

## **Interrogating the Development Discourses: A Sociological Introspection**

**Dr. Rabindra Garada**

*Faculty, Post Graduate Department of Sociology, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha (India)*

---

**Abstract:** *So far the conception of the word “development” has been highly economized in true sense of its approach and application worldwide. But the problems of development do not inclusively fall in the realm of economics alone. Further, the economic rationality is incomplete without referring to social ethics. Acknowledging this somehow the sociologists and development economists have delimited the economic conceptualization of the term “development” for a sensible comprehension of its retrospective results and future prospects. In this article we have reassessed and recaptured the quintessence of development discourse engaging classical economists, institutional theorists and diffusion theorists on the one hand and the sociologists and dependency theorists, on the other. Our critical overview reveals that while the economists explore the cause and consequences for the development and underdevelopment of a country in term of economic variables the sociologists conceive it in term of a state or state of conditions structured or induced by the economic and non-economic factors for the same. Nevertheless, their views and counterviews on development and underdevelopment largely complement to one another. However, the former gives a coherent theory of development to which the latter explains with a framework of critical thinking. Our study also reflect that the structural-functional assumption of society held by the sociologist and modernists and criticized by dependency theorists could not be the effective substitute against classical and neo-classical theory of economic development in the world. However, our study substantiate that underdevelopment refers to a state of backwardness or conditions of arrested development whereas development refers to a state of advancement or conditions of continuous development. Further, the conception of development has been realized much more than just a socio-economic endeavour. Interrogating the development discourses certainly proposes a new turn in the article.*

**Keywords:** *Development Discourse, Underdevelopment, Development, Economic Rationality, Social Ethics,*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Nothing can be imaginable in the World without referring to its development. Up to now the World actually reflects at its development more than anything else it has offered to humanity. Going through all the historical revolutions- be it industrial revolution, technological revolution and political revolution the human experienced the same. In fact, these revolutions envisage the materialistic path of development in bringing mankind’s social transformations and economic prosperity in every nook and corner of the world. Thus, the development is crucial to the world. But when and how it came into being remains still a controversial question. However, it is assumed that the age of development began on 20th January, 1949 in northern hemisphere when US President Harry.S. Truman for the first time declared in his inauguration speech that the southern hemisphere as underdeveloped areas. The very day when the President, took office; a new era was opened for the world which is known as” the era of development” mostly from 1950s to 1990s. Since then the term ‘development’ has been the fundamental frame of reference for the development of all nations in their journey through post war history (Sachs, 1997; Webster, 1984). Following the breakdown of the European colonial powers, the United States had launched the idea of development to the nation-states to follow their footsteps of development. In course of time especially since later parts of 1970s its parochial tendency of Americanization, Europeanization and westernization has been exposed to the world by the new independent sovereign nations and their citizens, leaders, indigenous people, scholars, social actors and others. Consequently, the light house of development has been erected with its imaginable cracks and crumbling structure in different parts of the world. The idea of development stands like a ruins in the intellectual landscape (Sachs, 1997: 1). Nevertheless, the ruin stands there and still dominates the scenery like a landmark as it permeates in any official declaration and even in the very discourses of grass root movements. Unfortunately, it was so happened that its adverse impact on people, society and natural environment was deliberately ignored by the concerned authorities worldwide. The arrow of progress in the name of development has been broken, and what it holds in store is found to be more threats than promises. However, it is highly held and remains highly value loaded term too. Sometime it is labelled as too narrow a definition or too broad a definition. Further, it has been realized that development is significantly much more than just a socio-economic endeavour. Considering the conception of the term

“development” in a idea of economic growth it has been extremely economized and commercialized far from the idea of humanism, in true sense of its approach and application in developed and underdeveloped countries (Wedster,1984). In course of time, it has been paid off into the dictums of political economy of the nation-state globally. In addition, it helps having a worldwide political economy where every body's due is not thought about and rather unfairly gets diverted and altered in favour of the globally wealthy people in the advanced countries (Garada, 1995; Baran, 1973). Further, at the present scenario, such dynamics further get aggravated by the forces of liberalization, privatization and globalization (LPG) in both developed and developing countries (Arce and Long,2000; Booth,1994). Somehow and other the sociologists and development economists have sensed it to delimit the word “development” at least for better comprehension of its retrospective effects and future prospects (see,Chambers,2005;Sachs,1997;Booth,1994;Crewe,1995;Escobar;1995;Webster, 1984).Achievement depends upon setting up a lot of things right. But, making what exactly set right to attain the overall targets of progress is an unavoidable problem for the underdeveloped and developing countries. It is pertinent to discuss about the various approaches to the options of development, although it has been resulted as pro-economic in the annals of economic growth throughout the world. In this context the article modestly attempt to reveal the truth of development and underdevelopment interrogating the development discourses through sociological lens.

### **I.I. Interrogating Classical Economics Discourse on Development**

#### **I.I.I. Whether Classical Economics is Ethical**

An open question whether classical economy is not revealing social ethics generates hard feeling among the economists worldwide. However, same may be comprehended in different tunes. The quintessence of classical economics traditions extremely pronounced of economic rationality and of largely without social ethics remains true to its profounder the so called classical economists who heralded the rational logic of land, labour and capital in the western countries during 19th century and that followed by the nation-states in subsequent history worldwide. But the conventional tendency of prioritising the economic rationality over social ethics sparks debate among intellectuals around the world all the times. It is really so inevitable that the classical western economic paradigm both in its ideology and practice epitomises an epistemology of classical liberalism and materialistic utilitarianism without a mistake. It pleads more freedom and less government control for any sort of economic development. In fact, over the time, the economists have been forgetting the ethics- the ontology of development strengthening the logic of classical epistemology and utilitarian methodology. This model justifies the logic of economic development through saving, investment and profits by evolving means of extracting the natural resources, processing the raw materials, transforming the technological and industrial establishments and transferring the human resources on commercial basis (Ricardo, 2005;Preston, 1996, Bandyopadhyay and Shiva, 1988;). The free market mechanism and rational capital can better develop a country from its economic backwardness and underdevelopment than restricted market and irrational use of capital. Smith explores that the free market forces and self interest can play the significant role of ‘invisible hand’ in social progress (Smith, 1776:69). He argues as how everybody's selfish interests help causing advantage to all of us in the society. Thus, no doubt the free trade, free markets, and laissez-faire policy can help increasing and developing the wealth of nations. Subsequently, the free consumers and free sellers considering their self interests in free market situation invisibly contribute in the process of building public goods and public progress in the society. Without generating profits the capitalists cannot think of such public welfare and it is due to the profits the capitalists can generate the ethics of sympathy for the poor. Smith's increased emphasis of economic rationality of self interest in his book, "The Wealth of Nations" and social ethics of sympathy in his book, "The Theory of Moral Sentiments" structures a synthesis of this dualism(ibid). However, the economists of present world hardly reconcile the apparent contradiction crept in this dualism. However, the capitalists' roles in contributing to the process of public welfare and people's liberty cannot be undermined. Thus, Smith stressed on the supply and proper utilization of capital in the process of production and to boost production one must therefore increase the use of capital goods in the society (Smith, 1976; Ricardo; 1973 and 1929, Hoselitz, 1960). In this context, Ricardo argues that of the producers- entrepreneurs, capitalists, landlords and labourers, it is the capitalists who can save and without their saving there will be no economic development at all. Unfortunately, this logic is still persisting at global level. However, based on Adam Smith's dualistic logic on land, labour and capital we should not exploit the natural resources at our maximum capacity. And also we must understand and respect that the law of nature which is superior to and more beneficial than the laws of the state. Thus, he argues that individuals not only know what the natural law is but additionally know how the nature wants us to behave in the world (Hoselitz, 1960). However, Smith's dualistic economic is seemed to be sacrificed in favour of capitalistic profits later on as Ricardo tresses that the capitalistic profits are the real driving force for any economy to develop in the World (Letiche, 1960). Ricardo also thought that for making profit the roles of savings and investment are far more crucial than that of the wage and rent in western world (Neri Salvadori, 2003:7; Letiche, 1960).

## **II. Interrogating Development Economics Discourses**

### **II. Whether Growth Model is rectified**

In the course of time reacting to the views of classical economic traditions four major approaches to economic development came into being in the western world such as the linear stages of growth model in 1950s and 1960s, the theories and patterns of structural change in 1970s, the international dependence revolution in 1970s and the neo-classical and free market counterrevolution in 1980s and 1990s respectively.

#### **II.I. Rostow's Linear Stages of Growth Model**

The growth theory advocated by Rostow and Harrod-Domar explains the saving and investment as the necessary conditions for economic development of a country. They viewed that the process of development can be accomplished in a series of successive stages of economic growth. According to Rostow, the transition from underdevelopment to development can be materialised in series of steps or stages such as the traditional societies, the precondition for takeoff into self sustaining growth, the take off, the drive to maturity and the age of high mass consumption that all countries must pass through (Todaro and Smith, 2004; Preston, 1996; Rostow, 1960). According to him, while the advanced countries crossed the stage of take off into self sustaining growth towards maturity and age of high mass consumption by 1960s, the underdeveloped countries were still left either in the primitive stage of traditional societies or in the pre-condition stage of take off. He further emphasized that the underdeveloped countries had to follow certain rules of development to take off for self-sustaining growth (ibid). According to Rostow's theory the resource demands of the modern sectors are to be met from the traditional sectors (ibid; Bandyopadhyaya and Shiva, 1988). The resources of the traditional sectors may bear the cost of prosperity of modern sectors but not necessarily generate anything substantial for the development of their own sectors and the people who depend on it. As a result, some of the leading outcomes are economic polarization, economic impoverishment, economic deprivation, indigenous people's vulnerability to such unexpected effects, etc. According to the Harrod -Domar's growth model more investment leads to more growth (Todaro and Smith, 2004, Prestons, 1996). It is true but not sufficient conditions for economic development as there are other non-economic variables such as managerial competence, skill labour, the ability to plan and administer the development project, etc equally responsible for it. They also failed greatly to take into account the best and most intelligent development strategies that can be nullified by external forces beyond the country's control because the contemporary developing nations are parts of highly integrated and complex international system (ibid). The quantitative logic of economic growth through this approach thus, undermines the qualitative dynamics of development. How growth and progress go together was largely undermined in this approach. This approach though discusses the viability of structures, processes and their concomitant effects but cannot resolve the problems of ethics the classical economists confronted. The thinking of change, progress, and development in term of growth is grossly mistaken in this approach.

#### **II.II. Lewis's Structural Change Model**

Nobel laureate W. Arthur Lewis's structural change model proposes the theory of two sectors model which focuses the mechanism by which underdeveloped economies transform their domestic economic structures and traditional subsistence agriculture to the modern, urbanized, industrialized and diverse manufacturing and service sectors (ibid;). According to him, surplus labour withdrawn from the rural area can be utilized in modern urban industrial sectors for economic development. It aims at labour transfer, the growth of output and employment in the modern sector (ibid). But Lewis's two sectors model may not be necessarily fit into the institutional and economic realities of most contemporary developing countries (Lewis, 1955). This approach fails to address the problems related the existence of capital flights, urban unemployment, labour saving technology in the urban area and labour intensive agriculture and non-existence of surplus labour in rural area and such other issues related to labour acts, trade unions, etc. Without understanding the dynamics of social life in rural sectors the modern industrial sectors bring a lot of contradiction worldwide. It is also true that as the urban world cannot accommodate the rural people, the surplus rural people also cannot be guaranteed that they cannot disturb the urban area. Thus, the ethical question is clear.

#### **II.III. International Dependency Revolution**

Reacting to above theories the international dependency revolution developed during 1970s promoted the neo-colonial dependency model, the false paradigm model and the dualistic development thesis as three major streams of alternative thoughts. The Neo-colonial dependency model generates an idea that dependence is a situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. It attributes the existence and continuance of underdevelopment primarily to the historical evolution of a highly unequal international capitalistic system of rich country and poor country relation. This theory recaptures the thesis that the developed countries not only justify their places at the centre against the underdeveloped countries at the peripheries but also explains how the rich people including landlord,

entrepreneurs, military rulers, professional elites and others belonging to former countries exploit the people in latter countries perpetuating the international capitalistic system of inequality and exploitation (ibid). In contrast to the models of stage and structural change theories which envisage on internal constraints such as insufficient saving and investment or lack of education and skills, the neo-colonial dependency model stresses on the point that underdevelopment is an externally induced phenomenon. The false paradigm model attributes underdevelopment to the cause and consequences of faulty and inappropriate advices -often uninformed, biased, and ethnocentric in nature are generally provided by the international agencies, institutions, experts and others ( see, Todar and Smith, 2004; Sachs, 1997; Webster, 1984). According to the dualistic development thesis with some different set of conditions of which some countries are superior to others can co-exist in a given space. In spite of change of time and development it represents the existence and persistence of increasing divergence between rich and poor nations and rich and poor people at various levels. These theories are also not exception to their weaknesses such as they are neither able to offer any satisfactory explanation as to how to initiate and sustain development nor explain as how to resolve the negative reaction emerging against such development in the third world countries (ibid).

#### **II.IV. Neo-classical Counter Revolution**

Challenging to the interventionist arguments of dependence theorists and static model of development, the neo-classical counter revolution in 1980s in the United States, Canada, Britain and Germany started controlling the world economy through two most powerful international financial agencies namely the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Consequently the free market approach, the public choice (or political economy) approach and the market friendly approach were structured to address economic development. According to leading writers of counter revolution school, including Jagdish Bhagwati, Anne Krueger, Lord Peter Vaker, Deepak Lal, Ian Little, Harry Johnson and Bela Balassa, the state interference not only makes the economic growth slow but also makes economic markets less efficient. Thus, to them any intervention by government in market economy is counter-productive (ibid:). In this respect the public choice theory of new economy approach also cautions that minimal government is the best government. It rather argues that governments can do nothing right because its machineries, bureaucrats, citizens and politicians act solely from their self-interest perspectives (ibid). The market-friendly approach, however, stresses that governments do have a key role to play in facilitating the operation of market. This approach also assumes that the state should provide a suitable climate for private enterprise along with suitable institutional support (ibid). The neo-classical counter revolution of the 1980s promotes the economic-cum-ideological views of developed countries.

It is perceived that all developmental economists have been criticizing each other but hardly provide any amicable suggestions. These theories do not take into account the geographical, cultural, economical, political, national and cultural specificities of less developed countries. The economic approach is more often found to be in one way directed of top-bottom process from developed countries to underdeveloped countries. It is mostly assumed in the economic interest of the developed societies- a theory by the developed countries, of the developed countries and for the developed countries.

### **III. Sociological Discourse on Economic Development**

While the economists explain the process of economic development the sociologists analyse the process of social development in relation to the other structure of a society as whole. While former assumes that slow or lack of growth of capitalism as root cause of underdevelopment the latter assumes it to be the structural berries prevailing in the underdeveloped and colonised countries. When Sociology came into being a subject of objective science and social reconstruction it explains the term “development”- the progressive transformation of certain aspects of a given society. Its multifaceted ontology, epistemology and methodology about social realities explain an interdisciplinary approach to the discourse of developments.

#### **III.I. Whether Marxian Optimism is Far from the Reality**

Unlike classical economists Marx explored the significant role of social forces behind the development of capitalism in the western world. Unlike Ricardo, he thought that the emergence of capitalistic economy is not natural, but an outcome of political economy in the west. Marx’s substantive and logical criticism to classical economic traditions remains the most revolutionary alternative in the discourse of development worldwide. His substantive criticism exposes the shortcomings of classical economy as ahistorical, static and pro-capitalist whereas his logical criticism explains the inherent contradiction of capitalistic economy developed in the western world. Marx exposed the true picture of political economy through his analysis of modes of production thesis from ancient society to capitalist society in the west (Marx, 1973 and 1970). Marx analyses the inner contradiction of capitalism- overproduction, under consumptions, economic imperialism, monopoly and finance capitalism, etc, in the west. Unlike classical economists Smith and Ricardo, he recognised the roles of the workers in economic production and how important their struggle against capitalism is. Unlike economists he

brought an interdisciplinary approach to the subject of economy (Preston, 2001:83; Marx, 1967). However, Marx's theory of economic determinism ignores other aspects of development as his emphasis on material well-being for the development of socialism and communism reveals such facts (Marx, 1973 and 1970). It is therefore, neo-Marxist Althusser was not agreed with Marxian understandings of historical materialism as progressive history and of class struggle as humanistic tendency against modern capitalism. He reminded Marx that ideological state apparatus like democracy and media, and the repressive apparatus like law and police are there as ruling class ideologies against any possibilities of class revolutions. Thus, socialism and communism expected to come through class struggle against capitalism are the dreams far from the reality. As a result, such possibility was denied and defeated against capitalism even in the Soviet Union and China which are known as shelter houses of Marxism (Preston, 2001; Sen, 1994). However, eliminating the philosophy of Marxism from the world is impossible and rather it continues to remain the most important thesis since the modern history to the present as Raymond Aron rightly views it is as if the opiate of the intellectuals worldwide (Sen, 1994:2.5).

### **III.II. Whether Weberian Pessimism is Any Way Out**

Whether it is religious rationality or bureaucratic rationality Weber was never optimistic about the future. It is because there was no Weberian socialism or communism ever structured to come. Contrary to Marxian economic deterministic theory of development Weber thought the religious ethic and rationality as well the crucial pre-requisites for development although he did not out rightly reject the former's epistemology of capitalism. He has explained several factors as the pre-conditions for the development of capitalism in the west. He argues that capitalism could not develop in the non-western world because the prevailing religious ethics and traditional social structures there could not found to be conducive for the same. For instance, unlike protestant denomination, the Confucianism in China, Casteism in India and religious conservatism in Israel stand like walls against the growth of capitalism. Thus, unlike Marx's economic determinism Weber argued that the religion is also the main determinant of economic development in the world. Like others as stated earlier Weber is also not free from criticism. For instance, he emphasizes only those aspects of religion (such as Protestantism) which are conducive and ignores other (such as renunciation in Hinduism) as the obstruction for development. He has emphasized protestant denomination of Christian religion as vital one against a wide range of other socio-cultural factors necessary in the process of development. Unlike classical economists and Marx, Weber was highly pessimistic of the future society as he claimed to predict that neither capitalism would be substituted by the alternative socialism nor it would be progressive in the future (Preston, 2001:109). He believed that there would be more bureaucratic rationalization and efficiency but not with similar responsibility and accountability to the people and society in the world to come.

### **III.III. Whether Sociology Promotes Alternative Development Discourses**

The development discourse promoted by sociologists is nothing but a discourse of modernisation because Sociology was by product of the forces generated in major revolutions- commercial, intellectual, industrial and French from 17th to 19th century which brought sweeping social changes in the western world. The positive intellectual transformation of Comte from theological to positivistic stage the social change, social evolutionism and social Darwinism of Spencer from simple to complex society, Durkheim's analysis of change from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity, Marx's progressive history from primitive communism to capitalistic society, Weber's rationality from traditional action to rational and legal action, Brown, Parsons and Levi-Strauss's harmonic social relationship from structural functionalism to structuralism and Habermas's communicative rationality', etc, exemplify the sociological discourses on development. In 1960s and 1970s the sociologists increasingly viewed the development as the modernisation project of western society which was also increasingly applied in the underdeveloped countries for their economic development in term of five year plans, community development programmes, physical and social infrastructure development, etc. In 1970s and 1980s the entire hopes of developing the third world societies on the basis of modernisation theory were dashed into ashes. And rather the developed countries became the centres of development exploiting and perpetuating the underdeveloped countries in the processes of modernisation as stated earlier. The structural-functional assumption of society held by the modernists and criticised by dependency theorists could not be the effective substitute against classical and neo-classical theory of economic development in the world. Thus, the overviews on the literatures related to sociological discourses hardly promote a distinct and alternative approach to development (see, Arce, 2003; Swedberg, 2002; Long, 2001; Eisenstadt, 1995; Harrison, 1988; Hall and Midgley, 1988).

#### **IV. Institutional Approach to Development**

##### **IV.I. Whether Institutional Perspective Really is transformed**

The institutional approach reveals that the problems of development do not inclusively fall in the realm of economics alone. Rather, the introduction of new methods of production, new sources of raw materials, new markets for demand and supply of goods and services, new organization of manufacturing the industrial products, etc can better contribute to the process of economic development. But these new institutional mechanisms are found to be replacing the old institutional mechanism in the third world countries. This approach as if pleads for the captive mind in imitating the western institutionalized patterns for the economic development of the backward countries. For economic development the institutions like caste system, religion, joint family and other cultural institutions in the country like India are to be replaced following the western institutionalized patterns (Myrdal, 1967). And even poverty, income disparity, social inequalities, hunger, malnutrition, etc, in underdeveloped countries are assumed to be the detrimental to economic development. Like Weber Schumpeter (1961) finds out the institutional obstacles to the process of development unlike Marx's economic determinism. Weber and Schumpeter argue that for the economic growth of any country the capitalism can be inclusively materialised through economic and non-economic institutional factors. In his book, 'The Theory of Economic Development', Schumpeter assigns the entrepreneur as the sole agent of social change whereas in his book, Protestant ethics and Spirit of Capitalism Weber found religious ethics as the sole institution of social change for economic development (Swedberg, 2002:231-32). Thus, they argue that the economic development is not a phenomenon to be explained by the groups of facts which are propounded by the economic theory alone.

#### **V. Diffusion Approach to Development**

##### **V.I. Whether Diffusion Perspective is Rational**

The diffusionists argue that the cultural diffusion from west can better help developing the backward and underdeveloped countries. The development takes place in the backward countries when the cultural elements from the developed countries will be defused through socio-cultural and political contacts among the people of different countries. The diffusioninists argue that since the third world countries lack modern values, modern technology, modern skills, knowledge, capital, etc they have to depend open the developed countries for their development (Moore,1967; Me Clelland,1961). This approach also pleads that the transfer of technology and skills from the urban sectors to rural sectors is desirable for economic development. In this context, Wilbert Moore (1967) holds the view that the development as if the transformation from one type of social organization to another. Unfortunately, it leads to a process of one way direction of top-down model justifying the transfer of modern avenues from developed countries to underdeveloped countries or from urban area to rural area but not vice versa. It is found to be deliberate and ethnocentric in nature for which the third world countries set to receive the modern avenues from first world countries are looked down upon.

#### **VI. Underdevelopment Discourse vis-a-vis Development**

In the modern history the underdevelopment are broadly assumed to be the result of merchant capitalism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in the third world countries. Under process of merchant capitalism the foreign capitalists accumulated huge capital through trade and plunder from early sixteenth century to late eighteenth century in the third world countries. Consequently, this helped the merchant capitalists to monopolize the markets and trade in the colonized countries and to maximize the domestic resources of the colonies with non-trade barriers. Since, the crops and minerals of third world countries used as sourced elements of cheap raw materials and subsequent sell of manufactured goods from Europe in the colonies the monopolistic foreign companies in the underdeveloped societies flourished for centuries. Further, the introduction of new legal system over local systems, new communication system like ports, railways telegraph, etc, new police administration and recreation centres also facilitated for the establishment of western capitalism and British political economy in the colonised countries (Preston, 2001). In later development during post World War II, neo-colonialism and imperialism were also set to continue the economic exploitation in the third world countries. Neo-colonialism just without direct political control became another form of economic domination by developed countries over the time. Since mid-1970s the world virtually became free of colonialism when the European power became weak in the emergence of United States of America as a super power and of nationalist movements all over the colonised countries. Unfortunately, later on the multi-national corporations (MNCs) increasingly found to be the centres of neo-colonialism have been strengthening their economic grips over raw materials and cheap labour markets in the third world. And they are also consequently, sustaining the exploitation and poverty in the third world/underdeveloped countries. Next to neo-colonialism the neo-liberalism was developed as a late twentieth century political economy worldwide. Based on neo-classical economic theories and market fundamentalism, it facilitated the private sectors' roles in determining the economic priorities of the state. As a result, the economic control from public to private sector gets shifted in

favour of later. As a result, thanks to the programme of neo-liberalism that the world has been experiencing the vices of political and bureaucratic corruption, unregulated markets, labour exploitation, and environmental degradation and so on. Thus, the merchant capitalism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and neo-liberalism are not merely the philosophies but the practices of inducing the massive exploitation in the third world countries leading to their underdevelopment over the years (Todaro and Smith, 2004; Webster, 1984). It is therefore, the dependency theorists argue that third world countries could not develop even following and applying the path of development- the sciences, modern values, modern educations, technology, strategies, etc available in the industrial/developed countries (see, Todaro and Smith, 2011; Todaro and Smith, 2004; Frank, 1998 and 1971; Fernando H. Cardoso and E. Faletto, 1978; Baran, 1973; Amin, 1976).

#### **VI.I. Whether Dependency Theorists are successful**

In order to change the state of backwardness in underdeveloped country the development discourses developed by Myrdal, Hirschman and Hoselitz in the global level provide most substantive and logical perspectives. They are economists and simultaneously sociologists in their approaches. They develop their theories on economic ground but explain their analysis with sociological imaginations. The developing/underdeveloped countries remain underdeveloped, because the foreigners' direct investment and trade in their economic establishments made them financially and technically dependents (Webster, 1984). The conditions or state of economic or social conditions of the nation-states and their comparison explain what is development and underdevelopment in human society. Thus, the causes and consequences of underdevelopment economy can be analysed on its internal and external socio-economic attributes that explain it over the time. Its complex possibilities visualised through many dimensions and factors can be analysed in different structural levels. In term of economic levels, it includes many factors such as low productivity, low supply of labour, low per capita income, chronic poverty, backward agriculture, backward animal husbandry, chronic unemployment and disguised employments, poor quality of the working population, slow or limited foreign trade and economic relation, insufficient capital formation, weak industrial and service sectors, etc. In term of social level it includes the discrimination of all stereotypes- gender, race, caste, region, etc, the instances of high infant mortality, morbidity, malnutrition, under nutrition, etc, and the instances of inadequate social infrastructure- transports, communication, health, education, drinking water, etc, (Sen, 1994:5.44-52 and Szentes, 1976). The lack of freedom- political and social and lack of sense of self- self respect and dignity in cases of political and psychological levels respectively including the above structural bottlenecks in socio-economic levels are largely held responsible for the underdevelopment of any country. Thus, the underdevelopment can be analyzed on the basis of economic backwardness but it is one of the major factors including social, political and psychological backwardness.

#### **VI.II. Dilemma of Backwash Effects versus Spread Effects**

Myrdal's land mark theories of backwash effect, cumulative causation and the institutional reforms criticise as well as suggest well grounded development discourse. He argues that the mono-causal economic explanation of development stimulated by laissez faire policy and international trade would certainly lead to the development of the developed countries keeping the third world countries poor. The theory of backwash effect of international trade and cumulative causation theory of economic development explain the causes and consequences of vicious circles of underdeveloped societies. According to Myrdal two types of forces known as "backwash effects" and the "spread effects" are assumed to be advantageous and disadvantageous to the development of a region. However, while the former helps in concentrating economic activities in some region the latter helps in spreading them to the other regions. These two types of causations factors are mutually interrelated in which if there is a change in one, there is change in another (ibid: 196). He insisted that the underdeveloped countries have to move upward for further development by reforming their socio-economic and political institutions. He also warns that any such change may lead to divergence not necessarily to the course of equilibrium. In fact, he warns that the circular cumulative causation leads to a negative result (though change in one level would lead to change in another level in circular way). Thus, the dilemma of backwash effects" versus "spread effects could not be resolved.

#### **VI.III. Whether Trickle-down Effects is really effective**

Like Myrdal Hirschman's theory of "trickle-down effects" explains the logic of development and underdevelopment in similar force. These effects are expected to help decreasing the inequality as development in the modern core will be filtered through to the backward regions generating growth therein (Hirschman, 1958). The Trickling down-effect of development caused in one sector or region to the underdevelopment in another sector or region will gain upper hand over the "polarization effect". In fact, the Trickle-down Effects is not really effective as the resources are drained upward from the down.

#### **VI.IV. Whether Dualism in Core-Periphery Model Dwells Forever**

The Core-Periphery Model was another important theory Friedman developed taking the ideas from the theories of Myrdal and Hirschman. The core - the cities and urban regions as main engines of development from which investment will be diffused to the periphery- the rural villages for economic development (Potter, Binns, Elliott and Smith, 2008). Using the analogy of the satellite and metropolis centres, A.G.Frank also argued that the surplus of the satellite is passed upward and at the cost of it, there is development in the metropolitan centres (Frank, 1975:96; and 1967:3, 9). The centralizing tendency of capitalism, expropriation tendency of economic surplus from underdeveloped countries and continuous capitalistic venture in the global economy have been resulting such economic dualism (Preston, 2001:218-19). Frank (1975:96) finds out that development and underdevelopment are related to each other through the common historical process. Hence, they are not separate phenomena, but are two sides of the same phenomena. Thus, he argues that development of the advanced industrial countries means the simultaneous underdevelopment of third world countries whose economic surplus the former countries exploit. In this context the world system theory developed by Wallenstein explains how peripheral societies are poor not because they lack technology, modern education, skilled work force, etc, but because the core societies exploit them taking human labour, raw materials and mineral resources from the latter societies (Preston, 2001:219-20, Wallerstein, 1976).

#### **VI.V. Parsons' Pattern Variables as Development Model (to What Extent)**

The pattern variables developed by Talcott Parsons in his theory of structural functionalism are viewed as development model in the western country. But it is merely an analytical realism but not realism in itself. It was Hoselitz (1960) who used it for explaining the development and underdevelopment in analytical level. The developed countries are developed because they apply Parsons's favourable pattern variables- the universalism, self-orientations, achievement orientation and functional specificity effectively as value of development whereas the underdeveloped countries are underdeveloped because they usually apply Parsons's unfavourable pattern variables- the particularism, ascription, collective orientation and functional diffuseness in their ways of living. It is also argued that the former countries are developed because they promote strong social welfare laws against the rural social stereotypes and feudal elitism comparison to the latter countries. The latter countries cannot help perpetuating the dominancy of their traditional elite rule in the society. And it is the elites who enjoy the monopoly of wealth, political power, education development, etc not the masses in the third world countries. Unlike in developed countries these conceptual schemes cannot be applied in the third world countries in similar spirit because the pattern variables are culturally determined everywhere differently.

### **VII. Substantive Reflection**

Thus, reflecting open the critical overviews we can substantiate the discourses that the underdevelopment refers to a state of backwardness and conditions of arrested development whereas development refers to a state of advancement and conditions of continuous development. The conditions or state of conditions of nation-states and their comparison explain what is development and underdevelopment in human society. Thus, the terms underdevelopment and development can be comprehended broadly in three levels, i.e, objective condition or state of conditions, subjective condition or state of conditions and comparative objective/subjective conditions simultaneously. In case of 1<sup>st</sup> level an economy, a nation-state, a society and even the individuals whose socio-economic status compared objectively against their counterparts for instance, in case of living standard one may lag behind others objectively with some statistical measures, in 2<sup>nd</sup> level the state of condition say for example in the aforesaid case of living standard one who is made to lag behind others subjectively and not by his objective condition and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> level the condition of the case not only compared but also inclusively comprehended giving rise to a complex of their multidimensional conceptualisation. Therefore, it is assumed that the economists try to conceive the development economy and underdevelopment economy or underdeveloped country and underdeveloped country with objective statistics in the first level analysis whereas the non-economists explain these concepts more in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> level analysis. The sociologists try to explain the developed societies and underdeveloped societies as modernity induced phenomenon taking into account of all level of analysis. An economist may define the country as an underdeveloped country which lags behind other developed countries in terms of some variables such as urbanization, industrialization, modern technology, modern education, modern healthcare, better standard of living, better life expectancy, so on and so forth. But the sociologists try to explain the relationship and inequalities as how exist between the developed countries and underdeveloped countries comparing these variables. They argue that the underdeveloped countries or societies are underdeveloped because they have unfavourable variables as stated earlier than their counterparts- developed countries. What is independent and dependent variables for the economists say for instance, if the former is modern values and latter will be the development compared to that what is cause and effect of similar relationship for the sociologists in a holistic

context. Nevertheless the dependency theorists give critical analysis of the conception of what development or under development are taking Marxian dialectical materialism.

### VIII. Conclusion

We can conclude that the thinking of change, progress, and development in term of economic growth is grossly mistaken in classical economics traditions. The development economists though speak about the viability of economic structures, processes and their concomitant effects but neither resolved the crisis of ethics the classical economists confronted nor followed the morality the latter suggested. Further, the epistemological issues of classical liberalism and materialistic utilitarianism inherently crept deep in the structure of classical, growth and structural change models could not be overcome by the later neo-classical and free market models. According to institutional and diffusion theorists the problems of development do not inclusively fall in the realm of economics alone. Thus, the conception of development can be realized much more than just a socio-economic endeavour. In this regards, the dependency theorists believe that the problems of underdevelopment were rooted in the historical processes of merchant capitalism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in the third world countries. But it is found that more regularly there has been "backwash effects" and "trickling up-effect" of development and core's development is realized at the expense of periphery in the underdeveloped countries. Thus, it is hardly realized- the prospects of the Euro-centric models in the backward countries. Reacting to this economic development discourses the sociologists tried to build an alternative perspectives to development but failed. It is because the Marxian optimism- the socialism and communism expected in the future against capitalism remains dreams not even close to the reality. Weberian pessimism was also not rectified as be it religious rationality or bureaucratic rationality Weber was never optimistic in regards to the future. It is because no Weberian socialism or communism will fall from the heaven to resolve the crisis like the protestant ethic what could it do. Parsons's pattern variables taken as development model in the western country nonetheless remain an analytical realism, however, not realism in itself. Thus, the sociology of underdevelopment disregards the economic determinants of world economic system over third world countries. It perceives that the underdeveloped countries remain underdeveloped because the foreigners' direct investment and trade within their economic establishments make them financially and technically dependents. It examines how the underdevelopment as a complex socio-economic process resulted out of international economy. However, the sociologists still relate underdevelopment vis-a-vis development to the environmental responsiveness, social customs, institutions and prevailing conditions of the society. They also reveal that unlike advanced societies and countries the underdeveloped societies and countries are more or less homogenous, stagnant and traditional in their orientation, and persistently lack entrepreneurial skills, individualism, rational propensities, motivations and initiatives and so on. It is further, argued that the growth of economic development in term of Euro-centric discourses get distorted in the third world societies and countries because of the earlier existed colonialism and current underdevelopment therein.

### Reference

- [1] W. Sachs, *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, (New Delhi: Orient Longman Limited,1997)
- [2] A. Webster, *Introduction to Sociology of Social Development*, (London: McMillan, 1984)
- [3] R. Garada, *Development and Underdevelopment in Orissa: A Sociological Study*, M.Phil Thesis, (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University, 1995 (Unpublished))
- [4] A. Arce and N. Long, *Anthropology, Development and Modernities: Exploring Discourses, Counter-Tendencies and Violence*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2000)
- [5] D. Booth, *Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research & Practice*, (Harlow: Longman House, 1994), Longman.
- [6] S. Corbridge, *Development Studies: A Reader*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1995)
- [7] Crewe, E. "Silent Traditions of Development Cooks", R.D. Grillo and R.L. Stirrat, eds. *Discourses of Development: Anthropological Perspectives*, Berg, 1997, Chap-3
- [8] A. Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).
- [9] P.W. Preston, *Development, Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford Blackwell Delhi: Regency Publications, 1996)
- [10] J. Bandyopadhyay and V. Shiva (1988), 'Political Economy of Ecology Movement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1988, 23(24): 1223-32.
- [11] D. Ricardo, *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*, ed. Piero Sraffa with the Collaboration of M.H. Dobb (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005). Vol. 4 Pamphlets and Papers 1815-1823. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/205>
- [12] D. Ricardo, *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. 1929)
- [13] J.M. Letiche, 'Adam Smith and Ricardo on Economic Growth', in Hoselitz, B.F. (ed.) *Theories of Economic Growth*, (New York: Free Press, 1960)
- [14] A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975) (Orig. pub. 1776)
- [15] B. F. Hoselitz, *Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth*, (New York: Free Press, 1960)
- [16] M.P. Todaro and S. C. Smith, *Economic Development, Indian Branch*, 482 F.I.E, (Patparganj, India, Delhi: Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd., 2004)
- [17] M.P. Todaro and S. C. Smith, *Economic Development*, (Delhi: Pearson Education Limited, 2011)
- [18] W.W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960)
- [19] S. Neri, *Old and New Growth Theories: An Assessment*, (UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, UK, 2003)

- [20] Lewis, W.A, the Theory of Economic Growth, (London: Allen & Unwin, 1955))
- [21] N.Long, (2001), Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives, (London and New York : Routledge,2001)
- [22] R.Swedberg, Economics and Sociology, (Princeton: Princeton University Press,1990)
- [23] A.Hall, and J. Midgley, Development Policies: Sociological Perspectives, (Manchester Univ. Press,1988)
- [24] D.Harrison, The Sociology of Modernization & Development, (London :Routledge,1988)
- [25] K.Marx, Society and Social Change, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973)
- [26] K.Marx, K. Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. Vol. 1. (S.Moore & E. Aveling, trans).New York: International Publishers, 1973)
- [27] K.Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, (Moscow: Progress Publishers,1970)
- [28] K.Marx, Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production, Vol.1, (New York: International Publisher, 1970,)
- [29] K.Marx, Capital: A Critical of Political Economy, Vol.1, (New York: International Publisher.1967)
- [30] A. Arce, "Re-approaching Social Development: A Field of Action between Social Life and Policy Processes", Journal of International Development, 15 (7), 2003
- [31] R. Swedberg, 'What Can New Economic Sociology Learn from the Historical School, especially Max Weber?', (ed.) in Heino H. Nau and Bertram Schefold, The Historicity of Economics, (Berlin: Springer Publishing House, 2002)
- [32] S.N. Eisenstadt, Modernisation: Protest and Change, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996)
- [33] A.Escobar, 'Imagining a Post-Development Era' in Crush, J. Power of Development, (London: Routledge,1995)
- [34] G.Myrdal, Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972)
- [35] G.Myrdal, Economic theory and Under-Developed Regions, (London: Methuneb, 1969)
- [36] K.Nkrumah, Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism, (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd.1965)
- [37] M. Weber, 'On Capitalism, Bureaucracy and Religion: A Selection of Text" in Andneski's (ed.), Religion and other factors in the Development of Capitalism, 1988.
- [38] J.A.Schumpeter, The theory of Economic development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle translated from the German by Redvers Opie, (New York: OUP, 1961)
- [39] D. C Me Clelland, The Achieving Society (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand. 1961)
- [40] W.Moore and Robert Cook, Social Change. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall (India)1967).
- [41] A.G.Frank,Reorient: Global Economy in Asian Age, (Berkeley: University of California Press,1998)
- [42] Fernando H. Cardoso and E. Faletto, Dependency and Development in Latin America,(London: University of California Press,1978)\
- [43] P. Baran, The Political Economy of Growth, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973)
- [44] A.G.Frank, Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil, (London: Penguin Books, 1971)
- [45] J.Dreze and A. Sen, India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- [46] T.Szentes, The Political Economy of Underdevelopment, (Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1976)
- [47] A.O.Hirschman, the Strategy of Economic Development,(New Haven: Yale University Press,1958)
- [48] Potter, R. B., T. Binns, J. Elliott and D. Smith, Geographies of Development: An Introduction to Development Studies, Third Edition, London: Pearson,2008)
- [49] A.G. Frank, The Development of Underdevelopment, Monthly Review Press, Sept.1966, 17- 31.
- [50] I.Wallerstein, The Capitalistic World-Economy, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)
- [51] B. F. Hoselitz, Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth (Bombay: Vakils, Fefferand Simons Private Ltd. 1984) .