

Understanding Development

An Overview of the History, Theory, and Consequences of International
Development

Clara R. Atwell

Social Sciences Department

GEOG 408: Geography of International Development

Dr. Ben F. Timms

March 17, 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
I. Overview of Colonialism and Measuring Development.....	5
II. Classical and Neo-Liberal Development, Including Debt	11
III. Structuralist, Neo-Marxist, and Socialist Theories	18
IV. Grassroots Development and Social and Cultural Factors	24
V. Environment and Development	30
VI. Globalization, Post-Development, and Alternatives	37
Conclusion	44
References	46

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

The word development evokes ideas of progress, growth, expansion, capitalism, education, and help. However, like the term development itself, all these words carry the nuanced weight of a history and a knowledge base defined by Western systems of power. Defining the word Development beyond its colloquial use requires a deeper understanding of the history and theory behind it, as well as the impacts international development efforts have had on peripheral countries. Because these impacts are relative to everyone in the so-called developing world, development must be viewed as more than a monolithic force of ‘progress.’

Eric Sheppard echoes this in the 2009 book *Knowing the Third World*:

“What we take to be knowledge is shaped by the power of a particular discourse, and of those who hold it, to shape how we think. In order to get a critical perspective on current norms about development and the third world, it is necessary to try to reconstruct struggles between differently situated knowledges out of which our consensus has emerged, (Sheppard 2009, 54).

A historical background of development builds a base to unlearn colonial systems of thought through critically questioning why the Global North and South look the way they do. The disparities in opportunities that exist between these two regions are so often taken as a given without a second thought of the implications this breakdown of the world carries. The Global South is made of former colonies and the North is comprised of former colonizers. Every breakdown of countries’ ‘level of development’ echoes this history. Colonizers put extensive limits on manufacturing in colonies, limiting their ability to accumulate capital. After WWII, this control continued through economic exploitation of countries land and people by promoting

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Western Capitalist interest abroad, most notably through neo-liberalism, but also with industrialization by invite -- Sir Arthur Lewis in the 1950s. The capitalist mentality has also bled into the private sector of development in the way many NGOs do their work. NGOs are often obliged towards meeting the progress goals as defined by their Western donors and boards. Furthermore, every macro-level shift in approaches to development has a micro level impact on individual's lives and livelihoods. This impact is personal and varies depending on cultural, environmental, political, and social factors.

This paper provides a brief introduction to these complexities of international development through providing a historical base of Western capitalist development, introducing alternative economic systems, perspectives, and means of development, and finally addressing the future of development. This discussion is broken down into six sections: an overview of colonialism and measuring development; classical and neo-liberal development, including debt; structuralist, neo-Marxist, and socialist theories; grassroots development and social and cultural factors; environment and development; and globalization, post-development, and alternatives.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

I. Overview of Colonialism and Measuring Development

Understanding international development necessitates an understanding of colonialism in both a historic and modern context. Periphery countries ‘in need of development’ share a common history of European colonialism and exploitation of native and enslaved people and land. As Willis notes in *Theories and Practices of Development (2011)*, this shared colonial history has significantly contributed to globalization, developed a power structure in which core states are reliant upon the exploitation of periphery states for their economic success and political power, and has shifted the infrastructure of cultural, economic, and political systems. This section will address these outcomes of development along with their implications for modern measurements of development.

Willis breaks colonialism into three main periods. The first began with Columbus's 1492 expedition and focused on Spanish and Portuguese mercantilist wealth accumulation in the Caribbean and Latin America. The second stage began in the 1600s and was led by the Dutch and British whose primary goal was to establish manufacturing colonies. These colonies were concentrated in North America and South-East Asia. The final stage, ‘the scramble for Africa,’ followed the 1884-1885 Berlin conference in which the British, French, Belgians, Portuguese, and Germans haphazardly divided up the continent of Africa into colonial states. This colonization was aided by the invention of antimalarial drugs in the 1850s. The great wealth gained from colonialism triggered the rapid industrialization of Western Europe and global capitalism. Since its roots in colonialism, the success of Western Capitalism has continued to necessitate the exploitation of periphery countries’ environmental resources and populations.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

The significance of this exploitation is clearly demonstrated by Galeano's *the Thirteen Northern Colonies and the Importance of Not Being Born Important*. Galeano argues that the lack of highly valuable natural resources in the thirteen North American Colonies allowed them to build a manufacturing economy, while Latin American and Caribbean colonial economies were restricted to the production of raw materials. The natural resources in this region including gold, silver, and tropical soils were so valuable to colonizers that all labor time was devoted to primary production, and manufacturing was banned. "A small Caribbean Island had more economic importance for England than the thirteen colonies that would become the United States," (Galeano 1973, 3). This resulted in the emergence of vastly different colonial systems in these respective regions. North American colonists came as settlers searching for a new way of life, they were encouraged to be entrepreneurial and to own land, or in the case of the 1862 homestead act were given land by the state outright (Galeano 1973, 1). This allowed for capital accumulation and investment in industrialization over time. In contrast, the laborers in the Caribbean and Latin America were subjugated under European control. European elites, who were often absent from the colonies, were the sole proprietors of land in Latin America in the form of Latifundios. The wealth gained from the enslaved labor working this land directly fueled the industrialization of Europe. Meanwhile, the laborers of these southern colonies became dependent on their mother countries for their basic needs. In sum, the success of the American colonies can be attributed to the fact that "New England colonists ... never acted as colonial agents for European capitalist accumulation," (Galeano 1973, 2).

In the early nineteenth century, Spanish and Portuguese influence in Latin America began to break down, and by the 1820s many of the colonies gained independence. However, it wasn't

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

until after World War Two that the vast majority of the colonial system collapsed. In the 1950s decolonization occurred due to a combination of the failure of many European economies after the war, calls for independence within colonies, and pushes from the Soviet Union and the United States, who were seeking to spread their international interests. The effectiveness of the United States' economic reconstruction effort in Western Europe through the European Recovery Program (Marshall plan) in 1948 along with Truman's inaugural address in 1949 led to the birth of the age of international development.

As Sheppard notes in *Knowing the third World: Colonial Encounters*, the discourse surrounding international development has been largely, if not entirely, shaped by Western thought and the expectation "that nations should copy the practices of wealthier [therefore Western] societies in order to 'catch up' with their development achievements" (Sheppard 2009, 54). This concept of a unilinear development path dates to Enlightenment thought when many Europeans were first interacting with indigenous groups in North America. It is entrenched in ethnocentrism and ignorance of the long-term impact of colonial exploitation. Nevertheless, this understanding of development as a linear process has translated into the measurement of development using primarily Gross National Product (GDP), a measure of a country's economic productivity.

GDP is an inaccurate measure of development for a myriad of reasons. First, it enables an environmental deterministic view among capitalist economists that disregards the impact of colonialism. This outlook is clearly displayed in Sachs's *Geography of Poverty* (2001). Deconstructing Sachs's with justice could take up a very long paper of its own. This deconstruction will focus specifically on his agricultural argument. Sachs states that countries

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

with coastal access and temperate climates have the highest GDPs as a result of their geographies. Put simply, success in farming major grains has allowed for population growth and investment in new sectors of the economy. While, lack of natural resources, poor agricultural conditions, no port access, and disease do pose a significant barrier to a state's agricultural production and trade, this simplistic and frankly inaccurate view of the root of poverty. Europeans colonized many of the regions Sachs discusses because of how agriculturally productive tropical soils are. Poor soil conditions that exist in many, not all, tropical southern hemisphere countries today can be attributed to unsustainable colonial farming practices. Furthermore, these states did not have the opportunity to invest in economic diversification because laborers, non-Europeans, were restricted from both owning land and engaging in the secondary economic sector. Furthermore, the money earned from plantation agriculture in the southern hemisphere was not invested into those economies, it went straight to Europe's development. Low GDPs in periphery countries did not result from geographic factors alone, they are a product of colonialism. The same goes for high GDPs in the Western European and North American core.

A second critique to using GDP as a measure of development is that GDP does not correlate with well-being. As Costanza notes in *Time to Leave GDP Behind*, although GDP/Gross National Income (GNI) are good indicators of well-being in a country to an extent, infinite economic growth and mass consumption do not correlate with societal equality, sustainability, or contentment. GDP rises with expenditures on natural disasters, war, security for increased crime, and oil spills, wellbeing does not (Costanza 2014, 285). As a result of this, many alternative development measurements have gained popularity.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

The Gini Coefficient measures inequality as a ratio between wealth held by the rich versus the poor. Unsurprisingly, former Soviet states have the lowest rates of economic inequality. In contrast, the United States, the country with the highest GDP, ranks closely behind Haiti, Iran, and Senegal in the Gini Coefficient. The UN's Human Development Index (HDI) attempts to combine factors beyond GDP to measure development. HDI indicates a combination of a country's health through life expectancy, education through both mean and expected years of schooling, and standard of living through GDP. Although this provides a more comprehensive approach to measuring development than GDP, it still relies upon Western measures of success. Bhutan's adoption of Gross National Happiness (GNH) provides a fascinating alternative to this. Based on Buddhist values GNH still uses standards of HDI but incorporates values of ecological and social well-being through attempting to measure happiness. Costa Rica, a country that defunded the military after the Second World War and instead invested in the education of its people, is the happiest place on Earth according to this index (Kirstof, 2010). The education of its people has contributed to lower rates of conflict, significant economic growth, environmental preservation, and gender equality. Costa Rica's push to develop on its own terms has resulted in significant increases in its citizen's wellbeing.

In sum, the global inequalities we see today reflected in GDP, health, and education are direct reflections of colonialism's exploitation of non-Western nations. Since World War Two, this colonial legacy has shaped the Western push for international development. Unilinear models of development like GDP have caused the development narrative to focus on societies of mass-consumerism as the pinnacle of societal progress. This outlook, rooted in ethnocentrism,

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

has led to new development measurements including, but not limited to, the Gini Coefficient, HDI, and GNH.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

I. Classical and Neo-Liberal Development, Including Debt

Development theory has long been shaped by Western economic theory and interests. This section will review the history of classical economics, Keynesian, and post-World-War-Two economic thought, along with how these theories influenced multilateral organizations and policy within the international development sector.

Adam Smith's theory of capitalist economics developed in response to growing access to foreign economies, industrialization, and Mercantilism, the economic system that dominated the West between the 16th to 18th centuries (Timms 2008, 102). Mercantilism focused on building a positive trade balance through the mass accumulation of bullion from overseas colonies and the protection of domestic industries. Smith's Laissez-faire Capitalism grew out of mercantilism and 18th-century British Enlightenment thought which focused on rationality, self-interest, private property, and ownership of labor. These thoughts, compared to the prior feudalist system, were nothing short of radical. Smith's system, as documented in his 1776 book *The Wealth of Nations* focused on pouring energy into production over trade and the division of labor to improve efficiency and boost economic growth. Central to the effectiveness of this system was the decreased role of the government in the economy. Smith argued that this market focused development allowed the 'invisible hand of the market' to regulate supply and demand and meet consumers' needs (Willis 2011, 37). David Ricardo took Smith's division of labor to the global scale throughout his 18th and 19th-century career in developing the concept of comparative advantage. He argued that if each state focused on producing what they are best at, overall production would go up internationally (Willis 2011, 38).

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Guided by these principles, the economies of Europe and North America took off at an unprecedented exponential rate throughout the 19th century. While this growth can certainly be attributed to classical economists' work and the labor of the Western proletariat class, it has deeper roots in land and labor exploitation within colonies. Western production of everything from ships to shirts was dependent on raw materials collected by free labor in the colonies.

In 1929 classical economic theory was challenged by the market crash and the subsequent Great Depression. The economy was built back under Keynesian economic principles. John Keynes theorized that government funding of infrastructure projects would create jobs and jumpstart the economy through the multiplier effect. President Franklin D. Roosevelt famously put this theory into action through the New Deal.

As described in the "Overview of Colonialism and Measuring Development" section, the age of international development began at the end of World War Two. The War's conclusion signaled the end of the colonial era and the emergence of new international organizations to promote economic stabilization and the prevention of communism's spread. Among these organizations were the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (which morphed into the World Bank in 1994). Along with these programs the United States put the European Recovery Plan in place in 1947. This plan, commonly referred to as the Marshall Plan, used Keynesian theory to promote the reconstruction of Europe. The U.S. believed that their assistance in reconstruction would prevent the spread of communism and help promote free trade.

Anticommunism efforts were central to original international development efforts. Walt Rostow's 1960 *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* reflects this.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Rostow split economic growth into five stages, starting with traditional society and ending with high mass consumption as the pinnacle of progress. Eerily similar to Enlightenment-era unilinear cultural evolution, this model viewed Western capitalist development as the only way forward. Rostow neglected to consider that this one size fits all approach to development would not fit the cultural context of many former colonies. Furthermore, a world in which every state is in a state of high mass consumption is impossible. Not only would our planet run out of resources if every state consumed like the United States and Europe, but also, high mass consumption in wealthy countries depends on the exploitation and cheap labor of 'less developed countries.' With no sources to exploit, this level of consumption would be unattainable.

Sir William Arthur Lewis's 1954 article "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour," was one of the first popularized economic theories coming from the Global South. Although Lewis was born in St. Lucia, a country exploited throughout the colonial era, he was educated in classical economics in Britain, and therefore his work fits well into the Capitalist narrative. His theory claimed that the Caribbean had a dual economy split between a small capitalist sector in the cities and a large rural subsistence sector. He argued that this resource-poor region's comparative advantage was their cheap source of labor. Through offering subsistence workers' wages slightly above what they made as farmers and investing in agricultural technology, Lewis believed labor could be moved into the capitalist sector without decreasing productivity. Under this theory, development in the capitalist sector would lead to a greater demand in agriculture increasing wages, consumption, and investment in the economy over time (Timms 2008, 104). Because the Caribbean lacked pre-existing capital, they had to depend on "Industrialization by Invitation" to draw rural populations to the cities. As Timms

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

critiques in the 2008 paper “Development theory and domestic agriculture in the Caribbean: recurring crises and missed opportunities,” this system failed in implementation because of its dependence on wealthy nations’ investment. The agricultural sector was transformed to be export-oriented, meaning that workers’ investment in food went towards the imported goods that filled Caribbean markets (Timms 2008, 105). Furthermore, the industries that relocated to Caribbean nations had no connection to their workers. As a result of this, wages stayed stagnant and when workers demanded more, these factories moved to other newly industrializing regions with cheaper labor.

In the 1960s and 1970s pushbacks against Western development emerged. Through decolonization, the global south had again found itself in a cycle of dependence. Rather than state control, they were under the economic control of Western multinational corporations. Former colonial nations sought out a third way of development beyond the frameworks of capitalism and communism global superpowers were pushing throughout the developing world. These third-way countries are now commonly referred to as third-world countries. Within the Caribbean, this took the form of the Plantation School of Economics which criticized Lewis for imposing a foreign economic model unfit for the Caribbean cultural context and pushed for land distribution and increasing access to education surrounding the use of technology for farmers. Through the Plantation School, the Caribbean Agricultural Research and Development Institute (CARDI) and the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) were founded (Timms 2008, 106). In 1972, Jamaican President Michael Manley took the Plantation School’s vision to heart during his term. Manley invested heavily in the country’s social services and infrastructure to build the domestic economy from the ground up.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Many newly independent countries' leaders followed similar paths of democratic socialism to Manley throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Given the lack of capital in their new domestic markets, they turned to outside loans. Between the end of the Second World War and the early 1970s, the post-war economic boom created perfect low-interest conditions for taking out loans. However, between the 1973 Yom-Kippur War and subsequent steep increase in oil prices, fall of commodity prices in 1979, and recession of 1981 to 1982, these conditions changed quickly. Southern countries whose economies remained dependent on primary sector exports were hit hard by these economic crises as a result of industrialized countries raising import tariffs to protect their domestic markets (Willis 2011, 55). These newly independent countries were no longer able to pay back their loans.

With no other options, these states were forced to turn to the IMF, which gave out short-term loans with strict attached conditions in the form of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). These conditions represented a return to Smith's classical or "liberal" economic thought. They were aimed at the stabilization and adjustment of these economies through what is now known as neoliberalism. To 'stabilize' the economy, countries were forced to devalue their currency, cut back on government expenditures, and freeze wages. These policies were targeted at increasing exports and decreasing imports, which would now be too expensive for locals to afford. To 'adjust' the economy, these states were forced to privatize all public industry, including health care and education, reform their tax system, and open their economy to foreign investment (Willis 2011, 57). In implementing these SAPs, "the IMF went beyond its stated mission of maintaining global economic stability through fiscal' austerity and included conditionalities

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

promoting the ideology of laissez-faire economics through privatization and trade liberalization" (Timms 2008, 107).

The consequences of neoliberalism were devastating. With the rise of import prices and lack of natural resources in many of these countries, there was no longer money to invest in basic economic inputs like oil, books, fertilizer, and factory equipment. Poverty rates skyrocketed, as wages decreased and were forced to stay stagnant, and unemployment rose. Along with this, the cost of living grew with the increase in import prices and the lack of domestic industry. There was no government money available to go to implementing social safety nets to help with this suffering because government funds had to go into paying back these loans. Often governments would have to take out loans to pay back what they had lent out. Nations were and still are, trapped in a permanent cycle of catastrophic debt. Due to the high-interest rates on loans, today many countries that have borrowed from the IMF have paid back far more than they originally lent out. They continue to be unable to invest in the social well-being of their people because of the repayment price, and wealthy countries that had a century-long head start on industrialization continue to outcompete domestic sellers.

Theories of development were born from post-war reconstruction in Europe and the above approaches to economic growth under the assumption that the Western road to development symbolizes the pinnacle of progress. However, these approaches to development imparted by the Western world were remarkably unsuccessful and unfit to the needs of newly industrializing countries. As Stephanie Black's *Life in Debt* and Timms's "Development theory and domestic agriculture in the Caribbean: recurring crises and missed opportunities" note, they

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

were instead built, explicitly or subconsciously, to fit the greedy desires of industrialized countries.

II. Structuralist, Neo-Marxist, and Socialist Theories

Karl Marx, born a century after Adam Smith, was a 19th Century economic philosopher. He proposed that beyond Smith's free-market economics there would be a radical shift in the way power and wealth were distributed in the form of communism. Marx outlines this transition from communism in stages, like Rostow's linear system of development discussed in the previous section. Marx's system contained two stages beyond capitalist mass accumulation: socialism and communism.

Marx began his model of economic progress with pre-capitalism, synonymous with feudalism. According to Willis, Marx characterized pre-capitalist states as irrational and backward (Willis 2011, 72). One could wonder what Marx knew of indigenous "pre-capitalist" systems beyond the Eurocentric views of the likes of Hobbes and Rousseau. Many of these systems were built on reciprocity and communal sharing. From feudalism, states evolved into capitalism, a system in which the former peasant class — the proletariat — must sell their labor for survival. Rather than returning profits of this labor in full, the bourgeoisie, the class that owns the means of production, keeps a portion of the profits. Although Marx is often seen as the antithesis to capitalism, he did believe that this was a necessary stage in the process. Marx argued that the contradictions inherent to the capitalist system will eventually lead to an unstable and deeply unequal economy in which the majority of wealth is held by the bourgeoisie. This extreme inequality will lead to a workers' revolt where the people take over the means of production. This stage necessitates a strong state that can lead the shift into socialism. Marx's final stage is of course communism, a system in which there is communal ownership of property,

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

and everyone works “according to their abilities and is provided with according to their needs” (Willis 2011, 71).

In his work, Marx noted that these stages may function differently outside the European system. This profound realization, for a time in which thought, was so deeply Eurocentric, allowed for adaptations to this system to fit within different geographic contexts. This section aims to outline the impact of Marx in Europe and beyond through exploring Socialist, Neo-Marxist, and Structuralist theories and practices. Most systems that have adopted Marxist thought have not followed or fit into this linear progression at all. However, building a base understanding of the above stages is still essential to understanding Marx. Furthermore, countries' failure to follow these stages demonstrates two things. First, simple economic models whether capitalist, communist, socialist or some mix of these will always fail to capture the diversity of social systems. Second, the countries and individuals that have chosen to adopt Marxist philosophy often represent the proletariat class of the world at large, rather than within a particular country. As Lenin noted in his spatial fix theory, capitalism tends to move its internal inconsistencies around geographically.

No state has yet reached a communist system where the people own the means of production. Rather, the states we think of as communist, such as the USSR and Maoist China have been socialist. In socialist states, the government manages, runs, and plans everything, political power is centralized to one party, and profit doesn't drive the economy. No established socialist states (not including democratic-socialist governments) have followed the linear development process laid out by Marx (Willis 2011, 85). Instead, most of these countries have leaped from a pre-capitalist to socialist governance under a totalitarian leader.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

In the Soviet Union, the transition to a socialist state from a monarchy began under Lenin who centralized the economy to focus on urban production. Under Stalin, who took power in 1929, the state intensified. His brutal leadership is notorious for many cruelties including, but certainly not limited to, deadly prison labor camps, repression, and the Great Famine. This suffering should never be minimized as a means to glorify socialism. However, it is important to note that within the USSR, social services were given based on need as opposed to one's ability to pay. As a result of this, spending on health and education rose significantly after the 1920s, increasing the literacy rate (Willis 2011, 90). Within the general population of the United States, it's difficult to applaud this success of socialism, while condemning the cruelties with the same hatred as any 'good American' without being disregarded as naive. As many young Americans were told: "communism is fantastic on paper. Yet, it has dire social consequences when put into action. Therefore, the inequities of capitalism are necessary, to some degree, to maintain democracy and worker incentive." This view leaves no room for potential benefits of socialist states. It's necessary to understand that socialism allowed the Soviet Union to transform from a peasant state in 1922 to a global superpower by the end of World War Two in 1945. Throughout the Cold War, the USSR competed with the U.S. not only ideologically, but also scientifically, launching Sputnik just 35 years after Lenin took power. In contrast, many states developing under Neoliberalism from the 1980s to today, a period of approximately 40 years, currently spend more on debt repayments than their health or education systems. No system can be viewed through a black and white lens, and true progress cannot be made without understanding the good, the bad, and the ugly of every political system.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

A similar trajectory can be seen within China. Mao focused his rule on rural development, central planning, and discouraged educational progress, forcing intellectuals into the field throughout the Great Leap Forward. By no means can his rule be highlighted for educational progress in the same way as Lenin and Stalin. However, one does have to wonder what elements of Mao's rule set up cultural preconditions that have allowed China to become the second-largest global economy under their post-Mao market socialist government.

Within the post-colonial world, Marxist ideas took a new form. Despite Lenin theorizing that capitalism would end with imperialism, decolonization in no way led to the dissolution of the capitalist structures within these states (Willis 2011, 73). Neo-Marxist theories are grounded on the premise that in focusing on linear development in the European context, classical Marxism neglect experiences outside of Europe. In the 1960s Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy produced the idea of capitalist monopoly to explain this phenomenon. This theory suggests that multinational corporations have allowed for the continued exploitation of the periphery world outside the context of traditional colonialism. Baran and Sweezy argued that the only way for countries to escape this exploitation was through adopting socialist systems (Willis 2011, 73).

Within the post-colonial world, Marxist ideas took a new form. Despite Lenin theorizing that capitalism would end with imperialism, decolonization in no way led to the dissolution of the capitalist structures within these states (Willis 2011, 73). Neo-Marxist theories are grounded on the premise that in focusing on linear development in the European context, classical Marxism neglect experiences outside of Europe. In the 1960s Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy came up with the idea of capitalist monopoly to explain this phenomenon. This theory suggests that multinational corporations have allowed for the continued exploitation of the periphery world

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

outside the context of traditional colonialism. Baran and Sweezy argued that the only way for countries to escape this exploitation was through adopting socialist systems (Willis 2011, 73).

Structuralists, coming from Latin America, similarly critiqued European linear development. However, their approach to development blurred the lines between traditional Marxism and capitalism. The structuralist approach focused on economic growth with respect to a state's cultural and historical context. The UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLA) is the organization associated with the development of structuralism. Raúl Prebisch, the former ECLA secretary, argued that low standards of living and poor economic growth in Latin America and the Caribbean could not be solved through free-market trade (Willis 2011, 74). The Western countries pushing free-market capitalism on the global south had years to develop their own economies with the help of colonialism and low outside competition. In short, the global context of European development was vastly different from that of post-colonial development. Structuralists advocated Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI) and land reform.

ISI refers to a protectionist economic policy in which developing states raise tariffs on imports to promote spending within the domestic economy that will feed into the development of industry that can eventually compete on a global scale. While a flawless idea on paper, ISI did not consider that the very things necessary for economic development such as fertilizer, oil, manufacturing machinery, and a large domestic market were not available in many small low-resource Latin American and Caribbean. This simple fact can be attributed to why ISI was successful in Brazil, by far the largest country in population and geography in this region, yet unsuccessful in the smaller states.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

In contrast to the restructured capitalist form of development ISI provided. Land reform was clearly a socialist inspired policy. As a result of colonization, much of the Latin American and Caribbean profitable farmland was in the form of latifundia plantations. This distribution of land contributed to the Latin American region being the most unequal region of the world. Agrarian reform proposed dividing this land among small farmers who put land to better, more productive, use. Again, while an interesting idea, the effectiveness of this reform did not stretch far beyond the borders of Cuba and Nicaragua.

It's fascinating to ponder what elements of each of these theories of development, including capitalism, could be adopted to create a system of genuine change. What cultural and political systems of thought are preventing this from happening?

III. Grassroots Development and Social and Cultural Factors

Traditional development models covered in previous sections focused on top-down approaches to social and economic ‘progress.’ The failure of many of these initiatives such as Neo-liberalism can be tied to the lack of nuance these models employ. Opposed to focusing on what individuals need, they looked at large-scale issues and drew on broad market-centered solutions in hopes that the growth of the economy would trickle down to the poorest in society.

Throughout the 1970s, it became increasingly clear that this macro approach to development was ineffective. The wealthy in both the Global North and South profited from these models. However, this wealth failed to improve the quality of life for the majority of citizens (Willis 2012, 103). This led to the rise of development alternatives that sought to build countries from the ground up. This section will explore these grass roots approaches to development as well as how both traditional and grassroots approaches have been influenced by cultural factors. Discussion of grassroots development will focus on the basic needs approach, decentralization, the rise of non-governmental organizations, as well as how discussions of empowerment, participation, social capital, and civil society has shaped these approaches. The second part will define and discuss the cultural implications of Social Darwinism and the Protestant Ethic using the writings of Mullings and Shrestha.

The “Making a living” chapter of *Geographies of Developing Areas* by Williams explores the complexities of making a living within the Global South. This chapter captures the myriad of economic factors traditional development models neglect through their top-down approaches. This paper demonstrates why some form of grass roots development is necessary in order to truly address the economic hurdles individuals face in the Global South, particularly

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

those working in the informal sector.

Williams uses four strong arguments to expand on this phenomenon. The first is that making a living in the Global South can only be fully understood through a holistic analysis. As a result of large proportions of these states populations are working in the informal sector, traditional measurements of economic activity don't capture the full picture. Second, he argues that ways of making a living must be understood as historically and spatially contingent. The impacts of colonialism and neoliberalism have molded developing economies. As a result of this, different ways of making a living are extraordinarily unequal demonstrating power gaps in gender and ethnicity. Finally, Williams focusses on something that lays at the root of grass-roots development which is that in any development system individuals' agency is critical to recognize (Williams 2014, 199). People exist independently beyond the unequal global power structures that shape their conditions.

The basic needs approach to development emerged in the 1970s and was widely accepted by international organizations including the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the World Bank. This approach targeted societies' poorest individuals working in the agricultural and informal sectors through working to guarantee them access to the essentials for survival. The ILO places these basic needs in four categories; basic personal consumption including food, shelter, and clothing; essential services such as education, healthcare, water, sanitation, and transportation; access to employment; and qualitative needs which encompasses things like decision making power and a safe living environment (Willis 2011, 104).

As Willis notes, this approach was designed to work alongside top-down development models and still held many of the same capitalist-centric goals as these traditional approaches to

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

development. Improving the quality of life for the poor and their skill sets directly contributes to economic growth and increased consumption (Willis 2011, 105). While a powerful idea, implementing the social infrastructure necessary to facilitate basic needs development proved difficult for developing countries young economies.

In the 1980s and 1990s with the resurgence of economic liberalism came the push to decentralize developing countries politics and economics. Both these ideas are fundamentally conservative in nature, taking power out of the hands of the central government and bringing it to the people. As a result of this, this grassroots movement worked well alongside the neoliberal development goals of the IMF that began to be implemented during this period. From an economic standpoint decentralization sought to make the economy more efficient and cost effective. However, from a grassroots perspective this movement was oriented towards giving individuals participatory power in civil society. Gaining this participation in contexts that lack widespread communication infrastructure and in which citizens are struggling to put food on the table is far more difficult than this simplistic and idealistic approach would predict.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have developed to fill the place of the government in decentralized developing countries. They act as essential community or state organizations that do not have the funding to exist as a result of neoliberalism. In the Western world the NGOs are thought to be the pinnacle of development organizations. Although NGOs vary greatly in size and approach, they are seen to have the ability to work at the grass-roots level and build social capital at the local level to meet a community's needs efficiently and effectively. One major caveat in this view is that NGOs are funded primarily by Western donors and have a board of directors. These individuals over the community that the organization seeks

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

to assist, are the ones who hold organizational power. At the end of the day, they determine where fundraising profits go. This fact once again results in Western intentions, good or bad, shaping how development programs are implemented. Willis captures the impact of this perfectly in the following quotation: "the need for rapid, quantifiable results, encourages project managers to focus on certain forms of project with tangible outcomes, rather than addressing deep-rooted inequalities which cannot be easily measured" (Willis 2011, 118).

All three of the above approaches to grass-roots development center around goals like Sachs "big five development interventions" he lays out in his 2005 article, "The End of Poverty." These include boosting agriculture, improving basic health, investing in education, clean water and sanitation, and empowering the individual to have a voice and participate in civil society. Development NGOs often claim to "empower" individuals or communities to do x, y, and z. This view is inherently Eurocentric in viewing Western assistance as empowerment. These organizations can only offer tools to assist individuals in empowering themselves.

Whether subconsciously or overtly Western cultural phenomenon such as social Darwinism, the belief that Darwin's rule of survival of the fittest in an evolutionary context applies to cultures, and Weber's theory of rationalism and the protestant ethic have been twisted to justify views of Western Superiority within development movements. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, social Darwinism was used to compare social organization to an organism with clear life stages. This dangerous perspective, which was also employed by Hitler, is clearly reflected in Rostow's stages of economic growth. Weber's theory of Protestant ethic, which was developed to explain Germany's success as a capitalist economy, was adopted to justify Eurocentric views of modernization (Willis 2011, 133). Weber claimed that the emphasis on

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

individualism and delayed gratification within Protestantism aided in the rapid economic growth of Germany in the 1800s. These characteristics are now a hallmark of Capitalist societies and have led to the development of the harmful views of people in poverty as lazy and corrupt Sachs discusses. The cultural implications of these views on the communities in the Global South are beautifully described in Beverly Mullings 2009 paper “Neo liberalization, Social Reproduction and the Limits to Labor in Jamaica” and Shrestha’s 1995 piece “Becoming a Development Category.”

Mullings’s paper is built around the idea of social reproduction which describes how a family, community, or society reproduces social order through education, values, and cultural traditions. Prior to the neoliberalism, the Jamaican state, along with many newly independent countries governments, was highly involved in this social reproduction through investment in things like national aliteracy programs and economic redistribution. With neoliberalism the shared responsibility of social reproduction shifted from the state and the individual to just the individual. This combined with the devaluing of currency, placed families, particularly women, in a difficult position. Both parents had to work in order to keep the family afloat. However, women, who are already more likely to experience unemployment and wage discrimination, also now held most of the responsibility for social reproduction. Two spatial fixes emerged to fix this problem, gang welfare and remittances. Gangs in the cities took on the role of providing housing, food, health, and educational resources to families in garrison communities in turn for their loyalty. This form of welfare has led to a remarkable spike in violence within Jamaica. Remittances can be attributed to keeping the economy afloat since the implementation of neoliberal policies. However, they too have a dramatic impact on Jamaican society in the form of

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

the dissolution of the nuclear family and household. Initially only men would go abroad to find work. However, now women too must go abroad to make ends meet. As a result of this, social reproduction has fallen on their parents or oldest children. Mullings warns that social reproduction for the next generation is necessary for the economy to function at even a basic level and that with growing numbers of non-dependents going abroad, any remaining level of societal structure will inevitably collapse.

Shrestha's paper explores social factors of development from a personal perspective, as a young boy growing up in Nepal. Shrestha describes how prior to Westerners coming in, he never viewed himself as underdeveloped and therefore lacking human dignity (Shrestha 1995, 268). He saw his poverty as a matter of fate and karma. While this view rivals the Western value of meritocracy, Shrestha didn't view his family's poverty as a negative thing he needed to escape until the overthrow of the Ran autarchy in 1951 when Western thought began to take hold in his home country. The influence development programs have on the devaluing of domestic cultures and livelihoods becomes strikingly clear in Shrestha's account. It doesn't matter if these development initiatives are top-down or bottom-up if they involve promoting ideas conceived in Western Culture to fix 'societal or cultural problems' in non-western states with entirely distinct cultural context. These solutions will inevitably fail or cause harm to the very populations they aim to help.

IV. Environment and Development

The human condition has always been shaped by a culture's relationship to the environment, and the natural environment has similarly been shaped by humanity. Depending on the context, this relationship has taken different forms, bending from a mutualistic reliance on reciprocity to one of parasitic nature. The trend of this relationship has been increasingly parasitic since the dawn of the industrial revolution. The leaders of this change have been Western, more 'developed,' countries. Thus emerges a connection between the environment and development. This section will examine this link, focusing on defining and critiquing historical theories of human's role within the natural environment, along with the consequences of these theories and more recent approaches to sustainable development.

Malthusian theory emerged in the 18th century and predicted that food supply increases linearly with each generation, while population growth increases exponentially. As a result of these factors, Thomas Malthus argued that the earth would reach a carrying capacity in which the amount of land available to humanity would simply not support the size of the population.

Although Malthus's theory did not take technological advances into account, it still gained a significant following and has undoubtedly shaped approaches to development within the globe such as pushes for increased uses of contraceptives.

Environmental determinism arose in the 19th century as an explanation of how the environment shapes culture. This theory, which emerged in the West, argued that those who live

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

in the temperate parts of the world, which translates to the western world, were inherently harderworkers and more creative innovators as a result of the necessity of innovation to their historical survival. This deeply racist and flawed theory has notably been adopted by eugenicists and whitesupremacists. This theory fails to account for the intersection of historic diffusion of ideas and agency of individuals, communities, and government bodies to deal with environmental constraints.

Ideas of what human-environmental interaction should look like have bled into political and economic theories as a result of their intrinsic ties to development. Socialist approaches to the environment have historically viewed nature as a resource to be exploited as a means of development. This ideation is reflected in the remarkable environmental degradation that occurred throughout the Soviet period (Willis 2011, 172.) This perspective contradicts modern connotations of socialism seen throughout the U.S. Capitalist approaches to development have been surprisingly similar to socialist approaches. This similar view of natural resources as inputsto economic progress is best reflected through modernization.

Europe's approach to development after the industrial revolution is synonymous with the capitalist idea of modernization. This mode of development views natural resources as inputs to rapid economic growth. It relies heavily on exploitation of resources with little regard for the long-term sustainability of this use. Willis refers to modernization as “an attempt to escape Malthusian limits” (Willis 2011, 169). As a result of modernization, post industrial revolution theworld population has grown far past Malthus’s original carrying capacity. Yet, the primary sectorhas rapidly shrunk as technology and scientific advances have replaced human labor. In the 1960s and 1970s modernization within agriculture was

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

intensified through the Green Revolution which applied advanced scientific knowledge to agriculture in order to produce synthetic fertilizers and pesticides. Post WWII, modernization became popularized in the international development sector.

Although the Green Revolution allowed for increased quantities of food production to match the growing population of the planet, it also intensified the consequences already seen as a result of modernization. Modernization has had clear impacts on the environment and human health causing climate change, pollution, and increased use of chemicals. The consequences of this growing now clean up later mentality have been felt more in poorer countries and areas.

Furthermore, modernization has increased global inequality as a result of only some countries being able to afford to participate in the industrialization of their economies and agricultural sectors. These issues of environmental justice will be discussed in depth later in this section.

In the 1960s alongside the green revolution emerged the environmental movement. Rachel Carson sparked this movement when she published *Silent Spring* in 1962 which called the consequences of using DDT and other chemical pesticides to the attention of the masses. In 1972, the Malthusian perspective emerged once again with Donella Meadows' the *Limits to Growth*. This study added technological advances to the Malthusian model and came to the same conclusion that current levels of consumption and growth are not sustainable to support the long-term growth of the human population.

From the environmental movement, sustainable development emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. Sustainable development aims to address the negative implications of international

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

development on the environment under the assumption that if all countries industrialized through the same process as the global north, the world would rapidly reach its limits to growth. In 1983, in recognition of this movement, the UN set up the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) to find long term solutions “that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Willis 2011, 179). This has since been the definition of sustainable development. Over the past 40 years the UN has continued attempting to rally the international community towards sustainable development through international conferences, pledges, and most recently their 17 Sustainable Development Goals in 2015 to replace their Millennium development goals.

Although the international community largely supports the idea of Sustainable Development, their approaches to it vary greatly. Willis sums up the two approaches to sustainable development as technocratic and eco-centric. Technocratic approaches focus on improving human standards of living while minimizing environmental impact through attempting to use greener energy sources. This ‘green-washing’ approach to development will not lead to real change. In contrast, eco-centric approaches push for radical change and a degrowth model. This prioritized the earth over the economy.

Peter Victor lays out a nuanced explanation of these approaches in his 2010 piece “Questioning Economic Growth.” Victor lays out three options to human’s approach to the environment. The first is to continue pushing for economic growth, while attempting to minimize environmental impacts. This echoes Willis’s technocratic approach. The second is to encourage growth, but only within economic sectors that use fewer resources. Given that such jobs are primarily in the tertiary sector, this approach seems idealistic and unrealistic.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Tertiary sector jobs require a market for secondary sector production which relies on intensive environmental output. To make this shift, there would have to be a radical sustainable change in the way goods are produced. The final approach, similar to the eco-centric approach, is to limit growth in itself. Victor argues that growth after a certain point does not actually contribute to the wellbeing of a state's people. His reasoning for this is that the genuine progress indicator — an economic approach to measuring development that accounts for environmental and social wellbeing — does not increase with GDP after a certain point.

An anti-growth or degrowth approach to sustainable development necessitates a revised connotation of what development means. Development is typically viewed as synonymous with growth as a result of capitalism, development, and growth typically being seen as interrelated in the western world. As a result of this, as Herman Daly points out in his 1990 article “Sustainable Growth: an impossibility theorem,” the idea of sustainable development is an oxymoron. Daly proposes an alternative definition of development and growth to challenge this oxymoron: “when something grows it becomes bigger, when something develops it becomes different” (Daly 1990,2). Through this definition sustainable development moves from being approached as sustainable growths to sustainable change. Daly argues for continued exploitation of renewable resources, but at a rate in which they can be replenished, along with the heavy taxing of resource extraction.

Furthermore, Daly states that this shift must begin within countries that have already had the chance to develop. Although Daly's approach is not the utopian view of degrowth via return to a community-centric lifestyle of environmentalists' dreams, it is a pragmatic and

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

realistic method of sustainable change that leaves room for and incentivizes local production for local markets.

Through recognizing that developed, rich economies must take on sustainable development first, Daly recognizes another key contradiction within classic approaches to sustainable development — the neglect of environmental justice. Sheppard dives into an environmental justice-oriented critique of sustainable development in the chapter “the Entanglement of nature, development, and globalization.”

“Mainstream sustainable development discourses often display other blind spots and biases. Such discourses privilege ‘global’ environmental problems and institutions over ‘local’ ones; conceptualize poverty, rather than consumption and poverty-producing conditions, as the root cause of environmental degradation; reproduce economistic and developmentalist biases; and advance a highly reductive interpretation of the environment as a static ‘resource’” (Sheppard 2009, 149).

To ethically enact sustainable approaches to development, it is vital to recognize that industrialized countries are the predominant producers of the greenhouse gas emissions causing climate change. However, as a result of the vulnerability and geographic location of the world’s poor, WEIRD countries, and specifically the bourgeois class within these states, will be the last to feel the full impact of the environmental degradation their output of environmental externalities is causing. Despite this, sustainable development discourse traditionally perpetuates the idea that lower income countries must refrain from using the very resources the Global North used to rapidly grow their economies and standard of living throughout the industrial revolution. There is a great irony in this, given that prior to western

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

imperialism and outside pushes to become developed, the indigenous populations of many global south states lived sustainably.

"For people in the third world who derive their livelihoods from the forests, fields, and waters around them, sustainability is intimately related to rights of communal ownership, collectively shared ways of knowing, cultural autonomy, religious rituals, and freedom from externally imposed programs that seek to promote someone else's vision of how to conserve or develop the environments they depend upon," (Sheppard 2009, 150).

Sheppard points out that sustainability within the capitalist system often looks like the privatization and commodification of public resources. While this usually takes an unsustainable form of damming rivers or building mines, it can also look like the establishment of national parks on indigenous land. This "promotion" of conservation ends in the restriction of indigenous stewards from their lands. Like all forms of development, sustainable development must take an intersectional approach to change the way in which modern economic systems and peoples interact with and view the natural environment.

V. Globalization, Post-Development, and Alternatives

The last five centuries have marked an unprecedented era of global interconnectedness as geographic hurdles limiting the diffusion of ideas and goods have shrunk. This global shrinkage, or globalization, was led by the West, beginning in the era of colonization, and has facilitated the rise of Capitalism as the world's primary economic system. Globalization has forever altered the world's landscape and people. This section will focus on addressing the cultural, political, and economic consequences of globalization along with reactions to globalization and proposed alternatives, primarily focusing on post-development and critical modernism.

Cultural diffusion and homogenization are the most obvious consequences of globalization. Walking down the main street of nearly any downtown in the United States one is likely to find a Mexican restaurant, a pizza place, and some sort of South or East Asian restaurant. On the other hand (speaking from experience), if that same individual found themselves in the Maasai Mara in Kenya, home to the Maasai people, a traditional pastoralist culture, they would undoubtedly be able to find a tiny market that sold cold Coca-Colas. This example of food provides a fantastic example of this mixing and homogenization of culture for two reasons. First, all the above foods and drinks were made possible by the Columbian Exchange. Al pastor pork from Spain, tomatoes for pizza from South America, hot peppers for Thai food from Mexico, and of course Coca-Cola's sugar which was domesticated in New Guinea, brought to Europe, and grown on plantations in the Caribbean throughout the colonial era. Second, the diffusion of food represents how Western consumption patterns have come to dominate the global landscape. Trends in Western consumer culture can become seen as superior over traditional food and

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

cultural practices. This is less seen in the U.S. where food from other cultures is seen as novel. However, in non-Western societies, “‘non-indigenous’ music, food, and clothing are promoted as being ‘better’ and thus people who can afford these goods are regarded as more ‘developed’” (Willis 2011, 217). While the diffusion and creolization of culture in itself is a fantastic means of building cross-cultural understanding and interconnectedness, it has drastic consequences when this diffusion is fused with capitalism and creates devaluation of traditional ways of life.

Further inequalities resulting from the impact of globalization can be found in the cultural diffusion of technology. Advances in technology have been the means in which the impact of globalization has continued to grow. Today it is possible to communicate with an individual across the globe in a matter of seconds thanks to cell phones and the internet. Furthermore, technology has allowed humans to overcome significant environmental limitations in production and medicine. However, access to these technologies has been vastly unequal. Many people in the global south can’t afford advancements in agricultural technology or access to the internet. Sixty percent of the world’s population lives without access to the internet. This gap, referred to as the digital divide, greatly hinders the ability for these individuals to escape poverty.

Technology and communications. Gaining access to technology, specifically mobile phones in remote areas can help with money management and gaining access to different market prices for goods. As technology becomes increasingly necessary to live in our globalized world, disparities in access will only continue to have more severe consequences.

The most pertinent economic impacts of globalization can be summarized in discussion of the new international division of labor, shifts in trade, and transnationalism. The new international division of labor refers to the continued perpetuation of the colonial system in the

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

production and manufacturing of goods. Opposed to the full production cycle from raw material to finished goods occurring in a single state, this process has been spread internationally. Harvest and industrial production of raw goods occurs in the Global South, whereas the advanced manufacturing and sale of goods occurs in the Global North. This is the result of the low costs of land and labor in lower-income states. As increasing numbers of people learn to speak English, this outsourcing has moved beyond manufacturing to also include banking, data processing, and call centers.

Free trade has also become a central to facilitating globalization, particularly after World War Two. Protectionist policies are regarded as inefficient in blocking the pathways of the international division of labor. International trade organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and North Atlantic Trade Organization (NATO) have emerged to govern world trade. The WTO, which emerged from the 1947 General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs, now has 164 members, and hence has significant impact on international trade policy. The organization has been accused of favoring the interests of northern economies over southern colonies through allowing North American protectionism, while pushing lower-income countries to reduce protectionist barriers which help local producers. This is despite the fact that southern economies significantly outnumber the northern economies represented in the WTO.

The final major economic impact of globalization is the rise of transnationalism. As Willis describes, transnationalism is the movement of activity back and forth across borders (Willis 2011, 209). Transnational migration has become a significant part of life in the Global South, particularly after the rise of Neoliberalism. Globalization has facilitated the ease of this migration and the connectivity between transnational migrants and those within their home

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

country. Two very important ways in which this connection is sustained is through remittances and hometown associations which help support an individual's home family and community financially.

The political repercussions of globalization is the last major impact this paper will focus on. On a large scale, as discussed above, globalization has led to the rise of international organizations such as the United Nations, European Union, and the WTO. These organizations play a role in increasing international cooperation, promoting capitalist interests abroad, and conflict mitigation. At the grassroots level, this impact has looked much different. The ease and discrete nature of communication in a globalized world has facilitated political mobilization. From the rapid spread of online petitions calling for a radical change in policing following the murder of George Floyd to the diffusion of information through the Twittersphere that led to the 2011 Arab Uprisings, social media has been central to the globalized age of civic society and political resistance. Today this can be seen through the outcry of support towards Ukraine following Russia's invasion on February 24, 2022. Before major news outlets had reported the invasion, it was posted on Twitter. From this date on social media platforms have been central to the spreading of news, human stories, and fundraisers relating to the war.

Globalization has transformed the social, economic, and political fabric of the world. Its impacts are multifaceted and impossible to categorize as good or bad. It has paved the way for capitalism to become the dominant economic system as well as capitalist consumer culture to be seen as the pinnacle of development. However, it has also allowed for the transfer of ideas and stories that have helped provide a base for cross-cultural dialogue and understanding.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

There have been three main reactions to globalization: reactionary responses, resilience, and resistance. The reactionaries are focused on protecting their home markets from globalization and as a result are isolationist and populist. Resilient responses aim to transform globalization, and resistance movements push to adopt the positive aspects of globalization while resisting the negatives. The next section will focus on the more progressive of these three reactions, resilience, in the form of post-development, and resistance in the form of critical modernism.

Post-development focusses on completely deconstructing and decolonizing the system of development to create a post-capitalist, post-patriarchy, and degrowth society (Demaria and Kothari 2017). Wolfgang Sachs, one of the originators of the post-development movement, argued that there are four failed premises on which the notion of development was built. The first is that the superiority of the West as the most developed place on Earth is unfounded. This idea rests on the assumption that if given the choice, every person would choose to live in a Western nation over their home country. His second point is that the cold war weapon is obsolete. Third, the global wealth gap has increased throughout the development era. This brings in the question, who is benefitting from development? His final point is that the universality of development is misconceived. There is no singular definition of development and it's a process that can and should take many forms depending on community desires and cultural context.

Demaria and Kothari's 2017 piece "The post-development dictionary agenda: paths to the pluriverse," proposes transformative alternatives to development. These alternatives focus on the rejection of the notion of development. The first step on this path to the pluriverse is the deconstruction of the western development model which has been widely accepted as beneficial

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

throughout the world. "Deconstructing development opens up the door for a multiplicity of new and old notions and worldviews, or else a matrix of alternatives" (Demaria, Kothari 2017). They argue for a return to indigenous ways of knowledge and advocate for solutions proposed by traditionally marginalized groups.

Although the ideals of post-modernism are nothing short of beautiful, they are proposed with no path to achieve this radical deconstruction and downscaling of society. To an upper-class liberal individual educated in liberal arts, these are the alternatives to development that the world desperately needs. However, to the majority of the world's people who rely on jobs in the production economy, these alternatives likely appear as idealistic and utopian. The hyper-academic language of post-modernist writings is frustrating for this reason. If only those who have had the privilege to receive an advanced education can understand the theory proposed by post-developmentalists, how will these ideas diffuse and gain traction with those who could be the most influenced by its approach? Can something so inaccessible to the masses still be radical?

Critical Modernism on the other hand provides a more realistic alternative to development. Opposed to abandoning development and modernization as a whole, as proposed by post-modernists, critical modernism seeks to transform development through adopting principals of democratic Marxism, feminism, and science (Peet and Hartwick, 2015). Critical modernists use logic and known experiences to build theories of a better world. One such theory central to critical modernism is the idea of radical democracy. This theory argues that no true democracy has ever existed in which there is direct popular control over all resources and institutions used and inhabited by people (Peet and Hartwick, 2015). Radical democracy meets

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

individuals' basic needs and is fueled by everyday activism. The approach of critical modernism gets away from viewing world systems through a black and white lens. It leaves room the truths of multiple systems.

Conclusion

Definitions and approaches to development have historically been defined by capitalist growth and are rooted in a history of colonialism. This paper aimed to build an understanding of international development through a critical lens of this history to assist in the unlearning of the Western notion of progress and development as positive forces of good in the world. This paper critiqued the historical base of Western capitalist development came to be through summarizing the history of colonialism and how development has traditionally been measured, and the way in which classical and neo-liberal economic models have been used to reinforce the colonial systems of economic dependence in a post-colonial world. The second central discussion in this paper was of alternative economic systems, perspectives, and means of development. This analysis covered neo-Marxist, socialist, and structuralist resistance to imposed development models; movements towards grass roots development that account for the differentiating social and cultural contexts; and the relationship between the environment and development, something that has traditionally been neglected in both socialist and capitalist models of development. The final section of this paper took a macro-level lens to look at the positive and negative consequences of globalization and reactions to globalization. Most notable of these reactions are post-development and critical modernism which provide more culturally appropriate and nuanced approaches to international development.

To truly be good, development must move away from being defined as a singular process. Opposed to being synonymous with progress, growth, expansion, capitalism, education, and help, development should simply be viewed as change or difference as Daly puts it. This change shouldn't be linear or occur the same way in each place. It must leave room for failure to

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

create a result that truly works. Most of all, this change must be created through individual agency of people within the community hoping to develop. The West will play two key roles in this future of development. The first is to look internally and see what change is needed to their own system. With no finishing point of development in this new system, no country can ever assume it is done. Key to this Western development will be looking to adapt changes made abroad to Western state's cultural context. For example, in this future the U.S. will be able to look at Cuba and recognize both the multitude of human rights issues within the country and the incredible universal healthcare the Cuban Government provides, despite spending far less on healthcare than the U.S. The second key role of Western countries in the future is acting as allies to lower-income nations. Wealthy countries have the means to help facilitate advanced networks of communication and wealth redistribution between themselves and the Global South. This connection will be essential in building strong international partnerships going forward. However, this support must be on the terms of those in historical positions of subjugation.

If development is seen as both a plural and gradient true positive change can be made. This change is necessary to address the intersectional issues of climate change, xenophobia, political repression, power struggles, and gender and LGBTQ rights that make up modern geopolitical conflicts.

References

- Black, Stephanie. 2001. *Life in Debt* [film]. New Yorker Films.
- Costanza, Robert, et al. 2014. Development: Time to Leave GDP Behind. *Nature*. 505: 283-285.
- Daly, Herman. 2010. "Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem". In J. Dawson et al. (eds) *Gaian Economics*: 11-16.
- Demaria, F. and A. Kothari. 2017. "The Post-Development Dictionary agenda: paths to the pluriverse." *Third World Quarterly*.
- Galeano, Eduardo. 1973. *The Thirteen Northern Colonies and the Importance of Not Being Born Important*. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*.
- Kristof, Nicholas. 2010. *The Happiest People*. *The New York Times*.
- Mullings, B. 2009. "Neo liberalization, Social Reproduction and Limits to Labor in Jamaica." *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30 (2): 174-188.
- Peet, R. and E. Hartwick. 2015. "Critical Modernism and Democratic Development". In *Theories of Development* (3): 307-324.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. 2005. "The End of Poverty." *Time* March 15: 41-54.
- Sachs, Jeffrey, et al. March 2001. *The Geography of Poverty*. *Scientific American*. 70-75.
- Sheppard, Eric et al. 2009. "Contested Environments: The Entanglements of Nature, Development, and Globalization". In *A World of Difference*: 51-168.
- Shrestha, N. 1995. "Becoming a Development Category." *Power of Development* 1st ed: 266-277.
- Timms, Benjamin F. 2008. *Development theory and domestic agriculture in the Caribbean: recurring crises and missed opportunities*. 101-117.

UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT

Victor, Peter. 2010. "Questioning Economic Growth." *Nature* 468: 370-371.

Williams G. et al. 2014 "Making a Living." *Geographies of Developing Areas*. 199-299.

Willis, Katie. 2011. *Theories and Practices of Development*. Routledge Press, 2: 1-234