Philippine Journal of Public Administration, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2 (April 1993)

Models/Theories of Development and the Concept of Social Development

ALFONZO Z. GUZMAN*

Various models/theories have emerged through the years in response to the need to gain a better understanding of the problems of development and underdevelopment in the Third World. These include, under the orthodox paradigm: the classical model, the neoclassical model, the expanding capitalist nucleus model, the structuralist model, the Maoist model, and the basic needs model. The radical/political economy paradigm includes: the Marxist model, the neo-Marxist model and the dependency model. Each of the model has social development dimensions. A review of these dimensions led to a conclusion that a viable development in the Philippines requires fundamental extrication of its economy from the orbit of the world capitalist system and the pursuit of an independent economic policy.

Introduction

The term "development" gained currency after the second World War as a consequence of the growing attention given by the industrialized West to the conditions of the underdeveloped nations (Ocampo 1977:2). The cold war politics of the 1950s and the early 1960s and the consequent competition for the allegiance of new independent nations have also been cited as part of the reason for this surge of interest in the conditions of Third World nations (Kunczik 1984:45-46). Development, however, may be said to have pervaded Western thought even as early as the latter part of the 18th century and early 19th century, albeit in economic growth terms, as evidenced by the theoretical formulations of such economic stalwarts as Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo.

The Orthodox Paradigm

The Classical Model

The concern of the classical theorists in Western industrializing nations was economic growth, in its aggregate measure. More specifically, they focused

*Doctor of Public Administration student, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City and Professor, Isabela State University, Cabagan, Isabela.

on the analysis of long-run economic growth, its causes and impact on other macroeconomic variables, and with sustaining long-run growth. They believed in the imperative of an extended market, domestic and foreign, to broaden opportunities for increased division of labor that would ostensibly raise productivity through efficiency and the use of improved tools and machines. Growth dynamic was believed to be engendered by both manufacturing and agriculture, with the former contributing greater capital investment and productivity/output. Increased savings and capital investment were accorded an essential role in an expanded production, but merchants and manufacturers were seen to be the major source of capital investment, rather than the landlord class, which was observed to be less predisposed to productive investment. Free competition, trade liberalization, technological change, and the determination to accumulate wealth also form part of the key features of the classical model (Hunt 1989:9-11).

The Neoclassical Model

The emergence of the neoclassical model was preceded by the Keynesian revolution in economic theory, apparently as a reaction to the international economic recession in the 1930s. The Keynesian postulate that increased savings during recession may exacerbate the downward spiral of output and employment, and that increased public sector spending during a recession might be a virtue, not a vice, (Hunt 1989:25) gained currency in the West during the recession period. Keynes noted that in times of recession and high unemployment in industrialized countries, the problem is to employ existing but poorly employed factors of production. He argued that increased aggregate demand (consumption and investment), which leads to increased economic activity, can only be brought about by increased expenditure (Blomstrom 1985:12). Parenthetically, his argument was borne out by the success of the New Deal in the US. However, he neglected the long-term problems of underdevelopment.

If the classical model was concerned with the dynamics of long-term economic growth, the neoclassical model focused on the short-run, efficiency-oriented perspective, prescribing for Less Developed Countries (LDCs) the efficiency-maximizing principles of partial and general equilibrium theory and the associated principle of comparative advantage.

As conceptualized and developed by Heckscher and Ohlin, the principle of comparative advantage argues that different countries have different relative supplies of production factors, and this determines what commodity would give a country the comparative advantage of cost. It prescribes that a country should specialize in and export those commodities which they have in abundance. Hence, a country with a relatively good supply of labor, compared to capital, should have a comparative advantage of cost in the production and export of labor-intensive commodities, as in developing countries. It should, however, import capital-intensive commodities from countries with relatively ample supply of capital, as in industrialized countries (Blomstrom 1984:15). The foregoing arrangement thus operates within the framework of an international division of labor, in which all nations must specialize in and export only those commodities which they can produce cheaply. Accordingly, the neoclassicists considered foreign trade as an effective "engine of growth" and espoused *laissez faire* — the principle that economic growth is best achieved by allowing the unimpeded operation of market forces. Government intervention is therefore held to be detrimental. However, later theorists concede minimal government intervention, e.g., in the area of planning how best free trade could be operationalized. Later theorists also introduced the notion of maximization of aggregate economic welfare through the operation of free market.

As with the classical theorists, the neoclassicists view development as a linear process and in purely economic terms. Underdevelopment is viewed simply as the inability of underdeveloped countries to generate the right quantity and mixture of savings and investment. Capitalists in the modernizing sector of the economy are perceived to bear the brunt of economic growth on the assumption that the benefits of growth will eventually trickle down to the traditional sector of the population.

The neoclassical framework opened the door to the grant of foreign loans/aid to the underdeveloped countries by the World Bank-International Monetary Fund (WB-IMF), with imposition of structural adjustment programs such as devaluation; restructuring, in the forms of reduced government spending and shifting emphasis of investment and production from nontradable to tradable goods; and import liberalization, which would ostensibly promote economic growth (Richter 1989:73-75).

The Expanding Capitalist Nucleus Model

The major propositions of the model include: an expanded domestic market; autonomous capital accumulation in the private sector; and government intervention to resolve the problems of externalities, market failures and imperfections, to guide resource allocation and to match expanded investment with effective fiscal policies. Intensive and long-run industrialization is emphasized. Savings and investment are considered essential, but the means of achieving them is a subject of disagreement among the theorists. The dominant position, however, emphasizes internal rather than external means. This is in accordance with the view that constraints to economic growth are predominantly internal (e.g., social and economic rigidities). The pattern of growth (balanced vs. unbalanced) is also an area of disagreement among the theorists, but the emphasis is on increased capital accumulation in which capitalists in the modernizing sector are still accorded the key role (Hunt 1989:52-64). The model also subscribes to the linear and trickle-down postulate of development.

The Structuralist Model

The structuralist model emerged in Latin America concurrent with the emergence of the expanding capitalist nucleus model in North America and Western Europe. Notwithstanding differences in the causal circumstances that gave rise to each of these models, they have some points of convergence. First, both perceive economic development as a cumulative process, contrary to the precept of comparative static equilibrium espoused by the neoclassicists. Second, both reject the static theory of comparative advantage. Third, both agree on the importance of mobilizing unproductive labor into productive activities. Fourth, both agree on the importance of state intervention in resource mobilization (Hunt 1989:47-51).

They differ, however, in one key respect. While the expanding capitalist nucleus model views the constraints to development as internal, the structuralist model views the constraints to have been engendered externally. That is, the international economy is held to be responsible for the existing structures of underdeveloped economies. Thus, the object of development is the structural transformation of underdeveloped economies so that self-sustained growth is made possible. The corresponding strategy is import substitution and concentration on the development of diversified domestic industrial sector, including capital goods production (Hunt 1989:53-63).

The Maoist Model

The successful experience of China in the simultaneous pursuit of growth and structural change, coupled with improvements in mass welfare during the postrevolution period, evoked the interest of scholars in the West during the 1970s. This interest was heightened by the trend towards redefinition of development to account for the problem of inequality, along with the intractable problems of mass poverty and unemployment. The Chinese experience assumed a strong interest value also because of its novel perspective of integrating social, political, ideological, and economic change (Hunt 1989:73-75).

From the Maoist perspective, the goal of economic development is material abundance, with abolition of income inequality. The key strategy consists in building up productive capacity and modern heavy industry within the context of social ownership of the means of production, social control of production decisions and distribution of output. Resource mobilization and allocation are geared towards simultaneous but rational buildup of heavy industry, light industry and agriculture. Increased capital accumulation is envisioned to spill over into the provision of mass welfare to support socialist transformation (Hunt 1989:73-75).

The Basic Needs Model

The emergence of the basic needs model in the 1970s was occasioned by hard data evidencing growing economic inequality within Third World countries and by the perception that policies of distribution with growth might not redound to the welfare of the poor living in absolute poverty. In 1976, the International Labor Organization (ILO) gave impetus to the perspective by enjoining all countries to give priority to the basic needs of their population, defining basic needs to include minimal consumption requirements needed for a physically healthy population, certain minimal standards of access to public services and amenities, access by the poor to employment opportunities to enable them to achieve target minimum income, and the right to participate in decisions that affect their lives (Hunt 1989:75-77). The object of development is equity and the improvement of the quality of life.

The model defines economic development primarily in terms of progress towards elimination of absolute poverty and unemployment. Meeting basic needs first is perceived to ease domestic demand constraint and induce investment, on which sustained growth is purportedly founded. The desired pattern of growth is one that is promotive of development of capital and intermediate goods production, via small and medium scale labor-intensive methods, although capital-intensive investments are not discounted. The use of low-cost, labor-intensive methods of capital construction and service provision are recommended for expansion of essential services (Hunt 1989:75-77).

The Radical/Political Economy Paradigm

The Marxist Model

It is the Marxist view that capitalism came to most underdeveloped countries via the transfer of large-scale business from abroad, rather than through the growth of competitive enterprise, hence, the failure of a strong middle class to rise. There is, therefore, generally no vigorous competition nor a significant accumulation of economic surplus among middle class entrepreneurs to support expansion and modernization of their businesses. Moreover, the penchant of aristocratic landlords for excess consumption and to invest in unproductive labor considerably erodes social surplus (the difference between output and necessary consumption). Actual social surplus is further reduced by the accumulation by businessmen of investment or bank accounts abroad. This waste of a considerable portion of the social surplus due to prevailing social and economic structures, with their concomitant antidevelopment social relations, habits, customs and culture, is what causes underdevelopment and militates against change, from the Marxist perspective (Hunt 1989:19-22). Furthermore, change is actively opposed by the ruling class, for fear that social and economic development would threaten their power, status and way of life. Governments of underdeveloped countries are also believed to be poor agents of change, since they are generally controlled/ influenced by these wealthy classes (Bautista 1986:9-10).

Marxism emphasizes close interconnections between economic, political and cultural aspects of social organization and theory. It postulates that the polity and culture of society reinforce a particular pattern of class dominance associated with a particular mode of production, consisting of the forces and relations of production. "Forces of production" refers to the mode of combination of labor with the instruments of labor and raw materials. "Production relations" refers to the class distribution of control over the means of production, the organization of production and the modes of appropriation of output. Marx identified five historic modes of production: the Asiatic, ancient, feudal, modern bourgeois or capitalist, and communist (Reyes 1989:16-17; Hunt 1989:18-20).

Economic growth is perceived to be very slow during the precapitalist stages, but to acquire dynamics during the capitalist stage in which capitalists are seen to accelerate accumulation of wealth. The anarchy of capitalist competition without central coordination would inexorably bring about crises of overproduction and underconsumption, which in turn would trigger mass labor layoff and wage decline. The dynamics of growth, however, would soon entrench monopoly capitalism as capitalists achieve concentration of wealth. Marx predicted that the concomitant exploitation of the laboring class or proletariat would soon lead them to rise up and seize both the means of production and state power, eventually ushering the communist mode of production. He envisions that the ideal state for all societies is one of material abundance in a context of communal ownership of the means of production, where each individual works, each according to his ability, for the good of society, and is rewarded according to his need (Hunt 1989:21-22).

Lenin later provided a new dimension to the analysis of change in nonindustrial capitalist economies. Unlike Marx whose analysis was focused on the national setting, Lenin dealt with the international setting. He argued that the accumulation and concentration of wealth in industrialized countries would drive capitalists to channel their surplus capital to their colonies for new investment, as source of cheap raw materials, and as captive markets. Unlike Marx, therefore, who viewed development of capitalism in underdeveloped countries as indigenous, Lenin viewed its development as a consequence of imperialism (Bautista 1985:10-11; Hunt 1989:22-23).

From the Marxist perspective, development is an inevitable, linear process that is historically determined. Thus, development is perceived as historical progression from precapitalist to communist mode of production, through social revolution waged by the proletariat against the wealthy and the ruling classes.

Neo-Marxism and the Dependency Model

The neo-Marxists argued that the development of the capitalistic mode of production in any country is determined by its position in the international economy, which is historically determined. Underdeveloped economies are locked into the production of primary products for export to industrialized countries. The manufactured goods supplied by the latter in exchange for these exports have ostensibly destroyed indigenous industries, and represent a strong disincentive to the local development of manufacturing production. In underdeveloped economies, production is characterized by export of primary products and by the existence of a small, protected, monopolistic modern industrial sector dominated by foreign capital and imported technology. The traditional sector of the economy locks the masses of people in poverty, while the dominant classes who accumulate wealth have limited interest in the development of producer capitalism in the periphery, preferring to channel most of the surplus abroad. Surplus is extracted from the periphery due to unequal trade exchange with the center. That is, the difference in returns to labor embodied in the products exceeds the difference in labor productivity. The neo-Marxist prescription for full development through the productive and equitable use of the surplus is a socialist revolution (Hunt 1989: 64-66). This is in stark contrast with Marx's conclusion that capitalism and its ultimate collapse is almost certainly a necessary and inevitable stage on the path to socialism.

The dependency model, while fundamentally aligned with the neo-Marxist analytical framework for underdevelopment is more optimistic than neo-Marxism in that it concedes the empirical possibility of growth in the context of the center-periphery arrangement. They differ, however, in that the dependency theorists highlight the concept of dependence (Hunt 1989: 68) and emphasize the elimination of dependency relations through the call for a new international economic order, so that nation-states can take control of their own development (Wilber and Jameson 1987:19).

The Concept of Social Development

Blumer (1966:3-16) scored sociologists for their inability to come up with a clear, objective referent of the concept "social development"—a kind of generic definition that would provide rigor and unambiguous framework for a scientific, analytical study of social development across a broad spectrum of societies. He noted that there appears to be an indiscriminate range of social happenings that have been lumped under the rubric of "social development"—a fact that has bred confusion. He deplored the neglect by scholars of this fundamental scientific concern of concept explication.

Of late, however, the concept has gained attention in the global development debate, and attempts have been made to define its parameters, but not without difficulty and divergence, as each country has its own conception based on its particular experience.

The 1988 UNCRD came up with various definitions, ranging from the narrow concept of provision of welfare services to the more holistic view that embraces material needs and social objectives, such as social and economic justice and equity, towards the improvement of the quality of life. For the Philippines, the following components have been cited: (1) self-reliance, or the ability to identify, develop and make full use of capacities; (2) welfare, or the adequate provision of basic services; and (3) social justice, or the equitable distribution of opportunities, income, and wealth (UNCRD 1988:8-10).

Global concern for the social dimension of development has made "human development" the core of the UN International Development Strategy for the 1990s. "Human development" has been defined as "enlarging people's choices." These choices include income, health, education, a good physical environment, and freedom of action and expression. It emphasizes the need to develop human capabilities, so that people can participate freely in social, political and economic decisionmaking, and work more productively and creatively for development. The basic principle is to put people at the center of development and to focus on their needs and potentials. Economic growth is deemed essential, but only as a means, not the end, of human development (UNDP 1992: 12).

A more recent conception of human development has extended its parameter to the issue of sustainability, occasioned by the observed strains on the environment due to indiscriminate and untrammeled economic activity of man, and by the notion that future generations must be taken into consideration. Economic, fiscal, trade, energy, agricultural and industrial policies should, therefore, be designed to bring about development that is economically, socially, and ecologically sustainable, thereby fulfilling present needs without limiting the potential for meeting the needs of future generations. The minimum requirements for achieving sustainable development are: (1) elimination of poverty; (2) reduction of population growth; (3) more equitable distribution of resources; (4) healthier, more educated and better-trained people; (5) decentralized, more participatory government; (6) more equitable, liberal trading systems within and among countries, including increased production for local consumption; and (7) better understanding of ecosystems diversity, locally adapted solutions to environmental problems, and better monitoring of environmental impact of development activities (UNDP 1992: 18).

The 1990 Human Development Report came up with the human development index (HDI), which combines indicators of national income, life expectancy and educational attainment, to give a composite measure of human progress. The HDI is conceded to still need improvement, but the 1992 Report carries suggestions to make the HDI gender-sensitive, income-distribution adjusted and environment-sensitive (UNDP 1992: 19-24).

Reaction

The classical growth theories have contributed in no small measure to the analysis of the problems of development and underdevelopment in terms of the conceptual and analytical apparatus that they have generated in the fields of microeconomics and macroeconomics. However, they have neglected to take into consideration the social, cultural, and political dimensions of development and underdevelopment. Indeed, their focus was mainly on the dynamics of long-term economic growth among Western industrializing countries.

The neoclassicists, focusing on the short-run, efficiency-oriented perspective, accorded attention to the conditions of underdeveloped countries by prescribing the efficiency-maximizing principles of partial and general equilibrium theory and the theory of comparative advantage. But, like the classicists, they focused mainly on economic growth and had similar areas of neglect. Their theoretical formulations failed to provide the correct basis for long-run resource allocation strategies in primary exporting countries (LDCs). Moreover, deviations from their assumptions of perfectly competitive markets, perfect divisibility of factors and products, and the absence of significant technological and pecuniary externalities exacerbated by the unaddressed social and other indigenous factors wrought dysfunctions in the growth process among the LDCs. The long-standing integration of LDCs into the global capitalist system characterized by international division of labor, which has perpetuated their dependent economies, has its roots in the principle of comparative advantage.

The expanding capitalist nucleus model has its merits in the perceived simplicity of its fundamental elements, the fresh perspective that it offered as an alternative to the neoclassical gestalt, and its widespread political acceptability. The same may be said of the structuralist model. Nonetheless, their prescriptions have failed to improve the lot of the masses in the Third World, despite observed increased Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth. Both, as well as the earlier models, have demonstrated that increased economic growth does not necessarily trickle down to the masses of people, who have been marginalized from the mainstream of economic activity. Their common recognition of the importance of government intervention to resolve problems of externalities, market failures and imperfections, and to guide resource allocation (for the expanding capitalist nucleus model), as well as to effect structural transformation of the economy to achieve a more balanced industrial development (for the structuralist model), has, however, demonstrated its merit in the economic success of the Newly Industrializing Countries (NICs), although apparently with the concomitant disengagement from the orbit of the international division of labor.

The Maoist perspective provides an interesting and novel approach to development. Holistic in strategy, it combines, at once, social, political, ideological and economic change. Such sweeping approach to development, however, while feasible—even successful—in the Chinese political context, where government assumes the initiative and direct intervention, will not be feasible in the political context of capitalist economies, where initiative is generally reposed upon the private sector, with minimum government intervention.

The basic needs model is likewise impressive in scope and in its focus on people and redistributive goals. However, there is serious doubt as to its political feasibility in that it seeks to "empower" people, which the power class will not exactly relish if they are to preserve their hegemony. Moreover, it is doubtful whether such a fundamental and sweeping approach is financially/economically feasible and manageable, especially with respect to the goal of eliminating absolute poverty. There is also the problem of defining "a better quality of life," as well as the criticism that the paradigm tends towards perpetuation of a traditional economy/society.

The political economy paradigm appears to offer the most valid explanation of underdevelopment in the Third World, particularly in the Philippines and other underdeveloped nations within the orbit of the world capitalist system. Several studies (cited in Bautista 1985:18-24) have already been conducted demonstrating the crippling effect on our economy of monopoly capitalism, a notorious outgrowth of economic imperialism and of our integration into the global capitalist system. Our linkage with the global capitalist system has been found to have been responsible for the perpetuation of our dual economy, consisting of a traditional sector and a modern industrial sector, which do not complement each other. Rather, they are addressed to the needs of the economies of the center, thus preventing an honest-to-goodness industrialization that is geared to our domestic requirements and to the requirements of an independent economic development. Our dependent and paraplegic economy is further perpetuated by our inability to reject the structural adjustment programs imposed by the WB-IMF (for fear of destroying our international credit standing). These structural adjustment programs have been found to be injurious to our economic development and worse, detrimental to the poorest sector of our population (Richter 1989:73-75).

It has also been established that the center-periphery economic arrangement has bled economies in the periphery. For the period 1980-1988, for example, the total net resource transfer from the Third World to industrialized countries— computed by subtracting the total outflow from the total inflow— was $287 billion (Petras and Brill 1989:485). Monopoly capitalism, moreover, has been found to have had an antidevelopmental effect, as reflected in repatriation of profits, exploitation of labor, exploitation of national patrimony, stifling of local entrepreneurship, etc. (Bautista 1985:18).

In view of the foregoing, it appears that our first-order concern, if we are to pursue a viable development path, is to extricate our economy from the orbit of the world capitalist system and the international division of labor. Only then can we pursue an independent economic policy, free from the dictates of the industrialized economies of the center and our exploitative relationship with them and their surrogates—the WB and IMF.

Once this is achieved, we must then forge an indigenous development philosophy, approach, and strategy characterized and rationalized as follows:

(1) A democratic system of economic and development planning, involving people's participation and oriented towards independent policies should be instituted. This will insure that planning is maximally informed and that people will be motivated to participate in the process of development.

(2) Development must be people-centered; hence, the human development principles and prescriptions of the UNDP must be upheld. The fulfillment of basic needs and the development of human capabilities should, therefore, receive preferential attention. The reasoning is that people cannot participate in the process of development if they are tied down by the problems of survival, and unless they are fully capacitated.

(3) Equitable distribution of resources and the fruits of development must be a primary concern; hence, redistributive policies should be sincerely and aggressively pursued. For, unless the masses of our people are endowed

with resources, they will remain marginalized from the mainstream of economic activity and development; and unless they partake of the fruits of development, there can never be an authentic development.

(4) A concrete program for sustainable development must be forged to include: a rational land-use plan; total log ban; control of energy-intensive pattern of production and consumption; and an intensive nationwide and continuing educational campaign on ecosystems conservation and management. Environmental impact of development activities should also be closely monitored, and indigenous solutions to environmental problems explored.

(5) A balanced industrialization program should be pursued and developed synchronously, with agriculture as its base, including small and medium scale industries, import-substituting industries, and capital/heavy industries geared both towards domestic consumption and export, and towards the requirements of indigenous development. This strategy will develop entrepreneurship, promote healthy, competitive capitalism, insure satisfaction of domestic demand while providing opportunities for foreign exchange earnings, and growth dynamic (as demonstrated by the NICs which have adopted the strategy), which have not been possible under the stagnating effect of the center-periphery trade arrangement.

(6) Economic protectionism, particularly for fledgling industries, should be instituted, in order to allow them to grow and flourish. This strategy has worked for Japan and other NICs.

(7) Government must resort to antitrust legislation to prevent and dismantle monopolies, whose evils are all too obvious.

(8) Importation should be controlled and highly selective to improve our balance of payments and to encourage our industries to grow, without undue competition from imports.

(9) Free competition should be upheld, but government must take an active role in providing the necessary impetus and incentives to the private sector for setting up vital industries and in resolving externalities.

(10) The principle of subsidiary — reserving a range of business activities to small businesses — should be adopted. This will encourage small entrepreneurship.

(11) Foreign debt should be repudiated selectively and payments limited to a small percentage of our export earnings. This should leave a wider financial latitude to step up social services delivery.

References

Bautista, Victoria A.
1985 Two Perspectives on Development: The Contribution of Sociology to Public Administration. *Trends in Philippine Sociology*. Quezon City: UP Sociology Department.

Blomstrom, Magnus and Bjorn Hettne
1984 *Development Theory in Transition*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Blumer,Herbert
1966 The Idea of Social Development. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. (Mimeograph).

Hunt, Diana
1989 *Economic Theories of Development: An Analysis of Competing Paradigms*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kunczik, Michael
1984 *Communication and Social Change*. Federal Republic of Germany: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

Ocampo, Romeo B.
1977 Concepts, Issues and Problems in Development. An integrating paper for the seminar on Local Government Administration held in the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand on 1 March-2 April.

Petras, James and Howard Brill
1989 The IMF, Austerity and the State in Latin America. *Third World Quarterly*. (April).

Reyes, Danilo
1989 The Crisis of Underdevelopment. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. 33 (1) (January).

Richter, Reiner
1989 The Effects of Structural Adjustment and Economic Growth on Income Distribution and Poverty in Developing Countries. *Poverty and Growth in the Philippines*. Manila: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and Philippine Economic Society.

United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD)
1988 Different Perspectives on Social Development. *Local Social Development Planning*. Vol. 1. Japan: UNCRD.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
1992 *Human Development Report 1992*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wiarda, Howard
1987 Toward a Nonethnocentric Theory of Development: Alternative Conceptions from the Third World. In Charles Wilber, ed. *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*. 4th edition. New York: Random House.

Wilber, Charles and Kenneth P. Jameson
1987 Paradigms of Economic Development and Beyond. In Charles Wilber, ed. *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*. 4th edition. New York: Random House.