KALAM - International Research Journal
Faculty of Arts and Culture,
South Eastern University of Sri Lanka.
13(4), 2020

Understanding Development: Changing Concept and Impact on Developing Countries

M.I. Mohamed Irfan[1] & Pukar Lamichhane[2]
[1] Interdisciplinary Unit, Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic Language
South Eastern University of Sri Lanka.
[2] Central Department of Public Administration
Tribhuwan University, Nepal.

Correspondence: irfanibrahim86@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is primarily focused on the idea of development and the changing concept of development over time. This paper is based on the findings of various researches and scientific papers focused on the study of western concept of development and analysis of various development theories and institutions that evolved over time. The study focuses the development as multi-dimensional process in reorganization and reorientation of entire economic as well as social system. Various propositions about the conceptualizations of development are discussed and primarily development as a dominant discourse of western modernity has been elaborately explored. The domination of western concept flourished in the post war period all over the world through different institutional apparatus and financial institutions in order to channel material aid and the ideology associated with development to these countries. This western concept has also been criticized as the continuation of the colonial domination in the name of development.

Keywords: Development, western concept, developing countries, globalization

1. Introduction

Development is a diversified concept having enough space for different schools of thought. Sometime the term development is considered as contested, complex and ambiguous (Thomas, 2004). However, development can be either a desired state (condition) or a process of change to attain the desired state. That is why, it is imperative to have an explicit idea about both the static and the dynamic aspect of development. Cowen and Shenton (1998) argue over the range of conceptualizations of development and make distinction between immanent development such as development of capitalization and imminent development such as deliberate process to develop third world countries after the post WWII period.

An American economist Michael Todaro utters that development is not purely an economic phenomenon but rather a multi-dimensional process involving reorganization and reorientation of entire economic and social system. Development is the process of improving the quality of all human lives with three equally important aspects: raising peoples' living levels, such as incomes, food, education etc.; creating conditions conducive to the growth of peoples' self-esteem through social, political and economic systems; and increasing peoples' freedom to choose by enlarging the range of their choice variables (variables of goods and services).

A substantial definition proposed by Turner & Hulme (1997) describes development as: an economic component dealing with the creation of wealth and improved conditions of material life, equitably distributed; a social ingredient measured as well-being in health, education, housing and employment; a political dimension including such values as human rights, political freedom, enfranchisement, some form of democracy; a cultural dimension in recognition of the fact that that cultures confer identity and self-worth to people; the full-life paradigm, which refers to meaning systems, symbols, and beliefs concerning the ultimate meaning of life and history; and a commitment to ecologically sound and sustainable development so that the present generation does not undermine the position of future generations.

Development is both an end as well as a means for the desired end. It is a gradual process of attaining intermediate goals in small and wide spaces before reaching an ideal situation. Thus, the notion of development signifies a shift from an unsatisfactory social, economic and political condition to one that is more humane, relatively prosperous, and environmentally safer and politically more inclusive (Zafarullah & Haque, 2012). The concept of development has been a debatable topic and gone through major shift over change in time. After the independence of the states from the colonial legacy in mid twentieth century, economic growth was considered as development. In the early 1950s, conventional thinking identified development with growth in GDP or GDP per capita. The earlier literature emphasized economic growth and capital accumulation at a macro level (Nayyar, 2006).

Smith (2003) identified the following three objectives of development: (a) To increase the availability and widen the distribution of self-sustaining goods such as food, shelter, health and protection; (b) To raise levels of living, including provision of quality and adequate jobs, better education and greater attention to cultural and human values, all of which will serve not only to enhance material wellbeing but also to generate greater individual and national self-esteem in addition to higher incomes; (c) To expand the range of economic and social choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence.

2. Paradigms of Development

Despite of range of definitional debates, there is a common understanding among the theorists, that is, development encompasses continuous change in a variety of aspects of human society. The dimension of development is very much diversified and includes economic, social, political, legal & institutional structures, technology in various forms, the environment, religion, the arts, and culture (Corbridge, 1995). Sumner (2008) argues about the three distinct conceptualizations ofdevelopment.1. Development as a long term process of structural societal transformation, 2. Development as short-to-medium term outcomes and desirable targets, and 3. Development as a dominant discourse of western modernity.

3. Development in Colonial Period

The British, French, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Belgian, and German created permanent communities in foreign lands in countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia, as their colony (Zafarullah & Haque, 2012). The transplantation of institutions and practices by colonizing countries in their colonies without realizing consequence in the native cultures brought ambiguous relations with indigenous social structures and created tension and inequalities, consequently, destroyed the existing social and economic relation to large degree. The political power was centralized but the state took in coercion, extraction, and at times absolute behavior to dominate over colonial society (Chiriyankandath, 2007). Colonial power had their own agenda in social, economic and political matter and forms of capitalism were introduced and investments were mainly concentrated in urban centers (Edelman and Haugerud, 2005). Colonial capitalism flourished with little indigenous participation and employment opportunities for the local population were limited in infrastructure building projects and the railways. Efforts at industrialization were uneven and sporadic. Natural resources were unilaterally exploited by artificially created controlled mechanism. Land reform was haphazard and often went against the interests of small land holders. (Zafarullah & Haque , 2012). Unbalanced development was there which had serious implication not only for the colonies themselves but for the colonizing countries as well (Havinden Meredith, 1993).

4. Challenges

Several problems of colonial development have been identified, which includes small export sector, domination of foreign companies in export sector, weak linkages to transportation and industry, prohibition of private capital to reinvest within colonies, and declining trade. Agricultural development was seen as a path to rapid modernization, but it suffered because of government‘s failure in promoting interactive cooperation among farmers, limited extension program, inadequate supply of farming inputs and non-availability of improved tools and techniques (Zafarullah & Haque, 2012). To summaries, the development approach adopted by the colonial powers remained feeble to attain maximum production of primary goods and fail to exploit the export earnings for diversification and development in the economy as a whole (Havinden Meredith, 1993). For an example; British attempted hard to deal with the poverty of African colonies through development, humanitarian, and welfare policies but achieved titular success. The laudable fruit of achievement for colonized countries from colonization was modernization ideals in the form of western education, liberalism, democracy, secularism and modern forms of government (judiciary, legislative bodies, bureaucracy, coercive forces) (Zafarullah & Haque,2012).

5. Development in Post War Period

This section of the paper extensively elucidates the historical transformation of the development concept and their consequence on the world economy in post-World War II period. This paper has mainly focused on the emergence of different elements and speculation of development and their influence in the goals and objectives of both developing and developed countries. John Rapley (2007) has outlined the progress of development admitting that development has come a long way in the past six decades and emphasizes the significance of development during the World War II period. A period when in rebuilding and confronting new challenges unleashed a float gate of Institutions, be it the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (which later became known as the World Bank) trade organizations. This was also a period where in there was the much talked tradition of theorizing special challenges faced by back ward regions upon sustainable paths to industrialization. A period was encountered where the goal of development was to raise income and give poor nations access to basic necessities. Lampooning colonialism, the effects of colonialism earnests for a better life to consolidate state independence was stressed. Thus, using a conventional ideological spectrum, the author holds that development thinking would have started among left wing branches of social science, following this trend of thinking. Despite of the above view, the Rapley (2007) holds that during early postwar period, conventional economic wisdom was not really left or right. He justifies this by upholding that a broad consensus had come to coalesce around certain core assumptions. Neoclassical theory during this period claimed that the main problem in the third world was the state itself, thus indicating that rapid development could only come about if the state was rolled back. Introducing a complexity, new left-wing schools of thought during this era, as manifested in the dependency theory, arose to claim that the market itself was the problem and called for a greater state’s role (Rapley, 2007).

6. Emergence of International Development Agencies

The inquisitiveness of the post war structure on the world economy started immediately after the end of World War II among the allied groups leaders. The conference was held in the hotel Bretton Woods and the nonattendance of Russia (USSR) explicitly signified the polarization of the global economy as western capitalist and eastern state-socialist. This popular Bretton Woods Conference provided the blueprint for post war capitalist economy. The intellectual shadow of the leading economic thinker of the age, John Maynard Keynes, loomed large over the conference with the particularly focus on favorable international trading environment. The major challenges at end of World War II were monetary instability and lack of credit that had inhibited trade among nations and led governments to adopt protectionist policies. Economic thinkers of the era understood that free trade was a growth- enhancing gift for promoting economic individual specialization and cooperation among global producers, and that a lack of unfettered trade in the 1930s arguably gave us the horror that was World War II. Ultimately, Bretton Woods conference gave rise to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which later popularly known as the World Bank. In 1947, a treaty organization was built on the consensus for freely flowing of international trading environment popularly known as General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (Rapley, 2007).

The major aim of GATT was to reduce tariffs, or taxes on imports, thereby lowering the barriers to trade among member states whereas IMF provided short-term loans to governments to cover their balance-of-payments deficits, encountered due to excessive imports and capital flows. The IMF later extended credit beyond its members' resources Also, IMF would apply the clutch to those countries that had been careless with their checkbooks and was allowed to demand government reforms to rectify structural problems in the economy-in effect. On the other hand, World Bank was created to invest money in the reconstruction of war-ravaged Europe and after the task was completed turned its attention to the development of the third world. The world need of a universal medium of exchange, a currency all participants in the economy would accept, to ensure that goods flowed freely across borders was fulfilled by US dollar (Rapley, 2007).

The Bretton Woods conference gave rise to IMF and WB but failed to take Keynes's advice to create an international trade organization, which would have enjoyed more power than did GATT to enforce the compliance of member states, and would also have been able to stabilize commodity prices. Later on, the Keynesian Revolution was associated with the rise of modern liberalism in the West during the post-war period. Keynesian ideas became so popular that some scholars point to Keynes as representing the ideals of modern liberalism, as Adam Smith represented the ideals of classical liberalism. However, in late 1930s and 1940s, economists such as John Hicks, Franco Modigliani, and Paul Samuelson interpreted Keynes's ideas in terms of formal mathematical models known as the neoclassical synthesis; and combined Keynesian analysis with neoclassical economics to produce neo-Keynesian economics, which dominated mainstream macroeconomic till 1980s. Likewise, Keynesian policies were adopted by almost the entire developed world and similar measures for a mixed economy were used by many developing nations. In late 1965, U.S. President Richard Nixon credited Keynes's idea for the exceptionally favorable economic conditions in USA (Rapley, 2007).

7. Development Discourse and Third World: Itemizing of Global North and Global South

The independence movement led to the emergence of a series of countries that did belong to neither the Western bloc of advanced capitalist countries known as *First World* nor the communist Soviet bloc known as the *Second World.* These countries had various features in common, including underdevelopment and rapid demographic growth, and they became known collectively as the '*Third World*', an expression coined by French economist and demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952. The number of features characterizes *Third World* countries as compared to the advanced capitalist economies of Western Europe and North America, particularly, low per capita income, poverty, shorter life expectancies, higher rates of infant mortality, lower levels of educational attainment, high proportion of the population is engaged in agriculture, less important of manufacturing sector in the economy, etc. In the 1950s, five newly independent Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia) took the initiative to rally the Third-World countries to form a united front against colonization. On 17 April 1955, the first Afro–Asian Conference was held in Bandung in a bid by *Third-World* countries to consolidate their position on the international stage (Rapley, 2007).

In a retrospective look at the construction of *Third World*, it is explicit to understand how the language of *Development* has been used by the West for legitimizing its interventions over the *Third World*. Further these countries have been referred to in a variety of forms. Before they gained independence, they were called *Backward* countries and upon the gaining of independence, they became *Emergent* or *New States*. Afterwards they became *Developing Countries* in order to fit into the Western notion of universal development or alternatively as *Underdeveloped* countries in the terminology of dependency critiques. Accordingly, the concepts *Third Word* and *Development* are inventions of the economically rich nations of the West and thus, Escobar (1995) argued development has become a discourse; a particular mode of thinking and a source of practice designed to instill in underdeveloped countries the desire to strive towards industrial and economic growth. Even though the broad meaning of development is the promotion of the creativity of humans, economic growth is the primary criterion by which development is determined. That is why economics has become the master discipline of theory-building and policy formulation. In his retrospective look at development anthropology at the World Bank, Michael Cernea referred to the econocentric and technocentric conceptual biases of development strategies as profoundly damaging. These paradigmatic biases largely neglect history of civilization and the associated values. The latter were the essential elements of social harmony and the balance between man and nature. Econocentrism does not tolerate the equivalence of nature with man. Therefore, it attempts to surrender nature by means of destruction and over-exploitation. Material accumulation has been the primary goal of the econocenrtic and techno centric development approaches.

It was assumed that the growth of the economy would trickle down to the masses in the form of jobs and other economic opportunities. The absurdity lies in the fact that the Third World's poor have been waiting for the past fifty years till the economic development trickles down to their level. As revealed by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in 1997 the number of people having no access to drinkable water is about 1.75 billion, while those deprived of primary health care stand at 1.5 billion after four decades of development. These statistics together with increasing poverty, inequality in income distribution, rising unemployment, environmental degradation, desertification of land, large numbers of human displacement due to civil wars, environmental hazards and development projects indicate that the declared economic growth is a myth (Banda, 2004).

8. Analyzing Development in Post War Period

8.1 Modernization Theory

The behavioral revolution, a shift in US social scientific thought, which began in the late 1940s till 1960s, gave rise to Modernization theory. Modernization theory mainly focuses on conditions that had given rise to development in the first world, and where and why these were lacking in the third world? Later on, Modernization Theorists reached varying conclusions, such as; the problem of the third world was a mere shortage of capital, (Rostow, 1966) lack of cultural values among third-world peoples(such as the profit motive to make them entrepreneurial), development required Westernizing elites, or some kind of education in capitalist values . On the other hand, they had consent that underdevelopment was an initialstate.

In this context, the role of West could significantly assist to speed up the process of development in the third world by sharing its capital and know-how so that to bring these countries could be brought into the modern age of capitalism and liberal democracy (Apter, 1965). The subjective opinions, biases, and judgments of behaviorists influenced scientific method in their study of human behavior and society. Specifically, modernization theory was being criticized due to reflection of optimism and idealism of their time. One of the major shortcomings was that Modernization theory was it could not easily accept that the third world might differ fundamentally from the first world. Despite of resembling of Modernization theory with Structuralism in its emphasis on physical-capital formation, but differed in the view of first-world capitalism and imperialism and the role they played in third-world development. The more radical second generation of structuralism retorted against Modernization Theory and argued that market economies created certain injustices that no amount of state tinkering could rectify and repudiated it, thus, a new theory came into rise in development studies with the divide of left-right known as Dependency theory (Rapley,2007).

8.2 Dependency Theory

The Political Economy of Growth, written by Paul Baran in the 1950s give rise to Dependency theory and argued against the claim of Modernization theorists that the first world guide third-world development through aid, investment. The first world actually hindered the emergence of the third world from poverty and uttered that Imperialism had not exported capitalism to the third world; rather, it had drained the colonies of the resources that could have been used for investment, and had killed off local capitalism through competition (Baran, 1957). Andre Gunder and Frank later sharpened Baran's analysis and pointed out that by siphoning surplus away from the third world, the first world had enriched itself (Frank, 1967). By keeping the third world underdeveloped, the ruling bourgeoisies of the first world ensured a ready market for their finished goods and a cheap supply of raw materials for their factories. The alliances of capitalist states of the first world with the dependent bourgeoisies were able to thwart the development of the third world. This latter class benefited from its dependence by earning its revenue on the export market and spending its profits on imported luxury goods. A national industrialization strategy would threaten the well-being of the members of the dependent bourgeoisie, because it would entail heavy taxes on their income blocking their access to cherished luxury goods and privileged position. The concept of "planter bourgeoisie" which explain the underdevelopment of entire third world was termed by two scholars, Frank and Samir Amin, who were working thousands of miles apart, in USA and Cote d'Ivoire respectively, but reached similar conclusions which exemplifies that these bourgeoisie evinced little interest in development and was content to be a parasite living off the avails of foreign capital.

Moreover, early versions of dependency theory purported that third-world countries would remain locked into classical dependence and would be apprehended in the cycle of producing primary goods and importing finished goods. Although, some of the Third-world countries such as Brazil and Argentina change their structure of production via industrial development, this development would not free third-world countries from their dependence. Because industrialization in the third world itself emerged from the first world who were seeking access to third-world's cheap labor market. Intentionally, first world export capital intensive assembly plants but none of their research and development capacity. Thus, third-world industry would be based on second-generation production technology and still would be owned by foreigners who processed imported inputs and created few jobs or linkages to other producers in the economy. In addition, the drain of foreign-currency reserves would be worsened as foreign companies sent their profits back home. This would compel the host country to export more primary goods for earning foreign currency to balance-of-payments deficits. In the meanwhile, health of the economy of Third world countries continue to rest onexports of primary goods and most of a dependent country's population can taste only few of the fruits of growth.

Major arguments of Dependency theory can be summarized as follow: (i) As long as third-world economies were linked to the first world, they could never break free of their dependence and poverty; (ii) Third world countries had to sever their ties to the world economy and become more self-sufficient with autonomous national development strategies; (iii) The second hand economic development would bring little social development.

Dependency theorists' place their faith in the state as the motor for development which could crush the domination of the parasitic local bourgeoisie and engineer a development strategy that was in the national interest rather than in the interest of a single class. In the end, dependency theory proved to be of less practical import than structuralism. Its recipe for development was applied briefly in Chile under Salvador Allende and in Jamaica under Michael Manley. Structuralism, on the other hand, influenced policymakers all over the third world. Dependency theory became popular on the left at the same time neoclassical theory reappeared on the right (Rapley, 2007).

8.3 Statism in the Third World

In post-World War II, Keynesianism and Structuralism came into rise and persuaded state intervention in economies all over the world till 1980. These statist theories took the form of generous welfare legislation, nationalization of private industries, and immense public programs in the First world, whereas it took the form of legislation to nurture emerging industries and to create public in Third world. As argued by Brett (1985), Colonialism left behind only few immature capitalist and Third world's economy could not rely solely on the private sector. Consequently, state played an obvious agent for economic and social transformation. The costs of establishing a new industrial venture in newly independent third world countries were estimated enormously higher in relative terms as compared to the early days of the Industrial Revolution (Bairoch, 1964). In this case third world had three options; to cut the national economy off from the world economy known as *Autarky;* to attract foreign companies with the necessary capital to build up the industrial sector; and to use the state to accumulate the necessary resources through taxation, borrowing, or control of the marketing of primary products. Autarky being popular in theory than in practice was not feasible in globalization era. In the 20thcentury, the chief experiments in autarky occurred in Albania in the later years of the Enver Hoxha regime (1945-1985), and in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge (1975-1979) but both of them failed and had to bear huge economic crisis.

The more pragmatic paradigm of development for third world was the logic of comparative advantage that makes foreign trade an essential component in rapid economic growth. This was the idea borrowed from economic theory where a a country enjoys a comparative advantage over another in the production of a good if it can produce it at a lower opportunity cost, that is, if it has to forgo less of other goods to produce it. It would be extremely costly for a country to satisfy all its own needs rather specializes in the production of a few goods in which it enjoys a comparative advantage, and relies on imports to satisfy the other needs. Most third-world governments opted for development strategies that blended the other two approaches and exploited comparative advantages instead of autarky. They sought to build up industry by mobilizing foreign and state investment, finding the revenue they needed for state investment through the sale of traditional exports. The strategy they adopted is known as import substitution industrialization. The logic underlying import substitution industrialization is that a country has to restrict imports of the goods by way of tariffs-taxes or of non tariff barriers such as quotas, content regulations, and quality controls in order to produce finished goods by itself which were earlier being imported in the cost of exporting primary goods. This immensely supports local investors to compete with foreign suppliers. But the challenges remain in relatively small domestic production which would not take advantage of economies of scale as compared to the foreign competition.

However, administratively inflated prices of imports and licensing schemes to limit the number of firms could guarantee of profit. In addition, many third-world governments go still further to encourage investment, offering firms access to foreign exchange at concessionary rates by overvaluing their currencies, thus allowing local firms to import inputs at artificially reduced prices. Governments can further accelerate the industrialization process by offering firms subsidies and cheap credit which would be covered up through taxing primary exporters and by establishing marketing boards that pay local producers less than the world price for their goods helps in pocketing the difference once they sell the product on the world market. Governments realized the greater savings from this strategy and later several countries have used this strategy of rural-urban transfer to build up their savings pool. Import substitution industrialization become one of the twentieth century's boldest and most wide spread economic experiments in Third world countries (Rapley, 2007).

8.4 Globalization for Development: Rhetoric or Reality?

Development discourse has widespread discussion on the topic of globalization. Argument continues whether globalization has left positive or negative impact on development. Globalization also being a western centric concept has shown both prospects and challenges for effective implementation of development agendas. Like development, globalization also does not have a common agreeable definition as it is considered as change in diverse aspects under different studies. For economists, it is about integrated economic activities and business opportunities on the global plane. From cultural perspective, globalization may be perceived as a spread of cultural practices from certain dominant places to others. Anthropologists on the other hand try to conceptualize globalization in the broad sweep of human history and the diversity of human-environment relations Zafarrulah & Huque2012).

Globalization ranges from the issues of trade and services, movement of capital, growth and poverty of the world population, international migration to easier transportation and communication around the world. It is a complex process that affects many lives and above all, increased economic interdependence among countries. Similarly, for World Bank (2000) explains globalization is not only the global circulation of goods, services and capital, but also of information, ideas and people. Correspondingly, IMF (2000) summarizes globalization as increasing integration of economics around the world, particularly through the movement of goods, services, and capital across border and also the movement of people (labor) and knowledge (technology) across international borders. Collier and Dollar (2002) analyze globalization as the growing integration of economies and societies around the world. In 2000, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified four basic aspects of globalization: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people, and the dissemination of knowledge (IMF, 2000).

After the end of World War II, cold war had begun, divided into ideology of capitalism and communism in United States and Soviet Union respectively. Decolonized states were striving for development. Hence, each of the superpowers either accepting capitalism or communism started providing development aid and technical assistance along with earlier colonial rulers. Developing countries had to determine their social, political and economic life on the basis of their donors who favored either capitalism or communism. However, there remains a huge dilemma about which regime, authoritarian or democratic, is best for development.

Authoritarian regimes (influenced with communism) brought development for some countries like China, Korea, Taiwan and Singapore and also the democratic regime (influenced with capitalism) also provided development in some countries like India (Zafarullah & Huque,2012). However, our concern here is whether globalization has reduced poverty or adversely affected it, specifically in developing world. Some studies reveals globalization has adversely affected poverty in South Asia. Although, economic growth has surged after globalization in South Asia but there is clearly distinguished inequality among rich and poor. A study in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India suggests that liberalization i.e. one of the facet of globalization was more rapid in India and Bangladesh and slow in Bangladesh and Pakistan.

However, all four countries are liberalized to a huge extent. They all suffer from poverty and inequality. Several authors have suggested that trade (i.e. phenomenon of liberalization) is not the major determinant of growing poverty inequality in South Asia because rich people are buying the imports rather than poor. There are other factors as well which determine growing inequality such as reduction of remittance in Pakistan led to increase in absolute and relative poverty in 1990s. That is why, due to lack of sufficient data, explicit idea of globalization, income measurements etc. it is perplexing whether globalization has positively addressed the issue of poverty or actually led to poverty and inequality in South Asia (Round & Whalley, 2002).

8.5 Development versus Growth (in Economics)

Development issues are complex and multifaceted. There is no one single pathway for economic development that all countries can pursue. In the long term, the economic development process requires changes in policies to account for new emerging factors and trends. Designing these economic development policies also need to take into consideration the social, cultural, political systems and institutions as well as their changing interaction over time in a country. Development strategies have changed remarkably over the past half century. Classical economists often see underdevelopment as having a single cause but history has demonstrated that focusing on one single factor alone cannot guarantee success in the development process. Capital formation is necessary but not sufficient. Structural change models that promoted industry but neglected agriculture bring merely the gross growth but did not bring the expected development (Dang and Sui, 2015).

The overview on the different development models portrays confronting ideas. The international dependence models pursued an inward-looking model of development that promoted state-run production whereas, the neoclassical free market counter-revolution is a different strand of thought that supported the role of the free market, privatization and export expansion.

However, the contemporary models of development see the government and the market as complements, in which a certain extent of government intervention is required to ensure that desirable outcomes can be achieved in the presence of related market failures. Although the ultimate goal of ***Economic Development*** goes beyond the growth of gross income (GDP, GNP or GNI) per capita, an understanding of the sources of ***economic growth*** is essential to achieve other objectives. Development is about economic growth as well as organizational change (Hoff and Stiglitz, 2000). Without growth, the change is unlikely to occur, since a country needs resources to realize other long-term objectives. ***Growth*** and change will thus continue to be central to any ***Development*** strategy.

8.6 UN Concept of Development in a Temporal Perspective

The UN Charter contains extensive provisions on international economic and social cooperation. Solving economic and social problems was recognized as an important element of peace and included among the purposes of the UN. The economic and financial decision making was shouldered by IMF, the World Bank and later to GATT (today the WTO). Nevertheless, from its early days the UN has established various funds for the improvement and growth in the underdeveloped areas, specifically focused on the funding of growth. In 1965, the two funds merged into what became the UN Development Program (UNDP). The funding capacity has grown over time and represents a standard feature of UN's role in development. Additional resources for development-related projects are provided by a host of other funds, programs and agencies of the UN system. The second important feature of the UN's work in the field of development is conceptual, that means, about the meaning of development beyond GDP growth. The answers to this fundamental question have been changing over time and have become ever more complex (Turk, 2014).

In the 1960s and 1970s the General Assembly adopted two UN development strategies with the slogan 'Trade not Aid' which became prominent at that time. In the mid-1970s a 'New International Economic order' was proposed as an attempt to focus development debate and practice on the needs of the Global South and to change international economic relations in the direction of redistributing the benefits of growth. However, the effort of the developing world to put forward a workable agenda of international economic restructuring did not and could not succeed. Instead, the main economic powers strengthened the instruments of the global market model of development and many of the countries of the Global South ended in the 1980s with adjustment programs formulated by the IMF (Turk, 2014).

Towards the end of the Cold War, the hardships posed by policies of austerity and structural adjustment generated a critique based mainly on ethical grounds. The examples of this ethically based approach include the concept of 'adjustment with a human face' proposed by UNICEF, human rights based concept of the 'right to development' and UNDP's work on 'human development reports', and were the most visible expressions of this reaction of the UN at the end of the1980s and the beginning of the1990s. The post-Cold War period opened a new chapter in the efforts to conceptualize the idea of development. The UN organized a series of global conferences on various aspects of development that defined the problems and set the goals of international cooperation as well as programs of action in areas such as environment, social development, the role and position of women in development, human settlements, population and human rights (Turk, 2014).

The creation of Human Development Reports (HDR) was another milestone paved by Mahbub ul Haq under the sponsorship of the United Nations Development Program with the universal and multidimensional objectives of global development. This initiative was underpinned with strong philosophy from Amartya Sen, who earlier had analyzed development in terms of strengthening human capabilities and expanding people's choices. The 2000 report on Human Development and Human Rights analyzed the links between them, especially what human development adds to human rights and what human rights adds to human development. The advent of the new millennium provided fertile ground for a much broader and multidimensional approach to development to take hold (Santos and Jolly, 2016).

In the beginning of new millennium, UN conferences gave a new thrust and substance to international development. They continue to represent the basis for all subsequent discussions on the concept of development. In the year 2000, the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan proposed a set of MDGs under the inspiring influence of the UN Millennium Declaration. These goals were based on the extensive work done through the development conferences of the preceding decade. They are therefore based on serious and solid work. The tasks set out in the MDGs were devoted to the reduction of extreme poverty, improvement of basic conditions of health and education, improvement of maternal health and reduction of child mortality, as well as ensuring environmental sustainability. The MDGs generated a variety of useful activities by governments, development agencies, private sector, NGOs, and the academic institutions. It is important to understand the emergence of the MDGs in their historical perspective and is not an arbitrary proposal but a result of distillation of several decades of development work and a realistic framework for both national policymaking and the international development cooperation in the future. The results achieved since the adoption of MDGs confirm this assessment. The UN report in June 2013 claims that the last 13 years since the proclamation of the MDGs have seen the fastest reduction of extreme poverty in human history: there are half a billion fewer people living below the international poverty line of 1,25 $ a day. Substantial improvement is reported in such areas as reduction of the levels of child mortality and death from malaria. On the basis of such encouraging assessments of the progress so far, the Panel recommended an ambitious program for the implementation of new development goals (*Sustainable Development Goals*) with the central objective of eradicating extreme poverty from the face of earth by 2030. UN reports tries to propose a realistic and ambitious vision of development together with an array of policy choices that should help in the decision-making (Turk, 2014).

As 2015 approached, it was clear that the MDGs had achieved considerable progress and governments along with a vast number of civil society groups became engaged in the formulation of what should follow. In spite of several inadequacies, the MDGs achieved sustained global attention in the form of SDGS and adopted by governments at the UN in September 2015. Institute of Development Studies (IDS) was often involved at the country level in helping to critically review progress. The SDGs are universal, applying to all countries. They have been assembled through an extraordinary process of participation, country by country, often with strong civil society participation, in countries of the South as well as in the North. In their diversity and multiplication, the new SDGs appear to have answered concerns of representation. They are the first global set of policies to have truly been originated from the contributions of multiple actors, stepping beyond the 'ivory towers' of 'developed' countries wisdom or top-down UN leadership. These are major virtues far outweighing their oft-derided number: 17 goals, 169 targets and 304 indicators. As each country is required to adapt the goals to their own situation and set national priorities – in consultation with civil society organizations – these seem narrow criticisms, compared to the remarkable achievement of all the nations formally agreeing on goals and targets for future development (Santos and Jolly, 2016).

8.7 Does the Western Idea of Development help Developing Countries?

The western concept of development has lead to many changes in national and international scenarios (Zafarullah & Haque, 2012). For example, policy makers worldwide, particularly from developing countries are obliged to reshape national development policies in line with its dominant premises. Similarly international donors have changed their stance in relation to development aid to comply with its principle tenets and forced aid-recipient countries to restructure their economies, reform governance methods, reorient state institutions and adopt market centered strategies. They further mention this globalization phenomena has also change the attitude of Parties and Politician of democratic and other polities. In a similar vein, Cammack and Tordoff (1993) argue that externally imposed economic development strategies influenced by neoliberal ideas challenged national sovereignty.

The data from some studies reveals that development models of western tenets have adverse effect in South Asia. Although, economic growth has surged in South Asia but there is clearly distinguished inequality among rich and poor. A study in Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India suggests that liberalization i.e. one of the western concept of development was more rapid in India and Sri Lanka and slow in Bangladesh and Pakistan. However, all four countries are liberalized to a huge extent. They all suffer from poverty and inequality (Round & Whalley, 2002).

The transformation of the development from one country to another by transfer of technology and investment from developed north to the developing south which would help in development of south. The stage of growth is the model Rostow has developed to show how the countries passes to modernization through different stages he has developed five stages through which each countries passes for the economic modernization of any nation, those are: *The traditional society*; *The precondition for take-off*; *Take-off*; *Drive to maturity*; and *Age of high mass consumption*. In addition, Rostow states that each country passes through these stages linearly and set out the conditions likely to occur in terms of investment, consumption and social trends at each state (Rostow, 1966. However it is not certain that all developing countries, especially those from South Asia would follow the same trend. This has been strongly verified that even after the seven decades of being free from colonization, South Asian countries could gain laudable economic achievement or as per the concept of development.

If we scrutinize the whole concept of development after WW II, the West or the global North has been emphasizing ***Development*** as equivalent to ***Growth,*** mostly in terms of economy. Furthermore, they are preaching those models of development which are merely based on idea of economic growth rather than whole concept of development. It is a paradox that despite of the fact, one size does not fits all; developed countries are imposing their pre-set idea of development in the name of Aid and Grant in developing countries. On the other hand, development of any country is measured on the numbers and counts such as GNP, GDP which are merely the variables of measuring the economic growth. There are many scholars who doubt that the real development can be measured in figures or numbers. Also it doesn't ensure that the fruits of development are tasted by all citizens in a country.

There is a distinction between development and growth, as argued by Sen (1988), since a number of different sources of contrast have to be clearly distinguished from each other. First of all, insofar as economic growth is concerned only with GNP per head (which can be expanded), it leaves out the question of the distribution of that GNP among the population (which becomes more unequal along with time). Another difference between growth and development relates to the question of externality and non-marketability. The GNP captures only those means of well-being that happen to be transacted in the market, and this leaves out benefits and costs that do not have a price-tag attached to them such as the environment and natural resources for our well-being. The argument can be applied to the social environment as well as to the physicalone.

Similarly, the information provided by GNP is fundamentally inadequate for the concept of development because development is obscured by the GNP information. There are difficult evaluative problems in judging what the "trade-off' should be between quantity and quality of achievements in the development process. The concept of development has to take note of the actual achievements rather than the matter only of quantification of the means of that achievement. The assessment of development has to go well beyond GNP information (Sen, 1988).

9. Conclusion

Development is a multi-dimensional process involving reorganization and reorientation of entire economic as well as social system. So, development is not purely an economic phenomenon rather it is a process of improving the quality of all human lives. The dimension of development is very much diversified which includes economic, social, political, legal & institutional structures, technology in various forms, the environment, religion, the arts, and culture. There are mainly three distinct conceptualizations of development: Development as a long term process of structural societal transformation; Development as short-to-medium term outcomes and desirable targets; and Development as a dominant discourse of western modernity. There is no doubt that development itself is a western centric concept. The discourse of development made it possible for the European powers to continue the colonial domination by using the language of development. In colonial period, power was centralized and had their own agenda in social, economic and political matter and forms of capitalism were introduced and development were mainly concentrated in urban centers. Efforts at industrialization were uneven and sporadic. Natural resources were unilaterally exploited by artificially created controlled mechanism.

Later on, in post-World War II period many countries freed from colonial rule. The goal of development was to raise income and give poor nations access to basic necessities. Institutional apparatus was established (e.g. World Bank, IMF) in order to channel material aid and the ideology associated with development to these countries. This ideology repeats the basic 'truth' of Enlightenment that progress is the achievement of characteristic features of the already rich societies in the West. Consequently, in the post-colonial era these institutional apparatus became the centers of power-knowledge production and also the source of channeling them to the societies outside the West. The activities of these international financial are blamed to have been mechanized to work as per the policy of limited developed countries and scholar such as Joseph Stiglitz potray severely criticizes these organizations. Various development theories were proposed by the western thinkers in post war period such as Modernization Theory, Dependency Theory, Statism, etc. Modernization Theory was argued for creating certain injustices (for developing countries) by market economies.

Dependency theory argued that the first world guides third-world development through aid, investment. However, it was criticized for draining the colonies of their sources that could have been used for investment, and had killed off local capitalism through competition. That means, by siphoning surplus away from the third world, the first world had enriched itself and by keeping the third world underdeveloped the first world ensured a ready market for their finished goods and a cheap supply of raw materials for their factories. The conclusion drawn from dependency theory was that Third world countries had to sever their ties to the world economy and become more self-sufficient with autonomous national development strategies. Thus, the faith in the state as the motor for development came in light.

Some argue that globalization is a western concept that has lead to the development of the economy but at the same time there is counter argument that it has lead to enhance the gap between poor and rich, means increasing disparity. There is harsh criticism that globalization has been galvanized by developed countries (North) in their own favor and has used by them as a weapon for expanding their imperialism and neo-colonialism to the developing countries (South). The concept of development has changed drastically with the change in time. At present world, development is not limited to the sphere of economic prosperity. It demands the greater dimension of social inclusion, equality, ecological conservation, human rights and sustainability. Developing countries need to stand rigidly in formation of their own indigenous policies. These countries need to be careful enough to commercialize their agriculture even through continuous government subsidy, develop rural infrastructure and build Industrial backbone and adopting globalization principles in selective manner. The most essential step for them is the real transformation of regionalism in practice. These countries can only improve their bargaining capability by standing together emphasizing on regional trade and development.

References

Apter, D.E. (1965).The Politics of Modernization, University of Chicago Press.

Bairoch, P. (1964). Revolution industrielle et sous-developpement, Paris:SEDES, p. 198. Banda, R.M.R. (2004). *Development Discourse and the Third World*, Proceedings of the

Second Academic Sessions, Available at: http://www.ruh.ac.lk/research/academic_sessions/2004_mergepdf/98-103.PDF [Accessed on 16th November, 2020]

Baran, P. (1957). The Political Economy of Growth, New York: Monthly Review.

Cammack, P. and Tordoff, W. (1993). *Third World Politics: A Comparative Introduction*, 3rd edition, Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

Chiriyankandath, J. (2007). *Colonialism and post-colonial development*, Politics in the developing world, 2nd edition. Oxford university press, PP. 35-52.

Collier P, Dollar D. (2002). *Globalization, growth, and poverty: Building an inclusive world economy*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Corbridge, S. Ed. (1995). *Development Studies: A Reader*. London: Arnold, pg: 383–392. Cowen, M. and Shenton, R. (1998). *Doctorines of Development*. London, Routledge.

Dang, G. and Sui P.L. (2015). *Infrastructure Investments in Developing Economies*, Springer Science+Business Media, Singapore.

Edelman. M. and Haugerud. A., eds. (2005). *Introudciton: The anthrolpology and development of globalization,* The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism, Oxford: Blackwell. Available at: https://direitosehumanos.files. wordpress.com/2011/02/development_globalization2.pdf [Accessed on 19th November,2020].

Escobar, A. (1992). *Planning*, The Development Dictionary edited by Sachs, W., Zed Books, London, 2nd edition, pg: 145-160.

Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Frank, A.G. (1967).*Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, NewYork: Monthly Review.

Gore, C. (2000). *The Rise and Fall of the Washington Consensus as a Paradigm of Developing Countries*, World Development, Vol. 28 (5), pg: 789-804. Available at: http://www.gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp/sotsubo/gore. pdf [Accessed on 14th November, 2016].

Havinden, M. and Meredith, D. (1993). Colonialism and Development: Britain and in Tropical Colonies, 1850-1960. London: Routledge.

Hicky, S. and Mohan, G. (2003). *Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development: Citizenship and Critical Modernism*. Working Paper for conference on 'Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring new approaches to participation in development', 27-28 February 2003, University of Manchester, Manchester.

Hoff, K., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2000). *Modern economic theory and development*. Frontiers of development economics: The future in perspective (pp. 389–485). Washington, D.C.: World Bank/Oxford University Press.

International Monetary Fund. (2000). *Globalization: Threats or Opportunity,* IMF Publication. Available at:

https://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200to.htm [Accessed on 15th November, 2019].

Nayyar, D. (2006). *Development through Globalization?* Research Paper No. 2006/29, United Nations University- World Institute for Development Economics Research (UN-WIDER). Available at: http://www.rrojasdatabank.info/rp2006-29.pdf [Accessed on 13th November, 2019].

Rapley, J. (2007). *Development Theory in Post War Period*, Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in Third World, 3rd Edition, Lynne Reinner Publishers, Colorado.

Rostow, WW. (1966). *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge University Press.

Round J. & Whalley J. (2002). *Globalization and Poverty: Implications of South Asian Experience for the Wider Debate*, ESCOR project, UK. Available at http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/apcity/unpan015802.pdf [Accessed on 20th November, 2020].

Santos, R. and Jolly, R. (2016). *From Development of the 'Other' to Global Governance for Universal and Sustainable Development*, Development Studies – Past, Present And Future, IDS Bulletin, Vol. 47 (2), pg: 13-32.

Sen, A. (1988). *Handbook of Development Economics*, Edited by H. Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan, Volume 1, pg: 10-24, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.

Smith, B. C. (2003). *Understanding the Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change and Development*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sumner (2008). *What is Development?* International Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice, Sage Publications. Available at: http://uk.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upminaries/18296_5070_Sumner_Ch01.pdf [Accessed on 12th November, 2018].

Thomas, A. (2004). *The Study of Development,* Paper prepared for DSA Annual Conference, 6th Nov, Church House, London.

Torado, M.P (1990). *Economics for Development World*, London, Longman.

Turk, D. (2014). *The UN Concept of Development and the Vision of Shared Societies*. Development 57(1): Thematic Section, pg: 19-24.

Turner, M. and Hulme, D. (1997). *Development and its Administration, Governance, Administration & Development: Making the State Work*, Palgrave McMillan.

World Bank (2000), Poverty in an Age of Globalization, Available at: http://www.sph.umich.edu/symposium/2004/pdf/povertyglobalization.pdf [Accessed on 20th November, 2020].

Zafarrulah, H. and Huque, A.S. (2012). *Managing Development in a Globalized World: Concepts, Processes, Institutions*, CRC Press / Taylor and Francis Group, Boca Raton,FA.