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Abstract

Development started as a policy intervention to help poor states follow in the footsteps of developed states. Development carries the baggage of enlightenment ideas of time, human, nature, and society. This scientific interpretation of human society forms a linear stage understanding of evolution of every sociability along European lines. Epistemically and thematically, modernisation and globalisation aspirations attached with development have its root in colonial aspirations of civilisation. From linear stage growth model to structural adjustment and then sustainable development, the development discourse has widely misrepresented the sociabilities it pledges to transform because it starts with the marginalisation of every non-modern perspective. Post-development is a set of post-modernist, post-colonial, and post-abyssal critiques of development, which is focused at traditional and non-modern knowledge to excavate alternatives to development for the so called third world. The development discourse and the policies it has brought about has created urban apartheids, globalisation-localisation paradox, worsening climate question and a massive silencing of indigenous and local communities and their systems of classifications. According to post-development lens, there is a need to form ecologies of knowledge among diverse social spaces of Pakistan where scientific episteme is to be engaged with traditional epistemologies or the epistemologies of the south.
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Introduction

Development can be defined as a process that transforms a primitive low-income society into an industrial high-income society to improve living standards in the areas with poor life conditions.¹ Development started as a policy intervention focused on the adoption of new technologies, transitions in modes of production and achieving high growth rates. While adhering strongly to the classical and neo-classical paradigms, development economics views this process as gradual, non-disruptive and equilibrating that initiates a process of growth which transcends all the national boundaries and class segments to incentivise even the poorest of the poor.² Encyclopaedia Britannica defines development in the following fashion:

“Economic development, the process whereby simple, low-income national economies are transformed into modern industrial economies. Although the term is sometimes used as a synonym for economic growth, generally it is employed to describe a change in a country’s economy involving qualitative as well as quantitative improvements. The theory of economic development—how primitive and poor economies can evolve into sophisticated and relatively prosperous ones—is of critical importance to underdeveloped countries, and it is usually in this context that the issues of economic development are discussed.”³

Development became an international policy discourse when the United States (US) President Harry Truman first used the word in his inaugural address in 1949, pledging to share the US’ scientific and technical prowess with the nations left behind during the course of history. The announcement came in the post-world war II scenario where the US was

² Jeffery Nugent and Pan Yoyopoulos, ‘What Has Orthodox Development Economics Learned from Recent Experience?’ Worlds Development, 7, (1979): 541-554
caught up with the soviet threat and feared the spilling over of socialism into the parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America called as the third world. The president stated:

“For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these (under-developed) people. I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing. Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.”

Constituting the cornerstone to development thinking, the above-mentioned contents give the gist of the international development policy frameworks. A linear theory of time and an unquestioned faith in progress are what makes up the mainstream development narrative. The regime takes its episteme from the enlightenment universals and therefore, holds a temporal judgement against the non-modern sociabilities deeming them primitive. The idea was to help the third world out of its primitivity by modernising it for which, development was the way forward. So, the development can also be understood as an attempt to make everything that is other than modern, emulate European history to cure the unevenness of modernity. This creates considerable discursive cracks in the narrative as the development regime firstly assumes the same colonial preconditions that the European powers had, for the current third world i.e. availability of a periphery to colonise and secondly, it overlooks the asymmetry in the relationship between the developed and the under-developed or developing world. This marks the established superiority of

---


modern scientific modes of thinking over the non-modern and traditional ones in the sociology of development.

The history narrates that development has so far failed to solve the problems it diagnosed the primitive societies with i.e. social turmoil, poverty, unstable governance to name a few. The economy-centric approach of modernity had the US policy makers believe that economic development would automatically bring about social and political stability but forced modernisation left the subject societies suspended between tradition and modernity and never really solved anything. Samuel P. Huntington notes that the US foreign policy for three decades after the second world war remained exclusively focused on economic assistance to the third world to solve its governance dilemma but instead, ended up complicating its problems even more by sharpening and perpetuating the age-old modernity-tradition conflict. The old and the new sources of authority came into a new and strengthened realm of discord.⁶

Scholars have been producing policy critiques on development right since the day of its inception as a new global manifesto for the realisation of the libertarian dream, a dream whose workability has been under a question mark itself. Development holds post enlightenment European providence as a precedent for changing societies but the conditions that helped Europe bring about the industrial revolution are no longer in their place. The 19th century manufacturing and export boom in Europe when replicated in the third world, generates a disproportionate consumption at the cost of saving rates hence, reversing the development’s own promise of high growth rates.⁷ In addition to the unfavourable conditions, there has also been a huge practical discrepancy in the regime of development. When primary goods export of the third world countries is placed in comparison with their industrial goods import from the developed world,

the export falls incrementally short owing to the asymmetric terms of trade.\textsuperscript{8} This further dents the Ricardian belief of development that international trade brings comparative advantage for the economy of every which size.\textsuperscript{9} A stream of scholars believes that development, despite being invested with noble intentions and billions of dollars has met with theoretical and practical failures and is still clueless about its destination.\textsuperscript{10} While on the other hand, there are also scholars who are of the view that development is the continuation of colonial governance as it perpetuates the hegemony of Western powers at the cost of freedoms and liberties in the third world.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Epistemology of Development}

As hinted earlier that development inherited the enlightenment understanding of time thus, it also adheres to the historical memory of modernity. The notion of development feeds on the validation of a strong linearity, laying an exclusively European blueprint of social change which every society must follow. The world in mainstream modern historicising is such as if there was a world where happened Europe, and the rest of the world has existed in the periphery of Europe.\textsuperscript{12} A significant reason behind the still lingering obscurity of the debate covering the dispute between the traditional and the modern is the troubled memory of social change in Europe. The European social change was not merely an all-out toppling up of the traditional but interplay of the traditional and the modern in many ways as industrial revolutions and 19\textsuperscript{th} century urbanisation were


\textsuperscript{9} David Ricardo developed the classical theory of comparative advantage in 1817 to explain why countries engage in international trade even when one country’s workers are more efficient at producing every single good than workers in other countries. It states that if countries specialise in producing goods where they have a lower opportunity cost – then there will be an increase in economic welfare.

\textsuperscript{10} William, Easterly, \textit{The White Man’s Burden: Why the West’s Effort to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good}, Penguin, New York. 2006, 144-152

\textsuperscript{11} Claire, Peacock. “Post-colonialism and Development: A Critical Analysis of The European Consensus on Development.” \textit{Department of Political Science, Lund University Press, Sweden}

\textsuperscript{12} Sandra, Halperin, “International Relations Theory and The Hegemony of Western Conception of Modernity”. \textit{Decolonizing International Relations} (2006), 46-64
also expedited by the old aristocracy and were not merely the actions of the new protestant bourgeoisie.\textsuperscript{13} Development has been totally ignoring this reality while applying hyper scienticity of modern economics and Weberian sociology on the so called pre-scientific societies with a hope to transform them entirely. Likewise, a keen look at the enfranchisement patterns of European populaces also invalidates the sometimes latent and sometimes dominant sense in non-European contexts that Europe has been civilised for eternity. Many western democracies turn out to have taken birth not so long ago i.e. in the late and early 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries respectively, if we consider the enfranchisement patterns of women and coloured, ethnic and racial groups in the west.\textsuperscript{14} Such erosion of collective human memory on a scale this massive has been made possible by the manufacturing of global racial amnesia which sterilises the colonial histories of subject nations.\textsuperscript{15} Globalisation this way can be looked at as the concretisation of this amnesia.

A plunge, the kind this paper is taking, into the discourse of development reaffirms what Robert Cox stated in his 1981 millennium article: “Knowledge is always for someone and some purpose.”\textsuperscript{16} Drawing upon Cox’s assumption, considerable hegemonic tendencies with in the epistemology of development can be identified. The narratives of poverty reduction and life sustaining goods and services have much in common with the colonial civilising mission. These parallels become more evident with the observation that all social sciences being taught in university classrooms is the perspective of white scholarly males of four European countries i.e. the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and Germany. \textsuperscript{17} This affords the discourse of development a heavy colonial genealogy. This

\textsuperscript{13} Jaulin, Sauren, “International Relations as The Imperial Illusion; or, The Need to Decolonize IR.” (2013), 23-30

\textsuperscript{14} Antony, Angkie. “Decolonizing the concept of Good Governance.” Decolonizing International Relations (2006), 109

\textsuperscript{15} Sankaran, Krishna. “Race, Amnesia and Education of International Relations.” Decolonizing International Relations (2006), 89-93


goes for other realms of modernity as well as it sustains itself by silencing the alternative racial, ethnic, and territorial perspectives. This naturalises the colonial position of the developmental history of the world. Various sociologies of silences constitute the sociology of modernity. But what is important to note here is that it is not only the mainstream development discourse that marginalises non-modern perspectives but also the critical accounts of development. While lambasting development for discrepancies in its policy and practice, the Marxian and dependency schools also adhere to the idea of linear history and share the dream of a scientific industrial society which they deem to be the real custodian of freedoms and liberties. The epistemic straight jacket of enlightenment remains in its place.

**Post-Development**

Over the time, development thinking kept evolving. New approaches and perspectives kept enriching the paradigm. It was not until after the Second World War, that development became a separate field with its own institutions and practitioners. Scholars started theoretical work in development studies, which had now become a distinct area of academic inquiry. Linear stages of growth, structural change model, Neo-classical counter revolution model, new aid architecture, international dependency theories and sustainable development are major theoretical perspectives that have impacted international narratives on development. All the mainstream as well as critical accounts of development, as stated in the previous section, are informed by the meta-narratives of rationality and humanism and cannot break free from cognitive straightjacket of enlightenment and therefore, reproduce the asymmetry in the relations between the developed and the under-developed. The failure of development in fulfilling its promises propelled many late 20th century
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development thinkers to think of alternatives to development, instead of alternative development. Wolfgang Sachs for instance underscores: “The idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape. Delusion and disappointment, failures and crimes have been the steady companions of development and they tell a common story: it did not work.” Therefore, it is imperative to subject the episteme of development to informed criticism. Post-development is the realm within the development studies that applies post-structuralist dissection on the discourse of development while other realms of criticism bring structuralist critique of the subject only. Post-development goes for ‘alternatives to development’ and does not limit itself to ‘alternative development.’ The approach distinguishes itself from dependency school and ecological theories on the basis of its unbelief in the rational-positivist core of modern critical thought. To post-development thinkers, the problem is not limited to functional and operational inadequacies of the development regime. They connect their critique with the critique of modernity. Post-development literature is mostly written in two socio-lingual streams i.e. English and Francophone. This very much clarifies the connection between the theory and post-modernism. There is a inclination in post-development scholars toward either anti-developmentalism or alternative to developmentalism. Both the approaches are overlapping in my understanding of development and used interchangeably.

23 C. Alvares, *Science, development and violence: The revolt against modernity*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1992
After Development

Development has not only failed to bring about the social change it promised but also produced new kinds of problems and reinforced the dependency problem instead of eliminating it.\textsuperscript{28} The new forms of crises that have accompanied the invasion of development in the third world notably are the perpetual dependency, resource depletion and cultural alienation.\textsuperscript{29} Except for the recent ecological accounts, development runs on a resolute belief in infinite progress, an idea proven at fault by the experience of past centuries. Progress and evolution are two defining themes of modernity and have totally ruled the western social consciousness for quite some time.\textsuperscript{30} They are inseparable from modern thought as they are so deeply imbedded in the European sense of history. Even the critical approaches as stated at several times in this paper cannot do away with them for instance, Karl Marx dubbed progress the law of history.\textsuperscript{31}

Wolfgang Sachs deemed it impossible to remain convinced on the utility of development.\textsuperscript{32} Since development is not merely a problem of ill-planning and flawed execution and neither is it limited to financial and infrastructural activities,\textsuperscript{33} “it is a complex system of categorisations and representations,\textsuperscript{34} an interpretive grid, a discourse.”\textsuperscript{35} This grid has constructed the third world and the under-developed using its positivist gauges and empirical econometrics.\textsuperscript{36} This has resulted in a massive
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misrepresentation of the citizens of the third world as a Nepali scholar Shrestha notes:

“As a young boy growing up in Nepal, I had no idea that I was underdeveloped. Poor and hungry I certainly was. But underdeveloped? I never thought—nor did anyone else—that being poor meant being ‘underdeveloped’ and lacking human dignity.”  

This social construction of the third world legitimates a whole empire of politics of poverty, a realm that has dominated the social dialogue throughout the second half of the twentieth century. When the World Bank defined poverty based on per capita incomes, it created a statistical and empiricist scale of social happiness. Therefore, if poverty was the problem of the third world, the only solution was high incomes which would never be realised without high economic growth rates. As development characterises the third world with respect to what it does not have and not what it does, the politics of growth rates became a defining characteristic of the third world without paying any heed to what the third world thinks about its problems. When a community is branded as the under-developed, it brazenly eliminates the chances for life other than being developed. Esteva notes:

“...ceased being what they were, in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others’ reality: a mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of the queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in the terms of a homogenising and narrow minority” (1992).

In accordance to the parameters that development has set to label a society developed or under-developed, the hunter gathering societies

39 Sachs, ibid, 52
would be the most underdeveloped forms of living, but quite on the contrary they were the real affluent societies.\textsuperscript{40} This way, every pre-modern sociability becomes Hobbesian state of nature which needs a Lockean contractuality.\textsuperscript{41} This task was to be carried out by the politics of growth as development was not imagined as a separate realm to governance. President Truman put the condition of ‘Democratic Fair-Dealing’ as cited in the introduction of this paper.

\textbf{The Problem of Westernisation}

“It is not the failure of development which has to be feared but its success.” (Sachs)

Since development is the process of becoming developed and the west and most specifically the United States of America from the Second World War onward is what is truly developed, the cultural industry of development dispossess the third world citizenry from their organic realities. Post-development thinkers are of the view that a real Lockean, free, and developed society has never been conceived. This is as Banuri quotes a character from a French Film ‘Mon Oncle d’Amerique’: “America does not exist, I have been there.”\textsuperscript{42} While, the western way of being is an evolved way of being, but it has problems of its own which are not usually showcased by the ‘development culture.’\textsuperscript{43} The ecological catastrophe that the developed lifestyle has created says volumes about the viability of development.\textsuperscript{44} This is in connection to the modern detachment of individual as a separate category from the nature that the modernity and development are this much apathetic toward eco-system, eventually


giving way to widespread spiritual and social disillusionment.\textsuperscript{45} This makes the west a complex impersonal machine focused on meaningless work.\textsuperscript{46} The socio-cultural desolation and eco-degradation in the west further problematize the development’s exclusive emphasis on the shortcomings of the third world.\textsuperscript{47}

Accepting the cultural diversity with full weightage instead of accepting it to transform it into a modern globalised monolith is at large what the post-development proposes. The universal positions of modernity have a parochialism of their own when they do not acknowledge alternative ways of being in which lived experiences can truly propose ways out of the cultural, ecological, and political abomination that modernity has pushed the humanity into.\textsuperscript{48} It is like a diverse gene pool in biological studies, which is essential for dynamic mutation process to happen, that diverse sociabilities can provide answers to our contemporary problems.\textsuperscript{49} This however, by no means implies Social Darwinism, but is used only to make an analogical point.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The third world has been represented in the development discourse as a passive victim of disease, hunger and poverty. While discrediting all the sociabilities other than modern ones the development regime discursively commits itself to transform the third world from their ‘primitive modes of living’ to modern modes. This was to happen only if primitive societies emulate the providence of western societies with a belief of strong historical linearity in evolution of peoples and societies. With the speech of Harry Truman, the US became the foremost of the perpetrators of this

\textsuperscript{49} Marglin, ibid, 22
transformation drive throughout the world. As Truman himself labelled US’ knowledge ‘inexhaustible’ and constantly growing, the American scientific proficiency became the 20th century’s panacea to every malady in the world. This was the recipe to embark upon the era of greater global production, greater global consumption, scientific advances, technical knowledge, freedom, and happiness. Epistemologically speaking, this makes it even more evident that the development has sprouted right out of the civilising mission of the colonial era.

Development has its roots in enlightenment project which according to Leotard is the ensemble of rationalism and humanism, the meta-narratives of modernity. These meta-narratives have a way of detaching human from natural contexts, imparting anthropocentric tendencies to them. This is how the foundations of European scientific prowess were laid down. The thoughts of Francis Bacon and René Descartes, who are among the ones who fashioned the contours of modernity were built upon the very same tradition of thinking that is mentioned above. These advances made possible the colonialism that reigned the world directly up until the second world war and kept governing by other means after that in the form of development.

Colonialism in addition to be an act of conquest and plunder, also provided the colonisers with distinct ways of understanding the world where scientific revolution did not happen and had its own diverse paths and systems of understandings. This resulted in the marginalisation of all the non-modern analytical systems and gave an imperial gaze to the knowledge that modernity rests upon. All the alternative sociabilities and analytical systems were branded as primitive and less evolved. The modern thinking became a straightjacket to understand the world. The higher condescending judgmental knowledge of modernity created a need for the so called primitive sociabilities to change, emulating the European providence. Therefore, there is an obvious tendency in modern scholars to assume change and progress as the laws of history giving history a very
linear form which could be replicated all over the world. Development focuses on transforming societies into what it considers as modern. This interventionist transformation according to development thinking would help primitive societies take leaps toward modernity and join hands with the white man on the course of history.

The most intriguing thing in this regard is the way the third world was constructed out of the former colonies and non-communist and non-liberal world. Arturo Escobar believed that this was very much how orientalism produced the orient and modern produced the primitive. The epistemic imperialism is of such scale that the poor and desolate masses instead of being just aware of their poverty and desolation have also to learn that they are ‘under-developed’ in order to engage with their own selves. The alternative perspectives talked about previously are marginalised to an extent that the consciousness they represented, historical experiences they had to endure and the human they were made to comprehend have totally been wiped off the realm of knowledge. The silencing of the non-modern by the modern is very much the story of development.

The post-development critique of development emphasises the need to investigate alternative avenues to rid the populaces of poverty, desolation and development crisis. As the paper quotes Wolfgang Sachs earlier, to post-development scholars, development has badly failed and alternatives to development are the need of the time. Those alternatives can be searched for in traditional knowledge because the modern knowledge has so far failed to represent their others in a fruitful fashion. Knowledge is always historically and culturally situated. This is the basic tenet for the framework used for this research which essentially attempts to drag the methods of classification and representation away from the positivist ways of inquiry. Building on Foucault’s notion of relationship between power and knowledge, it is argued that development is a hegemonically conceived idea to naturalise the US foreign policy goals by giving them a strong academic and epistemic base which reproduces its
disciplinary canons in a manner that whatever is too different, as Tickner and Blaney claim, is easily invalidated as unscientific or ideological. Jackson sees the quantitative-qualitative divide as a distinction of method without methodology, an almost aesthetic consideration, whose main function is to limit knowledge production. Claims to science, he argues, play primarily a disciplining function. The problem is due to the aura of objectivity attributed to science that unconsciously or deliberately works to maintain power orientations.

So how do we truly represent the silent? The answer is that nobody represents the silent other than the silent or in Gayathri Spivak’s words with a deliberate altering, let the subaltern speak. How do we truly understand colonial subjects and their problems? Linda Tuhiwai Smith has a lot to say in this regard. She is of the view that methods of classifying and representing the other must also be the methods of the other. Now this does not mean to totally depart from the corporate, globalised and scientific present but to find a point of convergence between these two distant worlds. This convergence can be imagined using Bouventura De’Souza Santos’ framework of ‘Ecology of Knowledges’. Ecology of knowledge is a realm where the scientific and southern knowledge is engaged with an informed realisation of limitations of both. Santos proposes to draw an abyssal line in order to carry out this complex theoretical task. An abyssal line is said to be the place where the utility of scientific thinking ends, and the workability of traditional thinking starts. The scholar has called this new realm of ecology of knowledge, the post-abyssal order of cognition. Every society must imagine its own abyssal line based on its own distinct history and experiences with colonialism and imperialism. But this does not mean that the previously conceived notions of social justice are no more held. Instead it only emphasises the need of establishing cognitive justice first as there can be no social justice without cognitive justice in Santos’ words. To imagine an alternative to development, it is essential to do away with the theoretical straightjackets that reproduce the prevailing patterns of hegemony and domination, both in cognitive and tangible realms.
think of an alternative, we must think in an alternative way, which makes it essential to profane the rational positivism to an appropriate extent. In the words of an American writer and activist; “The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.”