos* 86.1991]
- Nr. 3 Jochen Böhmer: Sozio-kulturelle Bedingungen ökonomischen Handelns in der Türkei. 1990. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 4 Gitta Walchner: Indiens Elektronikpolitik und die Exportpotentiale der Computerindustrie im Software-Bereich. 1990. [erschieden in: *Internationales Asienforum* 22.1991]
- Nr. 5* Dieter Weiss: Internationale Unterstützung des Reformprozesses in Entwicklungsländern durch Auflagenpolitik und Politikdialog? Probleme politischer Konditionalität am Beispiel Afrikas. 1990. [erschieden in: H. Sautter (Hg.), *Wirtschaftspolitische Reformen in Entwicklungsländern*, Berlin 1991]
- Nr. 6 Dorothea Kübler: Moralökonomie versus Mikroökonomie. Zwei Erklärungsansätze bäuerlichen Wirtschaftens im Vergleich. 1990. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 7 Jochen Böhmer: Die Verschuldungskrise in Schwarzafrika. Ausmaß, Ursachen und Ansatzpunkte für eine Lösung. 1990. (3,50 €).
- Nr. 8* Manuel Schiffler: Überlebensökonomie, Wohnungsbau und informelle Kredite in einem tunesischen Armenviertel. 1990. [erschieden in *Orient* 33.1992.1]
- Nr. 9 Fritz Roßkopf: Die Entwicklung des Steuersystems im Iran nach der Revolution von 1979. 1991. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 10 Barbara Igel: Die Überlebensökonomie der Slumbewohner in Bangkok. 1991. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 11/12* Dirk Steinwand: Sicherheit und Vertrauen. Informelle Kreditbeziehungen und ländliche Verschuldung in Thailand. Teil 1: Ursachen, Formen, Ausmaß. Teil 2: Eine Fallstudie aus Chachoengsao. 1991. [erschieden als: D. Steinwand, *Sicherheit und Vertrauen*, Saarbrücken/Fort Lauderdale 1991]
- Nr. 13* Dieter Weiss: Zur Transformation von Wirtschaftssystemen. Institutionelle Aspekte der Selbstblockierung von Reformpolitiken: Fallstudie Ägypten. 1991. [erschieden in: *Konjunkturpolitik* 38.1992]
- Nr. 14 Christoph David Weinmann: The Making of Wooden Furniture in Mozambique: A Short Overview of the Industry Based on Observations in Mid 1989. 1991. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 15 Armin Liebchen: Überlebensstrategien eines kleinbäuerlichen Dorfes der Bariba am Rande der Sahelzone im Norden Benins. 1991. (14,00 €).
- Nr. 16 Marin Trenk und Elsaied Nour: Geld, Güter und Gaben. Informelle Spar- und Kreditformen in einem Dorf im Nil-Delta. 1992. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 17 Dieter Weiss: Zur ökonomischen Transformation der ehemaligen COMECON-Länder. 1992. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 18 Steffen Wippel: Transformation du système économique et investissements directs allemands en Égypte. 1992. (4,00 €).
- Nr. 19 Günther Taube. Festung Europa oder ein offenes europäisches Haus? 1992. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 20* Bei fremden Freunden. Erfahrungen aus studentischer Feldforschung. 1992. [erschieden als: M. Trenk u. D. Weiss (Hg.), *Bei fremden Freunden*, LIT-Verlag Münster/Hamburg 1992]
- Nr. 21 Dieter Weiss: Structural Adjustment Programs in the Middle East. The Impact of Value Patterns and Social Norms. 1992. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 22 Dieter Weiss: Economic Transition from Socialism to Market-Friendly Regimes in Arab Countries from the Perspective of Ibn Khaldun. 1993. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 23 Koko N'Diabi Affo-Tenin: "Susu"-Sparen und Fliegende Bankiers. Finanzielle Selbsthilfegruppen von Händlerinnen und Bäuerinnen bei den Bariba in Togo. 1993. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 24 Christina Wildenauer: Von Geistern, Gold, und Geldverleihern. Der informelle Finanzsektor Süindiens und Ansätze zu dessen Einbindung in den formellen Finanzsektor. 1993. (7,50 €).
- Nr. 25 Thama-ini Kinyanjui: "Eating" Project Money. Rural Self-help Projects in Kenya as an Arena of Strategic Groups. 1993. (7,50 €).
- Nr. 26 Dieter Weiss: Entwicklung als Wettbewerb von Kulturen. Betrachtungen zum Nahen und zum Fernen Osten. 1993. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 27 Marko Curavic: Islamische Banken im Spannungsfeld ihrer Stakeholder. Die BEST Bank / Tunesien. 1993. (6,00 €).

- Nr. 28 Elisabeth Grenzebach: Gesicht erwerben und Gesicht verlieren. Die chinesische Alternative zur Tarifautonomie. 1993. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 29 Inse Cornelssen: Vom Bipolarismus zum Multipolarismus: Die EG als Katalysator weltweiter wirtschaftlicher Regionalisierungstendenzen. 1994. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 30 Henk Knaupe und Ulrich G. Wurzel: Die Jewish Agency und die IG Farben. Das Haavara-Abkommen und die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung Palästinas. 1994. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 31 Haje Schütte: Das Konzept des Informellen Sektors aus der wissenschaftstheoretischen Sicht von Thomas Kuhn. 1994. (4,00 €).
- Nr. 32 Christine Böckelmann: Rotating Savings and Credit Associations (ROSCAs). Selbsthilfepotential und Förderungspolitiken. 1994. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 33 Dieter Weiss: Human Rights and Economic Growth. 1995. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 34 Elsaied Nour: Die Rolle des Sozialfonds im Rahmen der Strukturanpassungspolitik in Ägypten. 1995. (6,50 €).
- Nr. 35 Cornelia Lohmar-Kuhnle: Explorative Projektfindung. Feldstudienenerfahrungen bei der Planung ländlicher Handwerksförderung in der Region Elmali/Türkei. 1995. (9,50 €).
- Nr. 36 Ruth Frackmann: Ghanaische Großfamilienhaushalte. Gemeinsamer Nutzen oder getrennte Kassen? Eine Fallstudie. 1995. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 37 Irmgard Nübler: Der Humanentwicklungsindex: Ein adäquates Meßkonstrukt für Humanentwicklung? 1995. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 38 Steffen Wippel: Islam als "Corporate Identity" von Wirtschafts- und Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen. Eine Fallstudie aus Ägypten. 1995. (12,50 €).
- Nr. 39 Adel Zaghah: A Monetary Alternative for the Palestinian Economy: A Palestinian Currency. 1995. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 40 Dieter Weiss: European-Arab Development Cooperation and the Middle East Peace Process. 1995. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 41 Dieter Weiss: Some Conceptual Views on Planning Strategies for Lagos Metropolitan Area. 1995. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 42 Klaus Komatz: Förderung von Demokratie und Menschenrechten durch EU-Entwicklungspolitik? 1995. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 43 Qays Hamad: Palästinensische Industrialisierung unter unvollständiger Souveränität: Das Beispiel der Bekleidungsindustrie. 1995. (12,50 €).
- Nr. 44 Birgit Reichenstein: Managementausbildung im Transformationsprozeß der Volksrepublik China. 1995. (7,50 €).
- Nr. 45 Steffen Wippel: "Islam" und "Islamische Wirtschaft". 1995. (10,00 €).
- Nr. 46 Sulaiman Al-Makhadmeh: Zur Kritik der Vernunft der arabischen Renaissance. 1996. (4,50 €).
- Nr. 47 Dieter Weiss: EU-Arab Development Cooperation - Scenarios and Policy Options. 1996. (10,00 €).
- Nr. 48 Steffen Wippel: Die Außenwirtschaftsbeziehungen der DDR zum Nahen Osten. Einfluß und Abhängigkeit der DDR und das Verhältnis von Außenwirtschaft zu Außenpolitik. 1996. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 49 Susanne Butscher: Informelle Überlebensökonomie in Berlin. Annäherung der deutschen Hauptstadt an Wirtschaftsformen der Dritten Welt. 1996. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 50 Stefan Bantle und Henrik Egbert: Borders Create Opportunities. An Economic Analysis of Cross-Border Small-Scale Trading. 1996. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 51 Wolfhard Peter Hildebrandt: Die islamische Wirtschaftsideologie. Eine Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Falls Pakistan. 1996. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 52 Thomas Ganslmayr: Flutkatastrophen und Wiederaufbau im ländlichen Indien. Fallstudie des Dorfes Thugaon Deo. 1996. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 53 Dieter Weiss: Wissenschaftspolitik und wirtschaftliche Wettbewerbsfähigkeit. Anmerkungen zur Berliner Hochschulpolitik. 1996. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 54 Sybille Bauriedl: Konstruktionen des Orients in Deutschland. 1996. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 55 Rainer Hermann: Defizite im Investitionsklima Syriens. 1997. (6,00 €).
- Nr. 56 Manuel Schiffler: Die Euro-Mediterrane Freihandelszone im Licht neuerer Ansätze der Außenwirtschaftstheorie. 1997. (6,00 €).
- Nr. 57 Dieter Weiss: Entwicklungspolitik als Technisch-Wissenschaftliche Kooperations- und Kulturpolitik. 1998. (7,00 €).
- Nr. 58 Meir Samuelsdorff: Finanzielle Fehlkonstruktionen der staatlichen Förderung von Kooperativen in Israel. Die Krise der Moschwei Owdim. 1998. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 59 Petra Streiber: Internationaler Frauenhandel. Funktionsweisen, soziale und ökonomische Ursachen und Gegenmaßnahmen. 1998. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 60 Sebastian von Eichborn: Der Kosovo-Konflikt aus der Sicht des Konzepts der Gewaltmärkte. Ein Bericht aus dem nordalbanischen Grenzgebiet. 1998. (7,00 €).
- Nr. 61 Dieter Weiss: Islamistische Bewegungen im Nahen Osten und in Nordafrika. Reaktionen der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik. 1998. (4,50 €).

- Nr. 62 Volker Häring: The Closing of the Chinese Mind? Die Debatte um den "Aufbau der geistigen Zivilisation" in China. 1998. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 63 Michael Müller: Entwicklungshemmnisse in der Transformation. Kleine und mittlere Dienstleistungsunternehmen in St. Petersburg. 1999. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 64 Katja Birr: Planung und Management von Entwicklungsprojekten als komplexe Systeme in turbulenten Umwelten: Eine Analyse der Zielorientierten Projektplanung im Rahmen eines entwicklungsorientierten Managements. 1999. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 65 Steffen Wippel: Marokko und der Euro. Folgen der Europäischen Währungsunion für ein assoziiertes Mittelmeer-Drittland. 1999. (12,50 €).
- Nr. 66 Marko Zielonka: Die Entwicklung der Automobilindustrie in Südkorea. Eine Untersuchung unter Anwendung neuerer wettbewerbstheoretischer Konzepte. 1999. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 67 Steffen Wippel: Entwicklung und Probleme der euro-mediterranen Beziehungen aus marokkanischer Sicht. Reaktionen der sozialistischen Opposition zum "Mittelmeerjahr" 1995. 1999. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 68 Udoy M. Ghose: Entwicklungspolitische Defizite der höheren Bildung in Palästina. 1999. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 69 Tom Weber: Ausländische Direktinvestitionen in Malaysia. Die Bedeutung wirtschaftspolitischer Investitionsbedingungen am Beispiel der deutschen verarbeitenden Industrie. 1999. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 70 Verena Dommer: Kooperative Modelle der Berufsausbildung – Theorie und praktische Umsetzung in der Berufsbildungshilfe. Eine Praxisreflexion anhand von drei Projektbeispielen in der Türkei, Tunesien und Nigeria. 1999. (12,50 €).
- Nr. 71 Hsin Chen: Wirtschaftspolitische und unternehmerische Reaktionen in Taiwan auf die Finanzkrise Südostasiens. 1999. (9,50 €).
- Nr. 72 Gero Gelies: Industrialisierungschancen der Europäischen Peripherie. Die Wettbewerbssituation der portugiesischen Automobilzulieferindustrie. 1999. (10,00 €).
- Nr. 73 Anja Englert: Die Große Arabische Freihandelszone. Motive und Erfolgsaussichten der neuen Initiative für eine intra-arabische Integration aus arabischer Sicht. 2000. (9,50 €).
- Nr. 74 Hatim Mahmoud: Überleben im Slum. Die Überlebensstrategien von Nuba-Migranten im Slumviertel Umbada der sudanesischen Stadt Omdurman. 2000. (11,50 €).
- Nr. 75 Markus Liemich: Erfolgsfaktoren von Joint Ventures in Rußland. Die Entwicklung eines Mobilfunkanbieters im Großraum Moskau. 2000. (15,00 €).
- Nr. 76 Uwe Simson: Protestantismus und Entwicklung. Was erklärt die Weber-These? Zum Todestag von Max Weber am 14. Juni 2000. 2000. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 77 Sebastian v. Eichborn: Lokales Wissen als Chance in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (EZ). Soll alles bleiben wie bisher? 2001. (6,00 €).
- Nr. 78 Gerd Günter Klöwer: Financial Co-operatives and Credit Insurance in Mongolia. 2001. (7,00 €).
- Nr. 79 Ulrich Wurzel: "The Missing Dimension". Implikationen systemischer Innovationstheorien für die Euro-mediterrane Wissenschafts- und Technologiekooperation. 2000. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 80 Dieter Weiss: Zur Verstärkung der wissenschaftlichen Kooperation mit Entwicklungsländern. Stützung innovativer Eliten, Nachkontakte, Gemeinsame Forschungsprojekte, Auffangpositionen in Phasen politischer Unruhen, Interkulturelle Dialogforen, Eine Rolle für EU-Partnerschaftshochschulen. 2000. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 81 Stefanie Roemer: Tibetische Flüchtlingsökonomie. Eine Fallstudie der gewerblichen Siedlung Bir. 2001. (12,50 €).
- Nr. 82 Alexander Solyga: Krisenprävention und Friedensdienste in der deutschen Entwicklungspolitik. Offene konzeptionelle Fragen. 2001. (5,50 €).
- Nr. 83 Daniela Stozno-Weymann: Ländliche Entwicklung und europäische Regionalpolitik in Brandenburg. Mit einer Fallstudie zum Oderbruch. 2001. (10,00 €).
- Nr. 84 Arvid Türkner: Finanzierungspraktiken von Klein- und Mittelunternehmen in St. Petersburg. 2001. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 85 Svenja Wipper: Möglichkeiten, Grenzen und Erfolgsdeterminanten volkswirtschaftlicher Regierungsberatung im Reformprozess der VR China. 2001. (13,50 €).
- Nr. 86 Corinna von Hartrott: Auswirkungen des Globalisierungsprozesses auf die Beschäftigten der Freien Produktionszone Mauritius. 2001. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 87 Noha El Mikawy: Contemporary Islamic Thought in Egypt: Should it be taken seriously? 2002. (8,00 €).
- Nr. 88 Pietro Soddu: Inmigración extracomunitaria en Europa: El caso de los enclaves de Ceuta y Melilla. 2002. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 89 Matthias Lichtenberger: Die Islamisierung der Ökonomie im Sudan. Wirtschaftspolitik zwischen Markt, Macht und Moral. 2002. (12,80 €).
- Nr. 90 Jan-Michael Bach: Islam in Indonesia since the mid-1990s. 2003. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 91 Stephan Manning: Public Private Partnership als Aushandlungsprozess: Befunde und Implikationen für die Entwicklungspolitik. 2003. (8,50 €).

- Nr. 92 Sebastian Gräfe: Privatunternehmer und Unternehmerverbände im Prozess wirtschaftlicher Liberalisierung. Klientelstrukturen, Patronage und Aneignung von Renten im ägyptischen Saatgutsektor. 2003. (12,80 €).
- Nr. 93 Bettina Gräf: Islamische Gelehrte als politische Akteure im globalen Kontext. Eine Fatwa von Yusuf 'Abdallah al-Qaradawi. 2003. (9,80 €).
- Nr. 94 Ines Kohl: Wüstentourismus in Libyen. Folgen, Auswirkungen und lokale Wahrnehmungen. Eine anthropologische Fallstudie aus der Oase Ghat. 2003. (12,80 €).
- Nr. 95 Stephan J. Roll: Die Süd-Süd-Integration im Rahmen der Euro-Mediterranen Freihandelszone. Integrationsperspektiven und Integrationsprobleme der arabischen Mittelmeerpartnerländer. 2004. (9,80 €).
- Nr. 96 Sabine Hutfilter/Annika Schäfer: Versorgungsdefizite in Dakar. Der Zugang zu Bildungs- und Gesundheitseinrichtungen sowie öffentlichem Transport unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der peripheren Stadtgebiete. 2005. (13,50 €).
- Nr. 97 Uwe Simson: Von Spengler lernen? Zum 70. Todestag von Oswald Spengler am 7. Mai 2006. 2006. (5,00 €).
- Nr. 98 Stephan J. Roll: Zwischen Finanzsektorliberalisierung und Herrschaftssicherung. Der Aufstieg einer ägyptischen Investmentbank und das politisch-ökonomische Netzwerk im Hintergrund. 2006. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 99 Florian Peil: Aufstand in Mekka. Die Besetzung der Großen Moschee 1979. 2006. (9,00 €).
- Nr. 100 Ulrich G. Wurzel: Limits to Economic Reform in an Authoritarian State. Egypt since the 1990s. 2007. (8,50 €).
- Nr. 101 Thomas Hüskens/Georg Klute: Emerging Forms of Power in Contemporary Africa. A Theoretical and Empirical Research Outline. 2008. (7,80 €).
- Nr. 102 Dennis Kumetat: Das Scheitern deutscher Unternehmen und deutscher Auswärtiger Politik im Nahen Osten. Irak, Ägypten, Saudi-Arabien 1933-39. 2008. (12,80 €).
- Nr. 103 Johara Berriane: Studierende aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Marokko. Motive, Alltag und Zukunftspläne einer Bildungsmigration. 2009. (12,80 €).
- Nr. 104 Tina Zintl: Modernisierungspolitik durch Kompetenztransfer? Syrische Remigranten mit deutschem Hochschulabschluss als Katalysatoren von *Brain Gain* in Syrien unter Bashar al-Assad. 2009. (8,80 €).
- Nr. 105 Thomas Hüskens: Stämme, Staaten und Assoziationen. Die neotribale Wettbewerbsordnung im ägyptisch-libyschen Grenzland. 2009. (9,80 €).
- Nr. 106 Ulrich G. Wurzel: Middle East-Related Economic Research in Germany. Scientific Community, Institutional Framework, Subject Choice and Methodological Selectivity. 2009. (12,80 €).

