

# THE HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT AND THE THEORITICAL APPROACH OF DEVELOPMENT

**Jacob T Makapedua<sup>1</sup>, Christien Karambut<sup>2</sup>, Cysca Langi<sup>3</sup>**  
Politeknik Negeri Manado; Jl. Raya Politeknik, Manado, (0431) 8152121  
Jurusan Administrasi Bisnis, Politeknik Negeri Manado

## I. Introduction

Over decades, there are debates about the meaning of development, because of the term of development may mean different things to the different people. However, actually, the terms development was used first time after World War II, when there were political, economic and cultural transformation in most part of the world, which were as fundamental and wide ranging as those proposed by development specialists in the 1950-1960s, but most of the ideas associated with modernisation/development theory had been formulated decades, sometimes centuries earlier.

Development also, is an essential purpose that most of people or nations take for granted. Hoping that the development will result in the changing of political, economic and social institutions. Economic progress is an essential component, but not the only component. Some theorists viewed that the process of development as a series of successive stages of economic growth through which all countries must pass. Some theorists also critic this argument. However, some theorists also critic the argument of growth as indicators of development.

According to Simone and Ferraru : 12, the development involves a broad range of belief, and attitudes that individual must acquire to adjust to the demands placed on them by social and geography mobility, broader political allegiances, economic growth, and technology that requires literacy, openness to new experiences, punctuality and working with people in close proximity and under condition fixed by large organisation rather than landlords and dictates of nature. Moreover, Simone and Ferraru state that development or modernisation is a term to describe the structural and behavioural changes that a society undergoes in the process of acquiring an industrial system or production and distribution.

Therefore, to deal with this different meaning and view of development, this paper will first outline the history of development in chronological order. Then this paper also will discuss the two categories of development theorists of development; modernisation theory and dependency theory.

## II. History of Development

The development actually had been occurred since the European occupied North America that were chroniclers, missionaries and colonisers made much of the technological gap between the people of the old world and the new. The European thought that Indians were savage, poor technology and lack of skill to use their land and much need of assistance from the European industrious men and engineers (Adas : 404).

Furthermore, in that period, technological advance increased rapidly, this seem as essential to the growth and well being, when America was transformed from patchwork of settlement colonies into a nation. John Kasson (Adas : 404) states that technological development was increasingly with the rise from barbarism to civilisation and machines were viewed as key agents for the spread of the civilisation in the New World. However, there were also some American thinkers such as Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry Adams that shared their European counterparts to the industrial order as dehumanising and environmental degrading.

Meanwhile, in the last decades of nineteenth century, in America the railways became the premier symbol of the advanced development of industrialisation, the extensively railroads had transformed the American landscape, pervading virtually all aspects of American life from commerce and advertising to education and recreation. Moreover, industry also more generally eclipsed agriculture as dominant sector in the American economy and the main influence on American social life. In this period, American became involved overseas such in China and Philippines, the assumption of their scientific and technological superiority became integral components of their own vision of the civilising mission. For instance, the fullest elaboration of Americas civilising mission ideology in Philippines, American viewed that economic reform and education as ways to create prosperous life to the Filipinos.

In the World War I period, American made further enhanced the already high esteem in which held inventors and machines. American and their allies made extensive use of the new military technology particularly tanks and airplanes that carried them to victory. In this period American proudly in the spectacles and creature comfort of the "machine age" (Adas : 408).

Furthermore, in decades after World War I, applied science and technology pervade Americans life to a degree that greatly exceeded that experienced by any other society, between 1917 and 1940 the number of American household that were electrified increased from less than 25 percent to over 90 percent. The automobile in that period, produced on Henry Ford's became an item of mass consumption. So, that is why, in this period Henry Ford as the pioneer was widely regarded as the prophet of a new age of "heroic optimism" in which science and invention were hailed as the key to American prosperity and the best

solution for social ill (Adas, p.410). In addition, at the 1930's the massive construction project had been done, such as; dams, highways, tunnel and bridges that designed to generate energy for and to extend the range of technology that American continued view as the key to their rise to the global power and as essential means of eradicating poverty both home and overseas. This means that, in the era between the World War I and II, the long standing assumption to progressive social development come to be view in terms of a necessary association between mechanisation and modernity.

In the period after World War II, the modernisation paradigm supplanted the beleaguered civilising mission as the pre-eminent ideology of western dominance. Where American social scientists were the main exponents of the new ideology. Competing theories dynamics and stages of transition from "tradition" to "modernity" were debated by academics and their jargon-laden discourse played a major role in policy formulation with respect to the "underdeveloped", "developed" or "emerging nation of the "Third World" and so fourth. The improvers and modernisers assumed that all people and societies not only could but would "develop" along the scientific-industrial lines pioneered by the West. In this period, modernity is associated with rationally, empiricism, efficiency and change; tradition connotes fatalism, veneration for custom and the sacred, indiscipline and stagnation. Joseph Kahl, who has provided one of the more detailed listing of these attributes, argue that traditional men are passive and fatalistic largely because they lack the sophisticated technology required to shape the world to their own desire, while modern men make use sophisticated technology to remake their environment and change their social system in ways intended to advance both their own careers and the development of their societies as a whole. Meanwhile Daniel Lerner in his pioneering work "The Passing of Traditional Society" measures modernity relate to human qualities and establish as definitive of the "modern personality". In Lerner viewed advanced communications as the key to making societies modern. (Adas 1989 : 413-14). Meanwhile at the same time, major change had occurred in most places in the world that led American president Truman made a speech that called "Point Four" on 20 January 1949. In According to the speech America must embark on a bold new program for making the benefit of their scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdevelopment area because of more than half the people of the world are living in condition approach misery. ( Rist : 70-71).

In 1960s the advance of development theories were continued, Marion Levy produced one of the most elaborate discussion of the effects of the transition from tradition to modernity that began with the assumption that the degree to which a society has been

modernised could be measured by the extent to which it made use of inanimate power and employed tools to multiply the effect of effort. Then, in the 1970s and 1980's Modernisation theory has come under heavy criticism for everything from the basic methodology flaws to its failure to account accurately for the actual experience of the people of the developing world. Most major critique of ideology of modernisation have challenged its ethnocentric vision of a single route to the development and the artificiality of its dichotomous vision of traditional and modern social systems. (Adas : 415-16).

### **III. Theory of Development**

After the World War II, there were debates between development theorists about the concept of development in their theories; however, in general theory of development can be classified into 2 major approaches. Firstly is Modernisation and growth theory in the 1950s and 1950s and secondly is the dependency theory in the mid of 1960s. Both of them do begin with the same two human constructions; the state and the marketplace.

The engine and focus of modernisation theory is always on the internal domestic aspect of national development; streamlining the centralised state so it can protect the nation's economic marketplace and domestic security against external and internal threats, encouraging the education, skills and opportunities of individual so they can function in the market place. While in the external context plays a role in providing opportunities for raising capital, trading or acquiring resources and markets. (Simone and Ferraru : 17).

The central of early modernisation theory was the notion of a dichotomy between traditional and modern societies. Traditional societies were defined as being pre-state, pre-rational and pre-industrial that third world societies were seen as the traditional ideal type.

Similarly, according to Higott, Robinson, Hewison and Garry Rodan, state that modernisation and growth theory are not simply intellectual transformed by intellectual debates but also an explanation and a description policies and processes which have accompanied intervention by industrial west in the third worlds. This means that modernisation and growth theory have actually followed and described the capitalist penetration of the third world. (Higott, Robinson, Hewison and Rodan :17).

Moreover, in 1950s most of modernisation theorists such as Rostow, Hoselitz and Higgins believe that for development it was necessary to bridge the gap between tradition and modern through the acquisition of the appropriate modern pattern variables. Rostow is one of the modernisation and economics growth theorist, with his famous Stages of Growth theory.

According to this doctrine, the transition from underdevelopment to development can be described in terms of a series of steps through which all countries must proceed. They are :

1. The traditional society
2. The precondition to take-off
3. The take-off
4. The drive to maturity
5. The age of high mass consumption ( Worsley 1978 : 141).

Beside Rostow's growth theory, there is also other growth theory that called Two Sector theory that formulated by Nobel laureate Arthur Lewis in the mid 1950s. This theory has focused on the structural transformation a primarily subsistence economy. In this model, the underdeveloped economy consists of two sectors; a traditional, overpopulated rural subsistence sector characterised by zero marginal Labor productivity that classify as surplus Labor and a high productivity modern urban industrial sector into which Labor from subsistence sector is gradually transferred. The major focus of the model is on both the process of Labor transfer and the growth of output and employment in the modern sector. The speed with which this expansion occurs is determined by the rate of industrial investment and capital accumulation in the modern sector.

Furthermore, according to the modernisation and growth theorists the diffusion of capital and technology as the motor for bridging the gap between tradition and modernity. Furthermore, capital formation and corporate structures necessary for growth can best be provided by the already developed Western economies. In other words, economic development were essentially concerned with finetuning the existing process of capital accumulation. Some modernisation theorists strongly believe that it was necessary for the third world to allow the diffusion of capital and technology from the developed economies countries.

During 1950s and early 1960s modernisation theory outlined development not only as a process but also a set of ends or achievements. This means that economic development to be measured in terms of growth rather than in terms of reproduction of the specific form of western industrial capitalism. Similarly, political development came to be viewed as a process of creating political institutions able to solve specific problems pertaining stability and regime maintenance rather than reproduction of democracy. In relation to the point modernisation theorists view that the strong government was a prerequisite of economic growth. (Higott, Robinson, Hewison and Rodan :19).

A crisis in modernisation theory emerged as it became increasingly apparent that economic, social and political condition on the ground in the third world did not approximate to the expectations, the process of diffusion was producing neither economic take-off nor flourishing indigenous bourgeoisie's and most glaringly, political system were becoming increasing authoritarian rather than democratic for example in Indonesia when Soeharto's regime had power. Moreover, according to the theoretical assumption that the apparent failure of growth strategies to cope this problem, poverty and unemployment or to produce viable domestic industrial economies were ascribed to a variety of endogenous factors including the incompetence and corruption of the state bureaucracies and the intrusion nationalist and socialist policies into what was supposedly a scientific and rational economic decision-making process. (Higott, Robinson, Hewison and Rodan :18).

On the other hand, the dependency theory emerged, when Heinz Arndt become embroiled in debates in the mid of 1960s with dependencies theorists who argue that the economic policies which accord with the prescription of growth theory simply serve to enrich foreign capital investors and their local compradors whilst entrenching mass poverty and broad structures of "dependence" and "underdevelopment".

However, the dependency theory is an indirect outgrowth of Marxist thinking. According to this theory the existence and continuance of under development primarily to the historical evolution of a high unequal international capitalist system of rich and poor countries relationship. Whether, because rich nation are intentionally exploitative or unintentionally neglectful, the consistency of rich and poor nations in an international system dominated by such unequal power relationship between the centre (the developed countries) and the periphery (the underdeveloped countries) renders attempts by poor nation to be self reliant and independent difficult sometimes even impossible. (Schultz 1960 : 91).

Furthermore, according to Simone and Ferraru, Dependency or World System theory emerged as result of the lack of an internal bourgeois driven developmental dynamic in the first place makes the nation subservient and vulnerable to the depredation of the advanced nation. This result in unequal relationship between strong states protecting the interest of their international investors and weak states unable to protect either their human or material resources from the ravages of an exchange system that favours the strong and wealthy. (Simone and Ferraru 1995 : 18)

Moreover, according to Arndt there is an unfortunate economic necessity, at least in the early stages of growth, for trade-offs between development and equality as well as a tendency for strong political force to seize a disproportionate share of wealth.

In relation to this point of view for instance, Peter McCawley state that government intervention in the Indonesian economy has largely served to enrich that small group of well connected businessmen in the Import Substitution Industrialisation sectors to the advantage of no one else.

According to the dependency theory, exporting capitalism from advanced economies to the third world becomes a part of the problem rather than being part of the solution to poverty and backwardness. The dependency perspective dramatically countered the optimistic liberal prospects of effective charitable assistance to help the underdevelop economies become developed economies. Andre Gunder Frank for instance, critics the Rostow's stages of Growth and the exploitation of the under development country resources by the developed countries. He states that capitalist development everywhere has been a fundamentally contradictory development based on exploitation and resulting simultaneously in development and underdevelopment. The growth and expansion led to development of a single, integrated capitalist system of world wide scope. Moreover, according to Frank that the past and present is that far from diffusing down development, the relationship between the core and the periphery widens the gap between the two and generates ever deeper structural underdevelopment in the periphery. (Warsley 1978 : 97).

#### **IV. Conclusion**

To sum up, the idea of development had been formulated many decades or even in century earlier that was start when the European occupied North America and became nation. The essential factor of development in this period is that machines were viewed as key and symbol of the advanced development or industrialisation. Then development and the invention machines had led America and its allies achieved victory in this war by invention new military technology. After World War II academic in the world debated modernisation and its stages of transition from traditional to modernity. The debates between development theorists about the concept of development in their theories can be classified into 2 major approaches; Modernisation or growth theory and the dependency theory. The central point of modernisation theory was the notion of a dichotomy between traditional and modern societies. While, the dependency theorists viewed that the economic policies which accord with the prescription of growth theory simply serve to enrich foreign capital investors and their local compradors whilst entrenching mass poverty and broad structures of dependence. This theory is an indirect outgrowth of Marxist thinking.

## References

- Adas, M. 1999. 'Epilogue'. Pp.402-418 of *Machine as the Measure of Men*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Higgott, R. Robinson, R and Garry Rodan . , (2000)'Theories of Development and Underdevelopment : implications for the study of Southeast Asia' In R. Higgott And R. Robinson eds., *Southeast Asia: Essays in the Political Economy of Structural Change*, pp.16-61. London: Routledge.
- Rist, G. 2011. 'The Invention of Development' Chapter 4 of *The History of Development*. 69-79. London Zed Book.
- Simone, V and Anne Ferraru 2005, 'The Asian Pacific. Political and Economic Development in a Global Context'. London : Longman.
- Todaro. M, Smith S, (2014) *Economic Development*, 12<sup>th</sup> Edition. Peardon Education
- Warsley, P. 1998, ' Modern Sociology". Introduction Reading 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Harmondsworth Middlessex Ringwood. Vic. Penguin.