

**Towards General Theory of Development and
Modernization with Special Reference to History of
Development and Modernization-Theories:
A critical and analytical Study in Sociology**

Dr. Faisal Al-Gharaibeh
Assistant Professor of Social Work and Sociology
University of Bahrain
Faculty of Arts
Kingdom of Bahrain

Preface:

Discussion on development theory and policy has, in the last few years, experienced a growing intensification of dispute between diverting viewpoints; In comparison to earlier controversies, the dispute has reached a qualitatively new dimension, to the extent that today the dogma of closing gap, Strategy has been equally both East and West since the Second World War is, for time, being seriously questioned. Expressed in simple terms, this dogma states that those countries whose level of socio- economic and technical development does not correspond with that of highly industrialized states are to be regarded as “strugglers” who, in order to make up for lost ground, must in principal, follow the same course of industrialization and technological advance - concentrated, however within a shorter period of time by means of accelerated economic growth – that the present industrialized and technological advance – concentrated, however, within a shorter period of time by means of accelerated economic growth – that the present industrialized countries put behind them 19th Century.⁽¹⁾

The disappointing results of development policy have set in motion learning process which has apparently led to a growing feeling of uncertainty, in the international “Scientific Community”.

For years, where is the former believed that it could be completely sure of its ground, uncertainty is leading them to reflect on a revision of their – exaggerated expectations with respect to the third world’s development chances.⁽²⁾ The attentive observer must, therefore, gain impression that the development of “development- theory” has arrived at decisive turning point.

This would seem to be a suitable point of time to trace, in a historical review, the way in which the conception of development theory developed, and in doing so, to consider the question as to which factors were respectively responsible for the birth of specific academic opinions their transformation. ⁽³⁾

Heuristic Methodology of Epistemological progress and the expectations of social reference Groups :

The Swedish noble prize Winner Gunnar Myrdal wrote in his book on the Political of the Manifesto of the Poor Third- World: “I’m of the opinion that our concepts of Underdevelopment, development and development planning ... are moving in an fundamentally opportunistic direction ... the fact cannot be overlooked that the concept of reality, the ideologies and the theories are exposed to the influence of the interests that emanate from the ruling groups in society, and that they are beginning, in this ways, to deviate from the truth in the direction that is opportune to these interests”.⁽⁴⁾

This above quoted of Gunnar Myrdal aimed to one of the central problems of Modern Scientific Theory, namely the question pertaining to the course of the process of epistemological progress and its application in the context of social sciences. To put it in more concrete terms: how do scientific theories originate how are they examined and how are they superseded by new theories?. Can a scientist’s interest in research remain uninfluenced by the valuations and expectations of relevant social reference groups existing in the social system surrounding him?

Analytical Scientific Theory – above all in the form advocated by Karl Popper postulates the separation of fundamental value and statements on a specific, i.e. the dichotomy of the discovery context and the substantiation context, between which, it is claimed no relation exists. Since the scientist is autonomous in the choice of his problem area, this theory also postulates a negative heuristic concept, which is based upon the assumption that scientific epistemological progress takes place as an evolutionary process, in the course of which “false” theories i.e. theories that do not survive the confrontation with reality, are eliminated, so that continuously growing stock of (provisionally) secured knowledge develops.

By contrast, Thomas Kuhn puts forward the thesis that falsifying experiences, in the sense assumed by Karl Popper, “Simply do not

exist”, for “if every single discordancy was a reason to reject a theory, then all theories would have to be rejected for all time”, He rather, believes, that sciences follow a positively oriented heuristic course, and that epistemological progress takes place, not in an evolutionary, cumulative fashion, but rather through the revolutionary supersession of the “paradigm” hitherto accepted as valid within a “Scientific Community”. Kuhn defines a paradigm as “the entire constellation of opinion value methods, etc., that are shared by the members given community”⁽⁵⁾ “Normal” science attempts to solve as many problems of content as possible within the framework of explanatory model that is considered correct (paradigm), without questioning the framework itself, which is set by certain fundamental assumptions. The paradigm gets in to crisis if fundamentally new facts come to light, and the number of unsolved problems, and findings that cannot be explained by the explanatory patterns, employed hitherto, become larger and larger. This is the time in which a competing theory has the opportunity of becoming accepted by the scientific community and thereby causing a change of paradigm.⁽⁶⁾ What is essentially new about a new paradigm is, hence, the radical transformation of the method of observation, which allows a clear view of possible solutions to problems that were invisible under the old paradigm. “Although the world does not change with the supersession of a paradigm, the scientist subsequently most certainly works in a different world.”⁽⁷⁾ Another aspect of this shift in outlook is the fact that the old concepts undergo a new interpretation. This change in the meaning of familiar concepts in particular is the decisive aspect with respect to the revolutionary effect of new theories.

When the shortcomings of the old paradigm have long been recognized, even by its supporters, and alternatives are already being discussed, it is not yet abandoned by them without further ceremony. Its final replacement is rather preceded by a more or less long period of competition, which is characterized by ‘time – consuming conflicts between the champions of the old and the apologists of the new theory, which are more socio – psychological than logical in nature’⁽⁸⁾

This is, above all, because the advocates of competing paradigms ... always move, to a certain extent, on different levels. The dispute between paradigms cannot be decided by proofs.

In Kahn’s opinion the orientation towards a positive heuristic

method stubborn adherence to established paradigms by no means impedes epistemological progress: on the contrary, it is precisely positively research orientated within the framework of a paradigm which carries the nucleus of its subsequent conquest within itself, in that repeatedly leads to unexpected results, which could not be deduced beforehand from the assumed theory, and which by their accumulation, finally contribute to an awareness of the anomaly and hence to the crisis of the paradigm.

In this contribution the view is put forward that Kuhn's approach to scientific theory – in the form qualified and modified by Wolfgang Stegmüller, amongst others- would appear to be better suited than Popper's to describe and explain the course of the epistemological process in development theory. The point of departure is the hypothesis that the emergence of paradigms in development theory is closely related to the expectations of respectively relevant social reference groups, that the form they take is orientated towards their relevance for practical politics, and that changes in paradigms, and the related transformation of the method of observation, are, as a rule, not triggered off by new scientific findings, but should rather be seen primarily as reaction of the the scientific community to changes in the sphere of the application context⁽⁹⁾

The History of Development Theories :

1-The Theory of Colonial Period :

Until the end of the second world war, little attention was paid into sciences of the developing countries' economic and social problems, despite the fact that conditions in these countries at that time- with the exception of the acceleration the rate of population growth – were not fundamentally different from the situation today “just like today, there was, at time, a large income difference between the developed and the underdeveloped area.

Even at that time . the gap was continuously widening, as had been the case for a century without provoking particular concern”,⁽¹⁰⁾The study of the living conditions of the people in the “backward area”, which were, to a large extent, under colonial rule, was a domain of cultural anthropologists and ethnologists, whose chief interest was devoted to the functional mechanisms of traditional tribal societies. Although several of them concerned themselves with changes in the traditional social structures as a result of external influences ,their

research was of a static nature in- as much as such influences from outside- for example through the cultural contact with the representatives and institutions of the colonial powers- were interpreted “disturbances” of original social equilibrium .

The reason why national economics at that time showed little interest in the problem of poverty in the underdeveloped areas lie to a large extent, in the world political power relationships.

The colonial administrations saw their tasks- apart from securing their power – above all in “making the activity of the Europeans in the colony possible”- an activity which was chiefly understood as “economically opening up the country and was to bring advantages primarily to the capital cities. Hence, they had no interest either in carrying out research into the causes of economic disequilibrium, or in a strategy of overcoming them.

Theoretical deliberations in this direction were regarded as a threat to the position of colonial powers and consequently had no real chances of being translated into concrete political measures. On the other hand, however, there was hardly any awareness of the possibility necessity for such measures. On the contrary “the desire to combat underdevelopment and poverty by improving income and standard, of living was considered a naïve venture⁽¹¹⁾

Although it is not easy to filter a common method of observation out of the multifarious studies written up to the end of the Second World War according to Thomas Kuhn, science does not achieve the stage of maturity until it develops paradigms- it can nevertheless be stated that the majority of the explanatory approaches of theory in the colonial period the imprint of a deterministic basic view of the causes of underdevelopment; hence, they lacked any problem awareness with respect to the possibilities of overcoming the inequalities between the rich industrialized countries and the underdeveloped “rest of the world”⁽¹²⁾ One could, therefore, speak of a deterministic paradigm, which was based upon the hypothesis-which was undisputedly assumed to be true, because it was confirmed by ostensibly empirical evidence – that underdevelopment was caused by a series of natural, constant factors and consequently could not be influenced even by political measures . Accordingly, the theoretical approaches that are argued within the framework of this paradigm certainly represented theories of underdevelopment .They were, however, not development theories, since lacked the strategic theoretical components that aimed

at overcoming underdevelopment. The most striking characteristic of determinism is the explicit ethnocentrism which is expressed in it. Gunnar Myrdal ascribes to this paradigm the ideological function of supplying with its statement on the biological and intellectual superiority of the white race, the theoretical foundation for the industrialized countries, claim to the right to rule over the non –white nations. Indeed ,the thesis of the irrevocability of underdevelopment proved to be a virtually perfect instrument for rationalizing the colonial power structure ;it did this , on the one hand, by reflecting the predominating opinion of the time in the gap of scientific reasoning ,and, on the other hand, by exempting “the colonial powers and the rich nations from the moral and political responsibility for the poverty of these peoples and for the lack of any development”, and simultaneously by justifying the necessity of white rule with reference to the “white man’s burden”, i.e. the white man’s historical task , which supposedly consisted of ruling those were not capable of ruling themselves, .⁽¹³⁾

The theory of international trade did not build upon the foundations of the theorem of the irrevocability of underdevelopment; since however, in its model assumptions, it completely ignored the existing inequalities – by means which it succeeded, as Myrdal remark in “explaining away the international equity problem”-it could be effortlessly incorporated in to the conceptual system of the determinism paradigm and employed to defend existing conditions – especially in the international division forced upon the World by the industrialized countries .

2-The Emergence of Development Theories:

The cause of the abrupt change in outlook which led to the suppression of the determinism paradigm was not to be found in the scientific field, but rather resulted from the change in the international constellation of power and interests in the wake of the Second World war .The beginning of decolonialization and the developing East – West conflict led to radical rethinking with respect to the problem of the underdevelopment areas; for the latter, as independent states, have become interesting not only as trading partners but also as against the respective ideological opponents. These considerations led to the birth of the idea of development aid, which was formulated for the first time as a politically relevant declaration in the four famous points

program of President Truman on 10th January 1949.⁽¹⁴⁾

In view of the transformed political landscape, and under the influence of both the protest of the former colonial nations, who did not want to be treated as second – class people any longer, and increasing inclination on the part of the Western industrialized countries to make concessions to the newly independent states for political reasons complete reversal of opinion also took place in the scientific field. The theorem of the irrevocability of underdevelopment, with its supposedly determining factors, no longer appeared to be appertune, and was silently abandoned. With the increase in problem awareness, the optimistic view “ that the problem of development is essentially the same in both underdeveloped and developed countries”. and that socio – cultural differences did not, in principle, represent a hindrance to successful development, became gradually accepted. This led to the need for a development policy able both to explain the causes of underdevelopment in a way that was different from the deterministic method , and to point to possible ways of overcoming underdevelopment.⁽¹⁵⁾

Hence, corresponding to the division of the world into two ideological camps till 1990 (the end of the Cold – War) , two new scientific views developed the new theoretical orientation and discussion: the modernization paradigm and the imperialism paradigm. Both originate from European traditions of thought, and both have in common the idea that the aim of development consists in repeating the process of economic growth in the present day developing countries. i.e, to catch up with the industrialized countries with respect to their welfare advantage.

They are, however, diametrically opposite when it comes to their explanations of underdevelopment and their models for overcoming it.

2.1 Modernization Theories:

In the course of the years, non – Marxist development theory has produced enormous number of theoretical approaches based upon different sub paradigms . As a rule, they only deal with partial problems and , as a result, their explanatory attempts and strategic concepts often come to controversial conclusions.

Although any attempt for an analysis within the frame – work of present contribution is bound to be selective and , therefore, incomplete, because of such the oretical variety, I shall, in the

following , attempt to provide a survey of the most important trends of development theory.

The formal inaugurating of development aid at the beginning of the 1950s caught the social sciences completely unprepared.

There were no suitable approaches at all – either to explain or to overcome under development on the basis of which a conception of development policy with generally acceptable objectives could have emerged, This shortcoming apparent in the economic field, where, in the context of granted economic, the question as whether economic development should , as in western countries, be left to the free interplay of market forces, or to be turned into a subject for planning – e.g , according to the model of China – would be more rapidly successful, heated debates.

In practice ,the argument for systematic development policy controlled by a state planning authority became more and widely accepted, despite the opposition of those who wanted “simply to transfer the liberal Ideology of justification to the economically underdeveloped countries , and postulated the setting up of a market economy”. Hence, the first phase of development theory is characterized by attempts to examine whether the macro – economic growth models of the “ Harrod- Domar - Type”, developed at the end of the 1940s , were suitable as instrument of planning , for “there were no formal instruments of economic theory available to explain growth and development processes”.⁽¹⁶⁾

Nevertheless, in the final analysis, all efforts at “applying the findings of growth theory , without modification to the developing countries, turned out to be a mistake”.⁽⁹⁾

A: Structural Theories :

One of the common elements upon which all of the modernization theories are based is the dualism hypothesis – originally written produced by Julius H. Boeke – which proceeds on the assumption of existence of divided economic social structure in developing countries. Dualistic structures are regarded not only as a decisive obstacle to development , but also, in some approaches, as a cause of underdevelopment , since they have the innate tendency of self – intensification.⁽¹⁸⁾

Different aspects of the dualism phenomenon come to light, depending on the method of observation. The following , above all, should be mentioned :

1. Social dualism, which is expressed in ethnic and racial differences, as well as in differing social structures and modes of behaviour.
2. Economic dualism (“traditional ”subsistence sector versus “modern ”market economy sector.)
3. Technological dualism, (labour- intensive traditional sector versus capital – intensive modern sector).
4. Regional dualism (differences between the urban and the rural, or between individual regions) as a special case of economic dualism.⁽¹⁹⁾

Bert F. Hoselitz’s Pattern Variables Approach can also be counted amongst the structural theories influenced by the dualism hypothesis; this model explains the gap between underdeveloped and developed countries by differences in the field of social norms, which have a further effect upon the determination of roles.⁽²⁰⁾

Referring closely to Talcot Parson’s model of action alternatives (Pattern Variables), he develops alternative pairs that are supposed to characterize typical social patterns and institutions in “traditional” and “modern” societies. Underdeveloped countries are characterized by the coexistence of social patterns from both fields. The implication of this approach is that development requires the progressive diffusion of “modern” attitudes and institutions.

B: Causation Theories:

The explanatory approaches are termed single crucial variable theories by Gustave F. Papanek , because they usually emphasize one single factor as the major cause of underdevelopment. Never theless, they are not monocausal theories, because all of them stress “that economic growth is a complex process influenced by many factors, but one is of a predominant importance and explains most of the difficulties in the growth rates which exist⁽²¹⁾, the following factors have been identified :

1. Climatic Conditions: Although this factor was of central importance to the colonial theory ” and has been advocated later, it has no further consequent in the modernization theories, due to its insufficient explanatory qualities.⁽²²⁾
2. Insufficient capital accumulation : There were different views on its causes : a lack of ability to save , which holds the mass of population prisoner in a “ Vicious Circle of Poverty” and the

economy in a “ low – level equilibrium trap”... a lack of incentives for investment , since the markets in the developing countries are too small for profitable investment, ... an inefficient financial sector, which is not able to adequately fulfil its role as intermediary in the transformation of savings into investment capital, and therefore demoralizes both sides.⁽²³⁾

3. Insufficient quality of the human sector . Again, there are three different views here: a lack of trained labor, of entrepreneurs, above all in the private sector, and of decision – making or organizational talent.
4. Social and psychological factors, of which , above all, the following should be named :the social structure of the traditional society, especially the institution of the extended family, which prevents economically rational behaviour, the whole gamut of beliefs and value concepts, thought processes and modes of behaviour, which include generative behaviour , that usually lead to consequences such as, explosion which has a negative impact upon economic development, the lack of performance motivation , non – conformist behaviour and empathy, the ability to conceive of oneself in a different social role from one’s current one , all of these being obstacles to development – orientated behaviour.
5. Finally , external factors , of which one should mention, above all , the thesis that underdevelopment was , and primarily caused by exploitation during the colonial period and the political and economic dependency, which still persists today. The latter thesis has, however, largely been ignored in the context of the modernization theories.⁽²⁴⁾

C: Transformation Theories :

These refer to deductive , prognostic approaches, in which statements of suspected course of the transformation of the underdeveloped social and economic structures are deduced from an analysis of structures and causes carried out earlier . The fundamental idea common to these approaches is “that the efficient economics and societies that develop under their own steam possess a specific structure”, and that the underdeveloped countries are “strugglers” , who have to repeat the development process that has already taken place in the industrialized countries.⁽²⁵⁾The transformation theories too contain theological elements; for objectives, and thus preliminary

decisions as to the development strategy to be chosen , can be implicitly deduced from the Standard patterns upon which they are based. The following approaches are the most important :

1. Walt W. Rostow's historically orientated theory of the stages of economic growth, which interprets the development process as a continuous of economic stages described as ideal types. This theory has probably influenced thought and action in the field of development strategy in the last two decades more than any other theory, in spite of criticism levelled against it .⁽²⁶⁾
2. The diffusion theory, which is based upon the assumption that the transformation process is set in motion by the transfer of scarce factors of production (capital, technical innovations, know – how, etc...) from the industrialized countries to the developing countries, and “that the advances that are made within the modern sector are bound to spread across the whole country by means of a process of diffusing consumer goods , techniques, modes of behaviour and institutions.”⁽²⁷⁾
3. Finally, a group of theories from the field of sociology and political science , that are predominantly to be classified under the heading of structural functionalism. They place the concept of “Modernization” at the center of their deliberations , defining it as order to a modern, industrialized and dynamic society”. As a result, they are generally referred to as modernization theories. Gabriel A. Almond wrote in his Book “A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics”. “All political structures are dynamic,, even in the most primitive society, is only they are not so clearly visible, it is consequently necessary to diversify underdeveloped political structures and to extend their capacities, so that they are in a position to maintain the stability of the system even when “development crises” “crop up”.”⁽²⁸⁾

The structural functionalist modernization theories emphatically assign “only secondary importance to the development of solution strategies” and do not go beyond “general principles”, despite their claim to explain the development process in terms of the overall society.

2.2. Imperialism Theories:

The theoretical approaches to be subsumed under the imperialism paradigm are all based upon Marxist social teachings and the

imperialism theory of Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin. The point of departure here is the thesis that the capitalist system has hitherto been able to postpone its collapse by making non-industrialized countries dependent upon it – through colonialization or other forms of exertion of power and forcing them to open up their markets for both the sale of goods and profitable investment for capital. The system's downfall is nevertheless inevitable, since the capitalist pervasion of these countries calls forth social conflicts that tend to lead to national liberation movement, through which capitalism will be devoid of its most important hinterland. ⁽²⁹⁾

After the Second World War, the classical imperialism theory was extended to form a series of development theories, which differed in their strategic deliberations, but not, however, in their analytical approach. The focal point of the theories is the thesis that poverty in the developing countries stems from their exploitation by the industrialized countries, who had managed to build up a "system of global interdependence; the structure of the latter comprised" the political subordination of the non-industrialized societies and their states.. to the interests of the metropolitan states; (its) economic content (involved) the continuous expansion of the market and there by the creation of a hinterland that was of vital importance to the dynamic form of production. ⁽³⁰⁾

Under the pressure of the change in the power relationships – independence movements in the colonial areas, encouraged by the existence of state – organized, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist forces – the capitalist system was forced (according to the imperialism theory) to modify its tactics, and went over from direct colonial rule to more subtle form of control; the objectives of imperialism, however, have not changed in any respect. Since it continues to maintain the support of the feudal and bourgeois upper classes in the developing countries, and lacks the will to surrender its position voluntarily, it will not be possible to overcome underdevelopment until a national revolution creates the necessary preconditions by smashing the old social structures and eliminating the dependency relations. The orthodox version of the solution strategies postulates the so-called "non-capitalist course of development" (socialism).

According to this, the "Structures of underdevelopment do not allow a socialist transformation, since a certain level of development of the productive forces is a prerequisite for this, therefore a national

revolution of liberation must initially take place , which has to establish the necessary conditions for the consolidation of economic and political relations with the socialist countries that allow for the socialist states to the peoples of the economically underdeveloped countries in all stages of development proper fulfillment of this can make the transition to the socialist revolution .⁽³¹⁾

It is however, characteristic of all of these approaches that the political field is over – emphasized and the much – adured socio – economic analysis is neglected.

2.3 Structural theories of international relations :

Beside Marxist authors like Samir Amin and Arghiri Emmanuel, who developed the concept of unequal exchange, one should above all mention John Galtung, who opened up a new dimension for the theory of international relations: He does not conceive the integration and conflict theories- which only deal with one single aspect of international interdependency relations – as mutually negating theoretical approaches, but rather supplied evidence to show that they are complementary; he then unified both aspects in a structuralist approach. His structural theory of imperialism can therefore be regarded as an important step in the direction of a general theory of international power and dependency relationships.

According to John Galtung, the relations between interacting partners are characterized by reciprocal dependency with different degrees of asymmetry, which can range from a state of complete equilibrium to complete , one – sided dependence. In the case of relations between industrialized and developing countries, the asymmetry stems from unequal positions of the interacting partners with respect to their political, economical, and technological exchange potential, and is maintained by a mechanism of structural power , which results from these unequal positions of power. In this context, the centers of the central nations can rely on the support of the centers of the peripheral nations as bridgeheads that are united with them by common interests. The consequence of such asymmetrical relations is an unequal distribution of the profits and losses that ensue from the interacting processes to the disadvantage of the weaker nations, which further damages the latter’s development potential and hence tends to contribute towards an intensification of the asymmetry between the interacting partners.⁽³²⁾

A solution of conflict by means of an integration strategy is , according to John Galtung, only possible in the case of interdependency relations that are in approximate equilibrium . In order to overcome asymmetrical relationship, on the other hand, one requires a change in the national and international dependency structures. The development strategy should, therefore, consist of two phases: a dissociative phase , which puts a certain distance between the conflicting parties, thus reducing the conflict potential and “allowing participants to acquire a certain degree of self – preservation, self – esteem , and self – sufficiency, until the conflict has balanced (in terms of power) ; this is followed by an associative phase, which is directed towards integration of the conflicting parties”⁽³³⁾.

Final Analysis , Summary and Prospects :

The above historical review should have revealed the close relations between the emergence and supersession of development theories on the one hand , and the expectations of relevant social reference groups on the other. It has also become clear that the factors that led to a change in the method of observation never came from the scientific community itself-despite the realization of “anomalies” , i.e deficits in explanation- but rather from the political sphere. The history of development theories up to now neither supplied any evidence to prove that development theoreticians work according to Karl Popper’s falsification strategy . On the other hand , it provides further evidence for the thesis....that social sciences don’t begin to become aware of social problems until they have been defined as such by relevant social groups. The current intensive effort at studying the problems of underdevelopment countries,-as Gunnar Myrdal recognized over twenty years ago- “by no means preceded the general interest in this problem , neither can it be claimed that it was our research that led to this interest . The new orientation in research was , on the contrary , caused and inspired by the pressure of events that gave the problems a political weight , a statement that applies to the latest developments in the field of development research.

The fundamental hypothesis can be summarized as follows:

1. Normal epistemological progress in development theory takes place within the framework of paradigms that are socially determined , i.e

are to a considerable extent orientated towards the performance expectations of reference groups in the political sphere.

2. Deviating theoretical approaches that proceed on the basis of a changed outlook and thereby question the explanatory model of the currently valid paradigm can only become generally accepted and become established as a competing paradigm if they are accepted by relevant reference groups as guideline for their political action. This assumes changes in the application context, with the result that social reference groups, that hitherto exerted relatively little influences and towards which the new theory is orientated, become politically more powerful. Another possible consequences is that the social reference groups that were hitherto relevant either totally reject, or also only partially continue to accept, explanations and strategic conceptions offered within the framework of the currently valid paradigm - as a result of a growing deficit of solutions to problems or a change in the constellation of political power - and begin to apply themselves to possible alternative solutions.
3. A paradigm is replaced when it loses its technological relevance, i.e. when it is no longer accepted by any politically influential reference group as an orientation for action. In contrast to Kuhn's assumption - which was obliged more to the natural sciences - a paradigm can be replaced as a result of profound changes in the social sphere, before a competing paradigm has established itself.
4. Competition between paradigms takes place when, and as long as, social reference group with political power continue to cling to the old paradigm as an orientation for action, despite the establishment of new paradigms.

If one observes epistemological progress in the field of development theory from the point of view of these hypotheses, then the following conclusion can be drawn:

The suppression of a paradigm has hitherto only taken place on the "parameters" of development theory. The determinism paradigm of colonial theory become irrelevant within a very short period of time after the end of Second World War, before the existing individual critical approaches had reached a stage of development that would have sufficed in order to establish a competing paradigm. Development Policy, which began for political reasons shortly after the War, found itself confronted with a vacuum as regards theoretical guidelines for action in many spheres.

This vacuum was filled almost simultaneously in the following by the competing paradigms of the modernization and imperialism theories. Orthodox Marxist development theory occupies a special position, in that, it rigorously avoids the scientific discussion that is customary in the Western Countries. One should, therefore, not reckon with the suppression of this paradigm in the foreseeable future, despite its growing explanatory deficit. In Western World, the modernization paradigm was able to assert itself for about twenty years, virtually unhindered, since it was accepted as the theoretical guideline for action by the overwhelming majority of politicians, including the elites in most development countries .

There is no doubt that research within the framework of development theory has achieved considerable advances on the way to construct a so called general theory of development. Franz Nuscheler is therefore is correct in referring to the fact that the modernization theories are still “ neither totally refuted nor insignificant” today. There is therefore no reason to speak of the fall the development and modernization theories, as its critics tend to do. The struggle for constructing a general theory of development and modernization is still going on. ⁽³⁴⁾

NOTES

1. See : Vlrich Menzel : The Differentiation Process In The Third World And Its Consequences For The Norh – South Conflict And Development Theory , In : “ Law And State” , A Biannual Collection Of Recent German Contributions To These Fields, Volume 30, Edited By “ The Institute For Scientific Co- Operation, Tubingen (1979, W.Germany. Pp. 52-84) .
2. Volker Matthias : South-South Relation, On Communication , Co-Operation And Solidatity Between Developing Countries , In : “Law And State” , Vol . 30, Ibid., Pp.84-107 .
3. See : Joan Robinson : Some Aspects Of Socio-Economic Development, In : Theories Of Social Change , Edt. Wolfgang Zapf, Berlin 1971, Pp.269-294 .
4. Gunnar Myrdal : Political Manifest About The Poor – World, Frankfurt, 1970,P.3.
5. See: Thomas Kuhn : The Structure Of The Scientific Revolution, Frankfurt, 1978,Pp.53-57 .
6. See: Morris Rosenberg : The Language Of Social Research, New York, 1965,Pp.36-52 .
7. See: Werner Heisenberg : The Relations Between Society And Science, In : “ Univetsitas” , A German Review Of The Arts And Sciences, Quarterly Journal Devoted To Social And Political Research , Vol. 18, 1976, Stuttgart , Germany , Pp. 97-98 .
8. Werner , Geisenberg , Ibid , P. 98 .
9. See : Meehan Eugene : The Theory And Method Of Socio – Political Analysis, Homewood , Illionis, The Homewood Press, 1965, Pp.112-115 .
10. See : Irma Adelman : Theories Of Economic Growht And Development, Stanford 1961,P.38 .
11. Wilbert, E. Moore : Industrialization And Society, Unesco – Mouton, 1963,P.299 .
12. Willbert, E.Moore : Industrialization And Social Change , In : Theories Of Social Change, Edt . By Wolfgang Zapf, Berlin, 1971,Pp.163-164 .
13. In This Context, Gunnar Myrdal Refers To The Fact That The Ideological Cintent Of A Theory Does Not Necessarily Always Stem From Aconscious Apologetic Intention, But Rather Is Often Due To Unconscious Value Implications; “Ideologies Always Appesr To The People Who Advocate Them As Simple , Indisputable Conclusions From Obvious Facts .
14. See : Gunner Myrdal : Political Manifest, Loc , Cit, P.268 .

15. See: Konrad Bekker : The Point 4program Of The United States, In : Bert F . Hoselitz (Edt.), The Progress Of Underdeveloped Areas, Chicago, London, 1961, Pp.230-235.
16. "Along Side The Political And Economic Reasons, Other Motives Were Also Involved : For Example, A Philanthropic Belief In Progress, In Which The Advanced Countries Of The World Appear As The Forerunners Of An Overall Development Of Mankind .
17. Gunnar Myrdal : Doplomacy By Terminology, In Asian Drama,Vol . Iii, Appendix 1,P.1839, (Berlin 1982)
18. See : Herry Johnson : Changing Views On Trade And Development, Some Reflections, In : Manning Nash (Edt.) Essays On Economic Development And Cultural Change, Chicago, 1977, Pp.363-368 .
19. Julius,H.Boeke : Economics And Economic Policy Of Dual Societies, New York 1953, Pp.4-8.
20. See : Richard, S. Eckaus : The Factor Proportions Problem In Underdeveloped Areas, In A.N. Argawala And S.P. Singh (Edts.) The Economics Of Underdevelopment, London,1968, Pp.348-356.
21. Bert, F. Hoselitz : Main Concepts In The Analysis Of The Social Implication Of Technical Change , In : Bert Hoselitz And Wilbert Moore, (Edts.) Industrialization, Loc. Cit.Pp.16-2
22. See : Gustav F . Papanek : Economic Development Theory , The Earnest Search For A Mirage, In Manning Nash, (Edt.) Essays Loc. Cit, Pp. 270-275. (N.Y. 1987)
23. Amongst Other Ezamples : S. P. Huntington, Mainsprings Of Civilization, New Yourk 1945, Pp.125-130 .
24. Amongst Other Examples,
 = Hans, W.Singer: Economic Progress In Underdeveloped Countries, In : Social Research, Vol. 16, 1949, Pp. 1-5 .
 = Richard R.Nelson : A Theory Of The Low – Level Equilibrium Trap, In : The American Economic Review, Vol.46,1956,Pp.894-902.
 =Shaw, E.S. : Financial Deepening In Economic Development, New Youk 1973, Chapter 3.
25. See:
 =David C. McClelland : The Achieveng Society, Princeton 1961 .
 = Everett, E, Hagen : On The Theory Of Social Change, Homewood 1962 .
26. Harry G. Johnson : Econmic Policies Towards Less Developed Countries, London 1967,Pp.48-55.
27. Walt W. Rostow : Les Etaps De La Croissance Economique, Paris, 1970, Seuil, Pp.13-14 .
28. Harry G. Johnson : Econmic Policies Towards Less Developed Countries, London 1967,Pp.48-50.

29. Gabriel Almond : A Functional Approach To Comparative Politics, In : Gabriel Almond And James Coleman (Edts.) The Politics Of Developing Areas, Princeton 1960, Pp.3-7.
30. See :
=Colin Clark : The Conditions Of Economic Progress 3rd Edition, London 1957.
=Simon Kuznets : Six Lectures On Economic Growth, Glencoe 1959.
= Rosa Luxemburg : The Accumulation Of Capital, Berlin 1913.
31. Clark, Colin : The Conditions Of Economic Progress, London 1957.
32. Howard Ellis : Approaches To Economic Development , New York , 1955.
33. John Galtung : A Structural Theory Of Imperialism, Oslo, 1986, Pp.121-127.
34. John Galtung Loc. Cit, Pp. 128-129.
35. For More Analysis, See :
=Lamger, William : The Diplomacy Of Imperialism, N.Y. 1968.
=Folrence, Srgant : Economics And Sociology Of Industry, Baltimore 1969.
= Mesdows, Donella : The Limits Of Growth, N.Y. 1972.

REFERENCES

1. Adelman, Irma : Theories Of Economic Growth And Development, Stanford 1961.
2. Aron, R. : Social Development, Paris 1965.
3. Almond, G. A. : A Developmental Approach To Political Systems, In: World Politics, N. Y. Nr. 17, 1965.
4. Agarwala, A. N. : The Economics Of Underdevelopment, New York 1958.
5. Apter, D. E. : System, Process And Politics Of Economic – Development, N.Y. 1963.
6. Almond, G.A. : The Politics Of The Developing Areas, Princeton 1960.
7. Almond, G.A. : Comparative Politics, A Developmental Approach, Boston 1966.
8. Apter, D.E. : The Politics Of Modernization, Chicago 1965.
9. Boeke, Julius: Economics And Economic Policy Of Dual Societies, New York 1953 .
10. Balandier, G. : Social, Economic And Technological Change, Paris 1958.
11. Balandier, G. : Social, Economic And Technological Change, Paris 1962.
12. Barringer, H. R. : Social Change In Developing Areas, Cambridge, Mass, 1966.
13. Boskoff, A. : Recent Theories Of Social Change, N.Y. 1964.
14. Bendix, R. : State And Society, Boston 1958.
15. Black, C.E. : The Dynamics Of Modernization, New York – Evanston 1967.
16. Braibanti, R. : Tradition, Values And Socio – Economic Development, Durham, N.C. 1961.
17. Bottomore, T. B. : Recent Theories Of Development, N.Y.1962.
18. Boulding, K. E. Toward A General Theory Of Growth, In : The Canadian Journal Of Economics And Political Science, Toronto, Nr. 19,1953.
19. Barau, P.A. : The Political Economy Of Growth, N.Y. 1957.
20. Buchanan, R.A. : Technology And Social Progress, Oxford 1965.
21. Clark, Colin : The Conditions Of Economic Progress, London 1957.
22. Coleman, J. S. : Article Modernization, Political Aspect, In: International Encyclopedia Of The Social Sciences, N.Y. Bd 10,1968.
23. Chong – Do Hah : A Critique Of Current Studies On Political Development And Modernization, In : Social Research, Nr.35,N.Y.1968.
24. Cancian, F. : Functional Analysis Of Change, In : American Sociological Review, Nr. 25,N.Y.1972 .

25. Donella, Meadows : The Limits Of Growth, N.Y.1967.
26. Demerath, N.J.: System, Change And Conflict, N.Y. 1967.
27. Dobb, M.: Economic Growth And Underdeveloped Countries, London1963.
28. Deutsch, Karl : External Influences On The International Behavior Of States, In : B. R. Farrel (Edt.) Approaches To Comparative And International Politics, Evanston, 1966.
29. Eugene, Neehan : The Theory And Method Of Socio – Political Analysis, Homewood, Illinois, The Homewood Press, 1965.
30. Eckaus, R. S. : The Factor Proportions Problem In Underdeveloped Areas, In : A. N. Argawala, The Economics Of Underdevelopment, London 1968 .
31. Everett, E. Hagen : On The Theory Of Social Change, Homewood 1962.
32. Ellis , Howard, Approaches To Economic Dvelopment, New York 1955.
33. Eckstein, A. : Individualism And Role Of The State In Economic Growth, In : Economic Development And Cultural Change, Nr.6,London 1958.
34. Eisenstad, S.N. : Political Modernization, Some Comparative Notes, In : International Journal Of Coparative Sociology, Nr. 5 N.Y. 1964.
35. Eisenstad, S.N. : Breakdowns Of Modernization, In : Economic Development And Cultural Change, Nr.12,London 1964.
36. Eisenstad, S.N.: Modernization And Conditions Of Sustained Growth, In :World Politic, N.Y.Nr.1964.
37. Eisenstad, S. N. : Social Transformation In Modernization In : American Sociological Review , Nr.30,1965(N.Y.)
38. Eisenstad, S.N.: Essays On Sociological Aspects Of Political And Economic Development, Den Haag 1961 .
39. Eisensad, S. N.: Modernization, Protest And Change, Englewood Cliffs, 1967.
40. Etzioni, A. : Studies In Social Change, New York 1966.
41. Etzioni, A. : Social Change, Sources, Pattirns And Consequences, New York 1964.
42. Florence, S. : Economics And Socololgy Of Industry , Baltimore 1969.
43. Findel, J.L. : Political Development And Social Change, N.Y.1966.
44. Galtung, John : A Structural Theory Of Imperialism , Oslo, 1986.
45. Gerschenkron, A. : Economic Backwardness In Historical Perspective, Cabridge , Mass. 1962.
46. Gill, R.T. : Economic Development, Past And Present, Englewood Cliffs, 1963.
47. Gusfield, J.R. : Tradition And Modernity, Misplaced In The Study Of Cocial Change, In : The American Journal Of Sociology, Nr. 72, N.Y.1967.

48. Huntington, S.P.: *Mainsprings Of Civelization*, New York 1945.
49. Hoseletz, Bert, F. : *Main Concepts In The Analysis Of The Social Implication Of Technical Change*, In : Bert Hoselitz And Wilbert Moore, (Edts.) *Industrialization*, Unesco, 1963.
50. Heisenberg, Werner : *The Realtions Between Society And Science*, In : "Universitas" , *Quarterly Journal Devoted To Social And Political Research*, Vol. 18, Stuttgart 1976 .
51. Howard, Ellis : *Approaches To Economic Development*, N.Y.1955.
52. Hass, E. : *Toward Controlling International Change*, In : *World Politics*, Nr. 17, N.Y. 1964.
53. Hoselitz, B. F. : *Sociological Aspects Of Economic Growth*, Glencoe 1960.
54. Hoselitz, B.F. : *Industrialization And Society* , Den Haag 1963.
55. Huntington, S. P. : *Political Development And Political Decay*, In : *World Politics*, Nr.17, N.Y.1965.
56. Horowitz, L. : *The Three Worlds Of Development*, N.Y.1966.
57. Hield, W. : *The Study Of Social Change In Social Science*, In : *The British Journal Of Sociology*, Nr. S, London 1955 .
58. Hart, H. : *Social Theory And Social Change*, In : L. Gross (Edt.) *Symposion On Sociological Theory*, N.Y.1959.
59. Hagen, E. : *On The Theory Of Social Change*, Homewood, 1962.
60. Huntington, S. P. : *Political Order In Changing Societies* , New Haven 1968.
61. Mardal, Gunnar: *Political Manifest About The Poor – World*, Frankfurt 1970.
62. Moore, Wilbert : *Industrialization And Society*, Unesco – Mouton 1963.
63. Moore, Wilbert : *Industrialization And Social Change*, In : *Theories Of Social Change*,Etd. By Wolfgang Zapf, Berlin 1971.
64. Myrdal, Gunnar : *Diplomacy By Terminology*, In: *Asian Drama*,Vol. Iii, Appendix 1, Berlin 1972 .
65. Mazrui, A. : *From Social Darwinism To Current Theories Of Modernization, A Tradition Of Analysis*, In : *World Politics*, Nr.21,N.Y 1986 .
66. Nelson, Richard : *A Theory Of The Low-Level Equilibrium Trap*, In : *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 46, 1956 .
67. Niehoff, A. H. : *A Xasebook Of Social Change* , Chicago 1966.
68. Nettl, J. P. *Industrialization, Development, Modernization*, In : *The British Journal Of Sociology*, Nr . 17, London 1966.
69. Papanek, Gustab : *Economic Development Theory, The Earnest Search For A Mirage*, In : *Manning Nash, Etd., Essays On Development*, N.Y. 1987 .

70. Presthus, R. B. : The Sociology Of Economic Development, In : International Journal Of Comparative Sociology, Nr. 1,N.Y.1962.
71. Pullmann, D. R. : Social Change In Economic Development Theory, In : The Canadian Review Of Sociology And Anthropolgy,Nr.3,Toronto 1966.
72. Parsons, Talcot : The Social System , Glencoe , 1951 .
73. Parsons, Talcot : Structure And Process In Modern Societies, Celncoe, 1960.
74. Parsons . Talcot : Economy And Society , London 1956 .
75. Robinson, Joan : Some Aspects Of Socio – Economic Development, In : Theories Of Social Change, Edt. Wolfgang Zapf, Berlin 1971.
76. Robinson, Morris : The Language Of Social Research, N.Y. 1965.
77. Rostow, Walt : Les Etaps De La Croissance Economique, Paris 1970.
78. Rose, R. : Modern Nations And The Study Of Political Modernization, N.Y. 1968.
79. Rosenberg, M. : Neglected Dimensions In The Analysis Of Economic Change, N.Y.1964.
80. Singer, Hans : Economic Progress In Underdeveloped Countries, In : Social Research, Vol. 16,1949, N.Y.
81. Shaw, E.S. : Financial Deepening In Economic Development, N.Y.1973.
82. Smelser, N.J. : Process Of Social Change, In : N.J. Smelser, Sociology , An Inrtoduction, N.Y.1967.
83. Smelser, N.J. : Toward A Theory Of Modernization, N.Y. 1963.
84. Spengler, J. : Economic Development, Political Preconditions And Political Consequences, in : The Journal of Politics, N.Y.1960.
85. Shils. F. : Political Development in New States, Den Haag 1963.
86. Spengler, J. : Breakdowns In Modernization, N.Y.1966.
87. Weiner, M. : Modernization, The Dynamics Of Growht, N.Y. 1966.