

Unit 1

Development and Progress: Economic and Social Dimensions

Contents

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Understanding of Development and Progress
- 1.3 Comte, Morgan, Marx and Spencer on Development and Progress
- 1.4 Tonnies, Durkheim, Weber, Hobhouse and Parsons on Development and Progress
- 1.5 Development as Growth, Change and Modernisation
- 1.6 Capitalist, Socialist and Third World Models of Development
- 1.7 Development: Social and Human Dimensions
- 1.8 Paradigm Shift in Development Strategies
- 1.9 Conclusion
- 1.10 Further Reading

Learning Objectives

This unit will help you to explain;

- perspectives on development and progress;
- development as growth and modernisation;
- social and human dimension development; and
- paradigm shift in development discourse.

1.1 Introduction

The concepts of development and progress are often used in a positive sense to indicate the processes of advancement of individual or of collective phenomena or of objects or of actions. Human society has made a long journey in this; so is the concept of development. For centuries development was understood as progress, thereafter as growth, as change, as transfer of notion, as modernisation and so on. Very recently it is understood (along with economic) as social and human development as well. Human society has progressed and developed through several stages. Indeed, human society has made a ceaseless journey from the stages of savagery to barbarism, from barbarism to civilisation, from theological to metaphysical, from metaphysical to positive scientific, from simple to doubly compound, from doubly compound to trebly compound, from homogenous to heterogeneous, from under-developed to developed, from ancient to feudal, from feudal to capitalist, from traditional pre-industrial (mechanic solidarity), to industrial (organic solidarity) from pre-rational /pre-capitalist to rational capitalist, from primitive to intermediate, from intermediate to modern, agrarian to industrial, rural to urban and so on. In social science literature, these advancements have been viewed from diverse perspectives or orientations and have been diversely understood in philosophical, political, economic and social terms. This unit delineates the major perspectives on progress and development. We have initially located these concepts in the evolutionary perspectives as elaborated by the classical social thinkers like Morgan, Comte, Spencer, Hobhouse, Marx, Weber, McClelland, Durkheim and Parsons and go on to explain development in economic and social terms as has been visualised in the contemporary world.

The economic notions of development as predominantly understood by growth in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and the Capitalist, Socialist and the

Third World models of development are also widely explained. Developmental perspectives have experienced a paradigm shift since the late 1970s. The notions of human and social development have required a central place in the emerging perspective on development. New strategies have also emerged to integrate the marginalised people and women in the development process and to redefine the role of the state in development. Hence the reformulated strategy of development, i.e., development with empowerment of the marginalised groups and the related issues are also examined in the last section of this unit.

As this is the first unit of this course, we have raised several issues here. These issues would be discussed and critically analysed at length in the following units of this course. Let us begin with an understanding of the concepts of development and progress.

1.2 Understanding of Development and Progress

As we proceed to understand the notion of 'development', we encounter several related notions, viz., evolution, progress, change, growth, transformation and so on. Indeed it is crucial that we should have an understanding of all these notions or concepts at the very outset even though there is a tendency to use them interchangeably.

The notion **evolution** is derived from the Latin word *evolvere*. It means 'to develop' or to 'unfold' which is closely related to the Sanskrit word *vikas*. The concept of evolution is specifically applied to mean the internal growth of a living organism – the plant, animals, etc. Moreover, internal growth has also been seen through various stages of gradual transition. For example, seeds evolve to seedlings, then to plants, to trees and then starts the maturity and aging process of the trees.

The notion of **progress**, on the other hand, is used to mean 'to step forward' that coincides with the Sanskrit word '*pra-gat*'. The fundamental meaning of progress, therefore, is the forward march or advancement towards a desirable end. There may be as many types of progress as there are desirable ends, for instance, progress in the acquisition of learning in health, in our march towards a place, etc. Moreover, historically progress has an ethical connotation and is taken to mean advance towards the ultimate moral values which human kind had been striving all down the ages to attain (Gisbert 1994: 467). However, the human moral values and the standard of judgments, are as diverse as human societies. All these diversities do affect the process of attainment of different indicators of progress.

The concepts of development and progress have been understood by the social scientists from diverse perspectives – conflict, functional, neo-conflict, structural functional etc. However in this unit, we shall describe them as early perspectives, the perspectives of Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Parsons. We shall categorise these thinkers in terms of various schools of thought while discussing change and modernisation in the next unit.

1.3 Comte, Morgan, Marx and Spencer on Development and Progress

One of the early concerns of anthropologists and sociologists was to examine the development and progress of human society from an evolutionary perspective. The grand ideas of Morgan, Comte, Spencer, Marx, Durkheim, Weber and many others are still considered for examining the journey of human society through various stages of development and progress. In the early part of the nineteenth century, the philosophy of history, which helped to formulate the general idea of progress, became very important especially

through the writings of Hegel and Saint-Simon who, later on, left their imprint on the work of Auguste Comte and Karl Marx and others. Let us begin with the work of Comte who was a student of Saint-Simon.

a) Auguste Comte (1798-1857)

August Comte (1798-1857), the founding father of sociology focused his attention on the study of change, development and progress in human society. He divided the study of society into two parts: **social statics** (the study of major institutions or institutional complexes) and **social dynamics** (the study of development and change). Comte saw human society and history as a single entity. Moreover he regarded the history of Europe as synonymous with the history of the human race (Aron 1965: 65). Accordingly he made several generalisations.

Comte observed that certain types of societies were dying and others were being born. The dying types were the theological and military. Medieval society was united by transcendent faith as expounded by the Catholic Church. Theological thinking was contemporaneous with the predominance of military activity, which was expressed by the fact that the highest rank was granted to warriors. The type being born was scientific and industrial. In this society the scientists replaced the theologians; and the industrialists, businessmen, managers and financiers replaced the warriors. Indeed from the moment man related thinking scientifically, the chief activity of collectivities ceases to be the war of man against man and becomes the struggle of man against nature, the systematic exploitation of natural resources (Ibid: 64).

Comte gave a universal scope and a deeper meaning to the idea of progress when he expounded the law of three stages of human evolution. To him, the human mind passes through three stages of progression – theological, metaphysical and positive. In the theological stage human beings explain phenomena by ascribing them to beings or forces comparable to humans themselves. In the metaphysical stage human beings explain phenomena in terms of nature; in the positive scientific stage man examines the phenomena and their linkages are examined in terms of reasoning. "To Comte, the method that triumphed in mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology must eventually prevail in politics and culminate in the founding of a positive science of society that is called sociology (Ibid: 66)".

When Auguste Comte defined sociology as the science of order and progress, and divided it into social statics (order) and social dynamics (progress), he was in fact inferring that progress was possible through order. He tried to understand social changes that occurred in the early years of the industrial revolution as an evolutionary process. The theory of evolution explains that societies pass through a number of stages starting from a simple form and becoming more complex as the process of evolution progresses. In the same way, Auguste Comte put forward the idea of evolutionary change and also related the idea of progressive change to the development of intellect, in particular the development of scientific thought. This "law of three stages" postulates that intellectual progress is accompanied by moral development, with a number of changes in social institutions as well. Comte considered material as well as moral progress to be essential types of progress and social change as a product of internal forces, that too, in a linear form.

b) Morgan (1818-1881)

Morgan was the first person to bring forth the definite order of human society systematically. He identified three main epochs through which human society progressed. These are *savagery*, *barbarism* and *civilisation*. He sub-divided savagery and barbarism again into lower, middle and upper orders according to the progress made in the production of the means of subsistence. To him,

“upon their skill in this direction the whole question of human supremacy on the earth depended. Mankind are the only beings that may be said to have gained an absolute control over the production of food. The great epochs of human progress have been identified more or less directly, with the enlargement of the sources of subsistence” (cf Engles 1970: 204). It would be interesting to elaborate a little more on how the human beings progressed from stages of savagery to barbarism and then to civilisation.

Savagery

- a) Lower Stage: Human beings lived in tropical or sub-tropical forests on trees. Fruits, nuts and roots served them as food.
- b) Middle Stage: Human beings began to utilise fire and fish as food. The new food made them independent of locality and human movement started geographically. Human beings of this stage predominantly used crude stones as weapons.
- c) Upper Stage: Human beings invented bow and arrow, wild animals were added to their food, and hunting became their normal occupation. Wood vessels and utensils were also used.

Barbarism

- a) Lower Stage: Human beings entered into the stage of barbarism with the introduction of pottery.
- b) Middle Stage: It began with the domestication of animals in the East; and in the West it began with cultivation of edible plants, introduction of means of irrigation; use of sun dried bricks and stones for making buildings.
- c) Upper Stage: This is a very transitional phase. This stage begins with “smelting of iron ore and passes into civilisation through the invention of alphabetic writings and its utilisation for literary records”. The use of iron ploughshare drawn by cattle, wide scale land cultivation, unlimited increase in the means of subsistence, rapid increase in population characterised this stage.

Civilisation

It is the period in which knowledge of the further working up of natural products, of industry and of art was acquired (Ibid: 209). In this phase of progression human society has acquired sophistication in dimensions of life.

c) Karl Marx (1818-1883)

Marx presents an interpretation of the structure, functioning and progression of the capitalist society from the previous stages. Marx however provides the idea of radical transformation of society by elucidating a comprehensive theory of human progress in terms of contradiction inherent in the material structure of society. To him the actual basis of society is its economic structure. To quote Marx:

In the social production which man carry on, they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, their relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which rise the legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social political and spiritual processes of life At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change in the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed to reference (Marx 1992).

Marx outlines the asiatic, the ancient, the feudal and the capitalist as the major modes of production or epochs in the progress of human society. The asiatic mode of production does not constitute a stage in the Western society. Primitive communities are characterised by community ownership and their subordination by the State. In the ancient mode of production, slavery and in the feudal mode of production, serfdom provide the foundation of the productive system. The capitalist mode of production is characterised by large-scale commodity production, emergence of free labour markets and rapid growth of technology. Marx forecasts that capitalism would be replaced by socialism through violent revolution.

Marx argues that new developments of productive forces of society come in conflict with existing relations of production. For Marx, it is the growth of new productive forces and the contradiction built into them outline the course of human history. Class struggles have been recognised as the driving force of social change and development. To him "the history of the hitherto existing society is a history of class struggles". The dichotomous class-based societies would be replaced through a vehement class struggle to usher in an epoch of classless, stateless society whereby each would contribute according to one's capacity and would receive according to one's need.

d) Herbert Spencer (1820-1903)

Herbert Spencer believed in progress and in the unity and irreversibility of historical development. The law of Progressive Development of society was his central concern. Spencer was highly influenced by Charles Darwin's work *The Origin of the Species* (1859).

Spencer propagated that all through the ages there had been social evolution from a simple, uniform or homogenous structure to a complex multifold or heterogeneous one. Thus he drew an analogy between the living organism and human society in explaining their progress through evolutionary processes. To him, in the process of evolution, societies march from simple to various levels of compound on the basis of their composition. The aggregate of some simple societies gives rise to compound societies; and the aggregate of some compound societies gives rise to doubly compound societies. The aggregate of doubly compound societies gives rise to trebly compound societies. Simple societies, according to Spencer, consist of families unified into clans, doubly compound societies consist of clans unified into tribes; and trebly compound societies have tribes brought together forming nations or states (Timasheff 1967: 40).

Spencer has also delineated the evolution of societies from military to industrial as a model of analysis. Compulsory cooperation; a centralised pattern of authority and social control; myths and beliefs reaffirming the hierarchical notion of society; rigorous discipline and close identity between public and private spheres characterised the military society. The industrial society, on the other hand, was characterised by voluntary cooperation; recognition of personal rights; separation of the economic realm from political control of the government; and growth of free associations and institutions (Ibid: 42).

It is very important to note that Spencer's model of evolution helped explain the emergence and expansion of the *Laissez Faire* doctrine of free market in Europe and America.

Spencer was of the view that progress was largely due to pressure of population and he presented a comprehensive theory by including a variety of factors in his theory of social evolution and progress. He treated human society as a biological organism and, therefore, tried to study "development" in the sense of change from within. He propounded an analogy between society and organism and between social and economic growth; and argued that "with increase in size, the structural complexity of the society also increases."

Reflection and Action 1.1

What are the fundamental tenets of progress of human society as propagated by Morgan? How are these different from those of Comte?

1.4 Tonnies, Durkheim, Weber, Hobhouse and Parsons on Development and Progress

The idea of progress and development were further explored by many scholars highlighting the discontinuities between old and new. In this section we shall focus only on the central ideas of Tonnies, Weber, Durkheim, Hobhouse and Parsons.

a) Tonnies (1855-1936)

To Tonnies, in *Gemeinschaft* human beings are united by their natural condition – by blood relations, by marriage or through a strong relationship between husband and wife, mother and child and among siblings. The kinship group, neighborhood and friendship are the major types of groups in the *gemeinschaft*, who are guided by the authority of the common will. Moreover the common will is evolved based on shared beliefs, values and ways of behaving. In the *gesellschaft*, on the other hand, there is no common will as individuals are guided by self-interest. Here every relationship is measured in terms of its value or worth which are measured in terms of amount of labour used for their production. Thus the relationship in *gesellschaft* is a production relation.

Through these theories, an attempt was made to explain the course of social evolution in a linear sequence. Tonnies viewed development as the loss of *Gemeinschaft* or human community. He believed that the Industrial Revolution was tearing apart the idea of family and replacing it with emphasis on facts and efficiency. Societies all over, especially in North America and Europe, had begun to focus on self-interest, what Tonnies called *Gesellschaft*.

b) Durkheim (1858-1917)

Durkheim also conceived society in terms of an evolutionary scheme. He talked about **social solidarity** by which he meant the moral beliefs and ideas, which defined the “common sense” underlying social life. Like a social evolutionist, he was of the view that **mechanical solidarity** (characteristics of pre-industrial societies) was based on agreement and identity between people, while **organic solidarity** in industrial societies was derived from agreement to tolerate a range of differences, conflicts being moderated through a variety of institutional arrangements such as courts, trade unions and political parties.

In the pre-industrial societies there is little or no division of labour, every one works in similar ways and consumes in similar ways; there is little division of opinion, little individuality. In organic solidarity, on the other hand, there are specialisation of activities and advanced division of labour whose production, distribution and consumption are carried out in specialised ways (Durkheim 1965: 133).

Durkheim tried to explain social change as the result of changes in the bonds of morality, which he called social solidarity. Societies based on mechanical solidarity are transferred to organic solidarity by the growth of industrialisation, heterogeneity, differentiation, specialisation of activity and individualism. The problem of the growth of population, shrinking of natural resources and growing individualism (growth of material and moral density), according to him, is resolved by division of labour in the industrial society, i.e., in the organic solidarity. As each individual is specialised and also individualism is respected they are socially integrated with bondage of division of labour. Indeed division

of labour in the organic solidarity ensures the integration of individual specialisation in the system. However, abnormal division of labour, according to Durkheim, may lead to normlessness (anomie)

Box. 1.1: Material and Moral Density

To Durkheim, material density means sheer increase in the number of population in a given space. Which moral density indicates the increased interaction among individuals caused by their increase in numbers.

Durkheim considers the development of the division of labour in the society to be associated with the increasing contact among people (moral density) since the greater density of contact leads to the specialisation of people. But, he argues, the moral relationship can only produce its effect only if the real distance between individuals diminishes, which means increase in material density. What Durkheim refers here is that moral density cannot grow unless material density grows at the same time. He refers to three ways in which this happens:

- 1) Concentration of people: People begin to concentrate together. Agriculture may begin this, and this continues with the growth of cities as well.
- 2) Cities: Cities always result from the need of individuals to put themselves in very intimate contact with others. They can multiply and extend only if the moral density is raised.
- 3) Transportation and Communication: Increased number and rapidity of means of transportation and communication results in suppressing or diminishing the gaps separating social segments which in turn increase the density of society.

Source: Durkheim 1933 and 1984

c) Max Weber (1864-1920)

Weber has examined the question of development of human society in the context of his study on capitalism. He pointed out that capitalism, as a symbol of progress, emerged out of rationalisation of work ethics, savings, frugal life style beliefs, values, and attitudes. Weber pointed out that capitalist industrialisation emerged in selected countries of Western Europe and not in other places because Calvinist Protestants of these countries developed a lifestyle of this worldly asceticism by way of rationalising their thoughts, religious beliefs and values to reduce consumption and to promote investment in industry with a view to glorifying the world as desired by God. Turning to India, Max Weber pointed out that the predominance of traditional values of Hindustan in terms of *Dharma*, *Karma*, *Moksha* and *Sansar*, traditional caste values, etc., were the major hindrance to the development of rational capitalism in India. In brief, Weber observed the development of human society from traditional pre-industrial to rational capitalist which was mediated by a process of rationalization of religious beliefs.

David McClelland, like Max Weber, emphasised those internal factors like the values and motives of the persons to provide opportunities to shape their own destiny. Therefore, the problems of backwardness, poverty, malnutrition, etc., are vitally linked to traditional and non-traditional thought. He was of the view that educational programmes and technical aid aimed at increasing the "need for achievement" of the people of backward areas are needed to solve these problems. McClelland concluded that modernisation and development can be achieved through a process of diffusion of culture, ideas and technology.

d) L.T. Hobhouse (1864-1929)

Hobhouse was strongly influenced by both Comte and Spencer. Following Comte he propounded that "the development of the human mind was the crucial

factor in social development”, while from Spencer he took the viewpoint of social evolution or development as a process of increase in scale, complexity and internal differentiation. Hobhouse highlights that the development of the mind brings about social development and “since this mental development includes a development of moral ideas towards the ideal of a rational ethic, which transforms the major social institutions, it can be regarded as progressive” (Bottomore 1962: 293).

e) **Talcott Parsons**

Parsons has used an evolutionary perspective to explain the development of human society through several stages. He introduced the concept of **evolutionary universals** to mean that despite historical specificities there are some general directions of evolution through which each social system evolves. He also emphasized on a historical and comparative analysis of major types of evolutionary stages of the social system across the globe ranging from primitive to the modern industrial society. Parsons analysed the following types of evolutionary societies: **Primitive/Archaic, Intermediate and Modern.**

The primitive societies are characterised by elementary forms of social organisation and elementary economic activities like food gathering, hunting, animal husbandry and cultivation to meet the survival needs of human beings. These societies predominantly use elementary technology. Their cultural expressions are integrated with animism, magic and religion. They have a very simple political system, which is governed by the community’s collective rule.

The intermediate societies evolve from primitive societies out of the pressure for social differentiation caused by growth of population. To Talcott Parsons, as a result of population growth the division of human settlements between towns and cities on binary lines increases. This also leads to occupational differentiations and the emergence of new classes of people in society. Thus there would emerge elaborate systems of stratification based on one’s control of power, wealth or status or in the pattern of the caste system. There would evolve generalised rules and codified norms for social control paving the way for the sustenance of a systematised political structure in the form of feudalism or monarchy. To Marx, traditional China, India, Islamic and Roman Empires are typical examples of intermediate societies.

Modern societies, according to Parsons, are a unique contribution of the West to humanity, which evolved because of the industrial revolution, democratic revolution led by French revolution and educational revolution. The Industrial revolution brought about radical changes in the production process with the help of advanced technology and science. The French revolution brought forth the ideas of equality, fraternity and justice paving the way for democratic governance and achieved social status. Education initiated the process of secularisation and universalisation of liberal thought. The main feature of modern society, according to Parsons are: the growth of universalistic law, evolution of the modern institution of money and banking, rational bureaucracy and growth of democratic society (for further details on Parsons read MSO - 001).

Reflection and Action 1.2

Compare and contrast the evolutionary models of development as elaborated by Marx and Parsons.

1.5 Development as Growth, Change and Modernisation

Though there are perceptible disagreements, development has also been understood widely in terms of increase in productivity, increase in the intensity

of modernisation, urbanisation and industrialisation. Here development has been viewed as the processes of the quantum increase of the goods and services, as transformation of society from pre-modern to modern in terms of institutional arrangements, as transformation of economy from agrarian to industrial, as migration of population from rural to urban areas, as shifting of economic activities from agricultural to non-agricultural and so on.

In this section we shall discuss the different connotations of development as in general perceived in the post-World War II period. We shall also discuss the impact of these notions of development in society very briefly.

- l) **Development as Multiple Connotations:** There are several connotations about development, such as development as **growth**, development as **change** or **transformation** and development as **modernisation**.
 - a) **Growth:** In economic terms, development as growth refers to an increased capacity to produce consumption goods and a concomitant increase in consumption patterns. (Little, cf Marglin and Marglin 1990: 1). As growth, development very simply may be defined with respect to an increased ability to fulfill basic human needs of food, clothing, shelter, healthcare and education. (Streeten and associates, cf Marglin and Marglin 1990: 2). In a third sense of growth, development has also been defined in terms of expansion of possibilities, an increase in individual choices, capabilities and functioning (Sen, cf Marglin and Marglin 1990: 2). Development in the above senses carries with it connotations of being positive, progressive, and natural beneficial and inevitable.
 - b) **Change and Transformation:** Development as change and transformation refers to the economic, social, political and cultural processes of change in human societies (Schrijvers 1993).
 - c) **Modernisation:** Development is also understood as modernisation, though some may disagree about them being one and the same thing. Often modernisation being seen as a means to development. In the economic realm it refers to the processes of industrialisation, urbanisation and technological transformation of agriculture. In the political realm, it requires a rationalisation of authority in general and a rationalising bureaucracy in particular. In the social realm it is marked by the weakening of ascriptive ties and the primacy of personal achievement in advancement, and in the cultural realm it is the growth of science and secularization, along with an expansion of the literate population that makes for what has been referred to as a "disenchantment" of the world (Marglin 1990). Development in this sense of modernity stands for what is understood as **Westernisation**, where the west stands as the model for the progress of the rest of the world. Development in this sense becomes a comparative adjective, which is based on the western centric assumption that there is a process of linear evolution of the world in which the West leads world history and evolution and that other nations must follow in their footsteps towards a homogenous world.

The term development has acquired a special meaning since the end of World War II when an era of development was launched by the American President, Harry S. Truman, who publicly expressed the need to embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of scientific advances and industrial progress of his country available for the improvement and growth of "underdeveloped" areas. Discounting old imperialism and exploitation for foreign profit, he announced a program of development based on concepts of democratic fair dealing

(Esteva 1992). Development by this declaration came to connote as an escape from the undignified condition called "underdevelopment".

- II) **Development and its Impact.** As development was predominantly defined in terms of increase in productivity, economic prosperity and an expansion of the market economy; underdevelopment had been constructed as the phenomena of poverty, low productivity and backwardness. There was optimism that economic growth was the fastest road to development. From the 1950s onwards, therefore, there has been an obsessive focus on industrialisation and growth of GNP and it has been assumed that the natural consequence of a rapid growth in these will bring about positive changes in existing social conditions. However there were several adverse consequences due to this.
- a) As development has meant industrial growth, profits and resources were diverted to feed industry at times ignoring the basic subsistence need of society. It obviously led to the expansion of the market at the cost of livelihoods for many. While it has generated utilities of consumption and luxury, it has also resulted in higher levels of pollution and erosion of natural resources that threaten mankind's very existence.
 - b) The growth-oriented development was accompanied by an increase in inequalities and social disintegration. There was evidence everywhere to show how development itself either left behind or even created a new large area of poverty and stagnation, making for marginalisation and exclusion of sections of populations from the fruits of social and economic progress. Gunder Frank who perceived the injustices of the existing developmental processes, coined the phrase **development of underdevelopment**, for he held that the process of development that is underway makes some people and regions developed while others are underdeveloped as a result of this global dynamics of the world system.
 - c) Economic growth has manifested itself in terms of an internationalisation of the economies of developing nations a boom in the financial capital at the disposal of nations; and increased mechanisation impacting processes and patterns of production and consumption. It has also meant increased concentration of wealth, wide disparities in distribution of wealth, the withdrawal of the welfare state and an increasing role of the military in the political and economic life of countries. Thus economic growth and economies of concentration cannot be a generator of development in the widest sense of the word.
 - d) The economic model is mechanistic and its assumption of economic rationality is not suited to poor Third World nations. A liberalised market, for instance, means an exclusion of the vast masses of the poor people from economy and that cannot be a way of removing poverty, the greatest developmental issue for the Third World.
 - e) Increased income levels, multiplied exports and raised economic growth of a few regions cannot take away from the urgency of the problems of increasing poverty of the masses, depleting resources, unemployment, underemployment, inadequate housing and mounting foreign debts that threaten national sovereignty, besides entailing a chain of reactions that can deplete national resources and capabilities to irreversible limits.

If this economic development causes anxiety, alienation, fragmentation, cynicism and demobilisation, it would itself abort what it seeks to do, that is, progress of humanity. Yet we need development to address the powerlessness that people feel due to illiteracy, unemployment, lack of productive assets and lack of knowledge. We cannot deny the need to change the fact of substandard existence and poverty that dogs the vast masses of humanity. We must also work towards expanding possibilities for people to fulfill themselves, yet we must be cautious of "the binary, the mechanistic, the reductionist, the inhuman and the ultimately self-destructive approach to change" that development has meant, given its political anchoring (Rahnema 1997).

From the above discussions we can conclude that the balance sheet of development may not be very optimistic, yet it still carries the only possibility of ameliorating long standing human problems of poverty and backwardness. Now let's learn the different models of economic development.

1.6 Capitalist, Socialist and Third World Models of Development

Economic development has been the prime concern of the modern state. However, this concern has been widely linked with the ideology and power structure of the state. As the nature of the power structure and state ideology are diverse, there have emerged diverse models of economic development across the globe.

In the post-World War II period the process of decolonialisation, the emergence and need for economic reconstruction of nation-states, and the shadow of the Cold War widely shaped the development discourse till the late 1970s. The industrial and political rise of the West and Southern Europe and North America on the one side, and Russia and communist states on the other, alongside the stagnation of a vast number of nations with low productivity, industrial backwardness and poverty gave rise to the First, Second and Third World models of development respectively, i.e., **Capitalist, Socialist and Third World**.

The capitalist model of development is characterised by provision of private ownership of property and means of production, minimum state control on economic enterprises, and a free economy regulated by competition. The developmental model also emphasizes sustained growth and modernisation with massive state investment at the take-off stage. From the view of this perspective, "economic development would revolve around industrialisation and the transfer of an underemployed rural labour force to the more productive occupations in the urban industrial sector. The state would have to mobilise domestic and foreign saving to create an investment pool from which it could finance a programme of directed industrial development" (Corbridge 1995: 2).

The First World model of development, however, encountered several challenges with the expansion of the socialist model of development represented by the Second World. The socialist model was contradictory to the capitalist model of development as it propagated the abolition of ownership of private property and means of production, emphasised state ownership of means of production, state-owned public enterprise, and a state regulated economy and centralised planning by the state for economic growth. While both the capitalist and the socialist models laid primary emphasis on economic growth, the socialist model also emphasised on the equal distribution of the fruits of growth among all sections of the population.

The Third World is represented by the ex-colonial, newly independent and non-aligned countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America who are industrially backward. Indeed the Third World development perspectives are caught between the conflicting ideologies of the First and Second world. These

countries represented a diverse variety in terms of their socio-cultural and political setting and historical experiences and levels of technological and economic development. However, notwithstanding these variations these countries are economically and technologically underdeveloped, and are undergoing the process of nation-building and fast social transformation in the post-colonial era. As against these backdrops, these countries have been experimenting with diverse models of development. For example, India has followed the path of “mixed economy” by adopting a path of development in between the capitalist and socialist models.

Significantly, in the 1950s, the growth theory was visualised from social, cultural, and political terms which coincided with the modernisation perspective on development. The modernisation theory was associated with both the capitalist and socialist social and cultural orders. A vast number of Third World societies also followed the path of modernisation with varied degrees of success. Indeed the historical experience and specific socio-cultural contexts have given rise not only to diverse patterns of modernity across the globe, also they contributed towards the emergence of imbalanced economic and political relationships among the nations.

The dependency theorists argued that unequal trading relationships and capitalist development have made the countries of the southern hemisphere dependent on the northern hemisphere, especially Western Europe and North America, for capital, technology and market. To Gunder Frank, the exposure of the developing countries to the economic influence of the capitalist countries have contributed to their dependency latter. (You will learn more about the modernisation and the dependency theories of development in the subsequent blocks of this course).

Reflection and Action 1.3

Write on the sociological critiques of the various models of development.

It is important that since the 1980s there have been serious doubts on the major theories of development. “The leftist strategies of development were at least partially, if not wholly, discredited by the collapse of communism, whilst theories that advocated a development path based on the western capitalist model were also seen as having delivered few of the benefits that they have seemed to promise.” It has also been observed that Third World countries have been struggling under the weight of accumulated debt to the developed countries. The “structural adjustment programmes” have been forced on them by the West, especially the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) with a view to creating conditions of economic growth by removing obstacles to the efficient operation of the free market. Note that the structural adjustment programme has not stimulated economic growth all over the Third World (Parfitt, T 2002: 2). In this backdrop let us examine the social and human dimensions of development.

Reflection and Action 1.4

What are the various connotations of development used in the post World War II period?

1.7 Development: Social and Human Dimensions

As discussed in the previous section, in classical term development is always deliberated with economic connotations and it is referred to as an increase in the gross national product or in per capita income. In this understanding, development is equated with growth and it is envisioned that a quantum increase in the production of goods and services would bring development. It

was also assumed that the trickle-down effect of growth would lead to an equitable sharing of benefits, resources and opportunities in society. This process of development, however, has not been able to yield the desired result to humanity, especially in the developing countries. Development pattern of the past few decades have shown the following trends:

- The high Gross National Product (GNP) growth of the fast growing developing countries has failed to reduce the socio-economic deprivation of substantial sections of their population.
- High income for the industrialised countries has not been able to provide protection against the rapid spread of social concerns like drug addiction and alcoholism, AIDS, homelessness, violence and the breakdown of family relations.
- Significantly, some low-income countries have demonstrated that it is possible to achieve a high level of human development if they skillfully use the available means to expand basic human capabilities (UNDP 1990: 10).

Against this backdrop, there has been a perceptive shift in conceptualising development. The realisation is that economic growth is essential for humanity but it should be seen only as a means to improve human choices. The *Human Development Report, 1990* states clearly:

We are rediscovering the essential truth that people must be at the center of all development. The purpose of development is to offer people more options. One of their options is access to income - not as an end in itself but as a means of acquiring human well being. But there are other options as well, including long life, knowledge, political freedom, personal security, community participation and guaranteed human rights. People cannot be reduced to a single dimension as an economic creature. What makes them and the study of development process fascinating is the entire spectrum through which human capacities are expanded and utilised. It is now realised that people are the real wealth of a nation, that the basic objective of development is to create an enabling environment for the people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives and that the statistical aggregates to measure national income and its growth have at times obscured the fact that the primary objective of development is to benefit people (UNDP 1990).

In this background let us discuss the concept of human development.

a) Human Development

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), human development is a process of analysing people's choices. In principle, these choices can be infinite and change over time. But at all levels of development, the three essential ones are there for people (a) to lead a long and healthy life, (b) to acquire knowledge and (c) to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. If these essential choices are not available many other opportunities remain inaccessible. Human development, however, does not end there. Additional choices, ranging from political, economic and social freedom to opportunities for being creative and productive and enjoying personal self-respect and guaranteed human rights are also inseparable parts of human rights.

UNDP depicts two sides of human development (a) the formation of human capabilities - such as improved health, knowledge and access to resources; and (b) the people making use of these capabilities for productive purposes—being active in cultural, social and political affairs.

If the scales of human development do not finely balance the two sides, considerable human frustration may result. According to this concept of human development, "income is merely one option that people would like to have, albeit an important one. But it is not the sum total of their lives. Development must, therefore, be more than just the expansion of income and wealth. Its focus must be people" (Ibid:10).

Box 1.2: Human Approach to Development

The Human Development Approach to development is different from the conventional approaches to development, i.e., the economic growth, human capital formation, human resources development, human welfare or the basic human needs approaches. As stated earlier, economic growth, that is, the increase in production (GDP) is necessary but not sufficient for human development. The theories of human capital formation and human resources development consider the human being as a means and not as an end. They are concerned with the supply side. The human welfare approach visualises people only as passive recipients of benefits of development and not as its participants. The basic needs approach aims to satisfy the basic minimum needs, i.e., food, shelter, clothing, etc., of the deprived sections of the population rather than on the issue of human choices (UNDP 1990: 11).

The human development approach puts equal emphasis on the production and distribution of resources, expansion and use of human capabilities, scope of choice, livelihood security, participatory process, social, economic and political freedom. All these indeed emphasise a paradigm shift in the social development strategy of the State.

b) Concern Against Ruthless, Rootless, etc. Growth

Following the conventional path of growth, the world has become more polarised and the gulf between the poor and the rich has widened further. The UNDP, in its *Human Development Report* (1996), points that the poorest 20% of the world's population has experienced a decline in its share of global income from 2.3% to 1.4% in the last 30 years, whereas the share of the richest 20% rose from 70% to 85% during the same period. The gap in per capita income between the industrial and developing worlds trebled. There have been regional imbalances. The UNDP has voiced its concern against the **jobless, ruthless, voiceless, rootless and fortuneless growth** in the late 1990s.

It was jobless growth, since the economy grew but did not expand the opportunities for employment for large sections of the population. For the developing countries, jobless growth has meant long hours and very low incomes for hundreds of millions of people in low productivity work in agriculture and in other informal sectors. This developmental process has been rendered ruthless by the fact that the fruits of economic growth have mostly benefited the rich; while millions of people stagnate in poverty. Ruthless growth causes people's cultural identity to wither. At places the dominant majority culture amplifies at the cost of marginalisation of the minority cultures. It has also been a voiceless growth as in many places it has not ensured the process of democratic participation of the people in decision making processes. The voiceless growth process also provides women a marginal role in economic development. Again, fast economic growth is also achieved in some countries at the cost of destruction of forests, polluting rivers, destroying bio-diversity and depleting natural resources. In this futureless growth, the present generation squanders resources needed by the future generation. At times the futureless growth benefits the industrialized countries at the cost of increased pressure on the poor people of the developing countries. As against this backdrop, the UNDP says development that perpetuates today's inequalities is neither sustainable nor worth sustaining (HDR 1996: 4).

c) Development as Freedom

In this context it is important to examine how development is being viewed as freedom by Amartya Sen (1999). To him, development must be perceived as a vital process of expanding real freedom that people enjoy. To him, expansion of real income and economic growth are not necessarily characteristics of successful development as countries with high GDP and per capita income at times have low achievements in the quality of life. On the other hand countries with low GDP and low per capita incomes have higher human development indicators. Here the central purpose of development is to improve human lives, i.e., expanding the range of things that human beings can achieve and can do. To him, the objective of development is to remove obstacles such as illiteracy, illhealth, poverty, lack of access to resources or lack of civil and political freedom. He does not deny that economic prosperity should be the major goal of planning and policy making. This is, however, only an intermediate goal to contribute to the ultimate goal of development, i.e., the development of human lives. To Sen, both the primary end and the principal means of development is expansion of freedom as freedom in one type helps advancing freedom of other types. While access to economic opportunities is a major factor of economic growth, he also recognises the contribution of instrumental freedom (political freedom, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees and protective security) in enhancing economic growth and the contribution of economic growth to facilitate those freedoms that come into the way of full attainment of human potentials.

Reflection and Action 1.5

How is the human development approach is different from the growth approach to development?

1.8 Paradigm Shift in Development Strategies

The post-colonial developing world since the early 1970s has experienced a phenomenal shift in the development strategy. For example, immediately after independence, India adopted a developmental strategy of “growth with stability” with the basic thrust on industrialisation, agricultural modernisation, expansion of infrastructure, education and mass communication. However, in the backdrop of the declining access of a vast number of people to the means of livelihood security, literacy/education, healthcare facilities, housing and other basic necessities of life, the philosophy of “social justice” was integrated in the development discourse in the 1970s. It is important that the focus of development has been shifted for the disadvantaged section of society. Again, since the early 1990s, especially in the wake of globalisation, the strategy of “empowerment with development” has been adopted to integrate the marginalised sections into the mainstream (SinghaRoy 2001). The developmental processes have experienced a phenomenal shift especially in the wake of the collapse of the socialist model of economy, the fast spread of neo-liberalised globalisation, introduction of new structural adjustment programmes, formation of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and enactment of GATT and GATS agreements. The neo-liberal developmentism has provided a new dimension to the notion of development with the philosophy of one world, one market and one ideology

a) Redefining the Role of the State

The *World Development Report*, 1997 emphasised the need for an effective role of the State for social and economic development but in a new form. According to it, the State is central to economic and social development, not as a direct provider of growth but as a partner, catalyst and facilitator. The world is changing, and with it our ideas about the state’s role in economic and

social development. In view of the collapse of the command and control economies, fiscal crisis of the welfare states, explosion in humanitarian emergencies in several parts of the world, growing lack of confidence in governance by private investors, increase in corruption and poverty, various dramatic events especially the technological change in the world economy on the one hand, and the growing discontent of the people, manifestation of grassroots mobilisation and increasing pressure of the civil society on the other, a redefinition of the State's responsibilities was suggested as a strategy for the solution of the some of these problems. According to the World Bank (1997), this will include strategic selection of the collective actions that States will try to promote, coupled with greater efforts to take the burden off the State, by involving citizens and communities in the delivery of the collective goods. It observes that for human welfare to be advanced, the State's capacity – defined as the ability to undertake or promote collective actions efficiently – must be increased.

b) Focus on Empowerment of the Marginalised

The World Development Summit, 1995, talks about "people's initiatives", "people empowerment" and "strengthening capacities of the people". Regarding the objectives of development, it specifically mentions "that empowering people, particularly women, to strengthen their capacities is the main objective of development and its principal resource. Empowerment requires the full participation of people in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of decisions determining the functioning and well-being of societies" (*World Development Summit, 1995*).

To ensure the full participation of the people, it is pointed out that the state should provide "a stable legal framework" in accordance with the "Constitution, laws and procedures consistent with international laws and obligations" which promotes, among other things, the encouragement of "partnership with free and representative organisations of civil society, strengthening of the abilities and opportunities of civil society and local communities to develop their own organisations, resources and activities" (*World Development Summit, 1995*).

It is apparent that within the given perspectives of the "stable-legal framework", "strategic selection of collective action" by the State, possible "partnership of the State with civil society and state sponsored initiatives of the civil society to have their own organisations", certain important dimensions have emerged. These encompass (a) all initiatives for empowerment of the marginalised groups should be in accordance with the prescribed rule of the land (b) the State will selectively co-opt people's initiatives as and when required (c) the civil society organisations would play a significant role for empowerment of the marginalised. Besides proactive State intervention, civil societies are going to play an important role in the emerging development discourse with empowerment.

1.9 Conclusion

Development and progress are social processes. These processes have not got uniform patterns all over the globe as the humanity is diversely located in terms of their geographic, economic, technological and political advancement. However, notwithstanding these variations, efforts are made by the social scientists to develop broad perspectives on development and progress. At times these perspectives have emerged to be contradictory in nature. In this unit we discussed various perspectives on development provided by the classical sociological thinkers. We have also discussed the various models of development as propagated and used by the Capitalist, Socialist and the Third World countries. Shift in the development perspectives since the late 1970s and the emergence of the notion of human development and the strategy of

development with empowerment of the marginalised is also dealt with in the unit. This unit has laid the foundation for a broad analysis of sociology of development which would be followed in the subsequent units of this course.

References

1.10 Further Reading

Dube, S.C. 1992. *Understanding Change*. Vikas Publishing House: New Delhi

McMichael, P. 1996. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Fine Forge Press: Thousand Oaks

SinghaRoy, D.K. 2003. *Social Development and the Empowerment of the Marginalised Groups: Perspectives and Strategies*. Sage Publication: New Delhi