



# Final Seminar Essay

Prepared by: Amit Shrestha

Course: Economic Growth, Justice and Distribution

Programme: Development Studies

April 26, 2009

Department of Government, Uppsala University

# Development?

**How have the efforts for development brought about growth, justice and equality, or the otherwise? Account on the aspects of development, and support your arguments against the mainstream ideology of 'development'.**

When we talk about development, we hardly ever ask once: development for whom? where? of what? at what cost? All we simply see is the hot money flowing into the system of those who devised the idea of development. This is not to burden ourselves with the moral blame of misjudgment, but to uncover the crude reality of how our society has been built upon. To understand the paradigm of development, we must, at firsthand, justify its definition with regard to its utilities - of what, for whom, where, at what cost, why, when. Are we meaning to develop a farmland or a dam or a market economy? Are we to develop the lifestyles of the West or reduce poverty in Africa? What will be the environmental and social cost? And, do we necessarily need development in the first place or can there be an alternative?

Modern societies tend to perceive development as a linear, self-dependent, and progressive economic growth towards modernization and globalization. Despite the numerous drawbacks and applied failures in history, for instance South American and East Asian crisis, the mainstream notion of development is firmly believed to succeed over time. The most promising of all beliefs being the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Yet, there are limitations of the

MDGs that should be taken into account. First, the perceived development is to copy the process of the “West”. This divides the world into two categories: developed and underdeveloped, yet both moving on the same path towards the same goals. What it fails to put into perspective is the social dilemma and disintegration experienced by materially rich countries, let alone the environmental threats incurred during the process of industrialization. In line to that, therein also lies an uncritical belief in the prospects of technology, globalization, free market, democracy, and global institutions. The great corner of development is highly weighed on economic growth, and for the poor, it is far less from a healthy happy life they dream of, and those dreams are produced (and re-produced) in the vacuum of expectations created in the division wall between the rich and the poor.

‘Development’ is a fallacy because it is ephemeral and it has no destination. We, as human beings, need to fulfill that void in our minds by performing something that is personally self-satisfying and productive; we can never be stagnant. So, we need to progress, or at least so is our delusion. In our modern societies, we have achieved heights in material progress, though unequally, we have realized that we were only able to fill that empty spaces in our stomachs, only to create another in our minds. We have achieved supreme superficiality and meaninglessness in our lives through ‘progress’. We like to believe that we can manage and maintain nature at large. In doing so, we do something that seems to be appropriate and desirable now through our ‘human glasses’, only after a decade to be faced with the problems arising from the same doings. We are all too human. And we make mistakes, but do we have the ‘natural right’ to push other non-human species to extinction? Why can’t we just leave them as they are or stop putting an economical value on them? Well, if we don’t preserve them, they won’t be serving us as an amusement or pleasure anymore, and we won’t progress. It’s again “we”.

Thanks to modern science, we have known (not necessarily understood) more about the nature, and less about our relationship with her. Now we know more and more of less and less. Applaud to reductionism! And we elude the holistic view that once used to be the only criterion to harmonize our existence with nature and other living beings. Now we see timber, not a tree; we call environment, not nature; we meet utility, not human. In a modern society, everything is a commodity, and everyone a “slave”. Of course, we have progressed by upgrading to ‘liberal

slavery'. An indigenous culture may not develop itself so much in comparison to others, but that does not necessarily put them in a category of "underdeveloped". If Truman coined the term 'underdeveloped' to represent such cultures, can I also coin a word 'overdeveloped' to represent the high-consumption societies?

As argued earlier, we, humans, find it impossible to 'not do anything'. Choices have to be made, either to submissively surrender to social dogma of development or be an expatriate. Most choose to collapse in the first category. Hence, development is justified by the mass number of "enslaved sheep". I believe every system is self-reliant, self-sufficient and sustainable in its own lights and shadows. The difference arises when one system is being pushed or desires to have similar thresholds as that of another. That's why we have so much poverty and inequality in the world. And these injustices serve a good excuse for the 'developed' to prove their superiority and self-fulfilling meaning of their existence. There again, development is justified in trying to help those 'underdeveloped'. The most appropriate analogy of human and nature is that of parasite and its host. While it is natural to live upon the blood of the host, it is implicitly understood that the parasite threatens its own existence with the destruction of its host.

## **Development vs. Economic Growth**

For many of the world's poor, there is no escape from their pits of daily struggle to fill that hole in their stomach. The freedom and number of choices to choose from is no more than the scope of options they have access to. More to it, those limited freedom of choices are under the hands of powers much mightier than they are. Global corporations, institutions and governments - all synchronized together design policies and impose upon those poor for the interest of development as they like to call it. Evidences from natural resource-rich African states and South American nations are all open for debate. What we see now is an accepted reality of imperialism. Imperialism is best defined as a mechanism for transferring wealth from the poor to the rich. In light of this, economic globalization and liberalization imposed by elite powers such as IMF and WTO is largely a post-modern reality of classical imperialism, and to less surprise, it propagates much the same outcomes[1].

While in the developed countries, over the last half century, we have managed to fill that hole in our stomach, only to create another in our heads, coupled with individual and collective spiritual crisis and meaninglessness in material possessions. The erosion of social and cultural values has already posed a threat for extinction. Similar dissonances are scientifically recorded in loss of natural wealth, social security, traditions, environment, and democracy in its 'literal philosophical' meaning. The actuality of functioning democracies is far from the philosophical foundation of normative democracy. To elaborate the real meaning of 'democracy' is out of the scope of this essay. Ecologically, thousands of species are becoming extinct everyday, while socially, indigenous languages and cultures are disappearing and we are facing the uprising of a global monoculture[2]. Hence, the lack of interconnectedness with nature and monotonous outlook of our daily lives, deeply embedded into the void of spirituality, have been successful in creating that hole in our lives. Much in linearity, a hungry poor cannot sleep of the emptiness of his stomach; a rich after a feast gets no sleep of the emptiness of his heart.

Development must be approached as a multifaceted phenomenon, putting factors such as preservation of social values, reduction of consumption (not poverty), access and redistribution to natural resources and basic services for people's livelihood. The injection of capital into the market is not enough. In regard to these terms, evolution may be the 'right' word to use, instead of development. Evolution takes into account every species, human and non-human beings, environment, and thus presents a systemic approach to the phenomenon. While significant concepts, such as sustainability, evolved with potentials to transform our concept of development, in concrete practical terms, such concepts are far beyond application, and have remained vague to comprehension alone. The MDG framework ignores to be all-inclusive and admit the challenges and limits of economic growth, in relation to development ideology.[3]

With this view of development as preached by the institutional academia, governments, UN projects, and elite decision-makers around the world has very little coherence in the interests of the economically-challenged, instead much have been fructified for the corporations and institutions. Yet, those decisions made behind-the-closed-doors do push the poor towards more destitution and at the verge of social breakdown, if not committing genocide. The rich OECD countries feel obliged to the 'under-privileged' countries and thus mounted 'free trade' in the name of development. While, in shadows, they continued to subsidize their farmers and export

their agricultural goods to 'open-market' of the poor countries. In exchange, they erected protectionist barriers on imports of goods and services from those countries.[4] To put this infliction into economic terms, it was only one way of many others to expand their economy; and yes, development was the agenda, but alas! for the developed. While those poor peasants now can not compete with cheap imported goods from the rich countries, and thus, are pushed to stop earning a decent livelihood, which they did before economic giants moved into the local markets.

The advocates of development continue to persuasively claim that economic growth is the foremost solution to ending poverty, creating social harmony, preserving the environment and increasing the quality of life. Yet, in sharp contrast, even though the global economic output has increased fivefold, the number of people living in absolute poverty doubled. There has been unprecedented social unrest and aggression. The richest 20 percent own 90 percent of the world's total wealth.[5] The rate of extinction of species of fish, birds and animals are at its alarming rate alongside deforestation and land degradation. Of all, to our humanly disappointment, there is a sharp rise in insecurity and hostility among fellow human beings, almost everywhere, be it in developed or under-developed country. All these existential challenges, for sure, cannot and will not be attributed to economic growth. But, economic growth, in itself, cannot be the only right measure to solve these problems.

Going to the roots of economics, the theory implies that there can be growth, only when we increase productivity of a system. This corresponds to exploiting natural capital to its optimum by limited human capital to increase productivity. Thus, industries that are drawing natural resources down and exhausting non-renewable energies are the ones that increase productivity, and henceforth, leading a nation towards economic growth, with increased Gross National Product (GNP). Thus we can say that GNP is the measure of economic growth, and alternatively, the measure of the rate of turning resources into toxic waste. We can expect to increase our GNP exponentially to unrealistic heights, but how long before we reach planet's limits on finite natural resources?

## Development vs. Inequality

In most developing countries, it is less important to chase the industrial development of the West and have high levels of national output than to allocate whatever levels of economic output they possess. Higher GNP not necessarily paints an equitable society. For most of the world's poor, the basic needs of life can be met with minimum level of economic output.[6] If the priority of that economic output is to facilitate people with basic food, shelter, clothing, education, health care, basic transport and clean water, then it is practically feasible within the will of most countries, and thus alleviate human deprivation.

Development? Yes. Economic growth in developing countries has brought modern lifestyles, airports, television, air-conditioned houses, electronics, urbanization, fashion, automobile, and computers. All of these have significantly isolated human interactions that used to be a part of social goodwill in villages. These calculated sophistication are the fruits for the few rich fortunate, and do not, at its slightest, improve the living conditions of the poor. In fact, there is a growing sense of disparity among the rich and poor, seeding social stress, crime, and domestic violence. Thus, those to whom growth has proved beneficial need more foreign trade to import guns to protect themselves from the raged poor. But, when we ask a poor of his desire, he will speak of access to food, water, shelter and lands on which he can build his livelihood. But, rarely will he ask for economic growth. I contend the scheme of economic growth is incomprehensible for his simple living.

Accounting from 1950 when the developed countries and the UN committed themselves to globalize the process of development, the average income of the people in the wealthiest countries was about 30 times that of living in the poor countries. After 50 years of economic growth and prosperity, this inequality ratio has tripled to 90 times.[7] However, these figures are based on national averages, therefore, represent disparities among nations, but fail to consider the disparity among the people within a country, rich or poor. The majority of the world's people continue to live in agricultural societies that power the industrialized economies to serve at the service of the wealthy few.

If the philosophy of development is to erase inequality in societies and between nations, what went wrong during these 50 years, that we have greater contradictions between the two categories of rich and poor? This global apartheid is increasingly appearing in both the South and the North, presented by social distress within societies. The industrialized nations have become 'one-third-two thirds' societies where one-third is wealthy and secure; another third is excluded and marginalized; and the last third find themselves lost between the two thirds. While in the South, countries following the North are becoming 'one-eighth-seven-eighths' societies where only one-eighth is financially secure and benefit from globalized economic growth.[8] In contrary, the rest mass populations of destitute are condemned to suffer in perpetual deprivation.

## **Development vs. Poverty**

The crudeness of reality is that despite global increase in wealth and scientific developments, democratization of nations, and globalized free trade market, some 2.6 billion people still live at less than or at the threshold of US \$ 1 per day. Hasn't the arms of development meant to reduce poverty in the first place? The World Bank defines extreme poverty as living under less than US \$ 1 per capita per day. This measurement of poverty was applied in 1981, when US \$ 1 had a much greater value than what it has now. After 25 years, the World Bank still uses the similar threshold of US \$ 1.25 to measure extreme poverty, and claims to have reduced extreme poverty from 52 percent to 26 percent of world poor since 1981.[9] True, but can one buy the same amount of food now with same US \$ 1 as he did in 1981. I doubt. So, how can the World Bank define extreme poverty with the same unit, and call it development in reducing poverty?

Although there has been a drop in extreme poverty scale, and mathematically, people living above US \$ 1 per day has increased significantly, but does that acquired nominal "wealth" produce any better quality of life for them? Given, the consumer price rise, internal political conflicts, indebted to global institutions, and civil unrest, I doubt their living conditions have improved any more or less than 1981. In numbers, the total population living under extreme poverty in 1981 was 1.4 billion that has decreased to 1.2 billion in 2004. On the brighter side, though world population has increased rapidly since 1981 from 4.5 billion to 6.4 billion in 2004, the ratio of poor to world population has decreased from 1:3 to 1:6.[10]

The most disturbing paradox is that India has more poor and hungry people than any other country in the world, when in contrast; today India is one of the biggest producers of food and agricultural products. Reasons? It's a "spicy mix" of globalization, neo-liberal economic policies, development policies, the caste system, corruption, natural disasters, and lack of state subsidies in agriculture. All of these factors contributing to force more than 350 million, almost one third of the population, to go to sleep on an empty stomach.<sup>[11]</sup> And development policies being one of those factors. While in figures, yes, India is a rising South Asian powerhouse in technology and business, but internally, has that development dispersed its seeds to all peasants who are in desperate need? Within social castes and geographical regions, the disparity has sharpened even more. Only the few rich and corrupted have been benefitting from globalization and development, while the poor continue to sell their sweat and blood for a piece of bread for their family.

Where has development been "done"? Yes, in India. People have jobs, more food in the market, education, technological advancement and a liberal market structure. What more? Quality life? The hi-tech mechanization in agriculture has pushed small farmers out of daily business, and made them "surrender" their fertile lands in the lands of corporate agricultural businesses. Farmers themselves work for such businesses, and are being paid a penny for their slavery, because they have no choice. While such corporations rip excessive benefits from exports of produced goods by the hands of those farmers. And where do those cotton clothes go? To the West, to H&M, when they themselves do not have a pair of proper clothes. Yes, people have jobs, or say another form of "paid liberal slavery".

With that earned penny, those farmers need to feed a family of seven. Yes, there is more food in the market, but is the money enough to feed such a big family? No. Only for those corporate businessmen. And then, there is education for every one at an affordable cost. But, why would a child go to school hungry, instead of looking for food, or working to earn some food for himself and his family? Nicholas Negroponte, in World Economic Forum 2005, announced "One Laptop per Child" initiative. At the face of screaming hunger and daunting diseases, what good would a laptop bring to a poor child in India? Today, India has between 30-50 million children under the age of 15 working to fill that hole in their stomachs.<sup>[12]</sup> While some are forced to work, some

choose to work, because they do not have a choice. And yes, this is development, everyone has job and the economy is booming. So says the development advocates. For those millions of poor, technology is as close as the stars they stare at night when they sleep under the roofless structures.

What of liberal market structure? Market mechanisms are ruled by the neo-liberal capitalism, and impose a view of development based on “free trade”, not necessarily equal. And its not the poor peasants who have the say in the policy-making, but the governments under the dictate of global institutions such as International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, rich countries, and transnational corporations.[13] More often than not, those poor peasants are considered no more than dispensable objects. So, how has liberal market structure brought about equitable development? Of course, there has been development, but unequal.

The real challenge is not to reduce poverty or lift people from that US \$ 1 per day threshold. Each country has sufficient amount of resources to feed their own population, if they start to channel and allocate resources to those in need. If each of 6.7 billion people in this world consume similar amount of resources as the people in the West, I reckon, we will need 7 planets like Earth.[14] A mere impossibility, unless we discover life on another planet to suck their resources to feed our economies. The true challenge, however, is over-consumption in the industrialized countries, and intervention in another countries’ politics, for a selfish benefit of channeling resources to meet own demands. Our planet is a self-sustaining system with limited resources, and as Mahatma Gandhi said “Earth has enough to suffice our need, but not our greed.”[15] The only challenge for human beings is to redistribute the resources equitably and stop transgressing to satisfy own greed. Poverty, in itself, is not a ‘disease’ and thus, cannot be cured. Relatively, poverty exists because there exists unproportionate wealth somewhere. And poverty is the evidence of healthy functioning of global capitalism and neo-liberal economic system.

## Development vs. Natural Environment

In the name of development, Coca-Cola set up a bottling factory in Plachimada, India in 2003. It employed few educated professionals, and claimed to benefit the locals from job “opportunities” and market expansion. The consequences of this new establishment? Thousands of local farmers were being put off their lands because Coca-Cola was stealing and bottling their water, poisoning their land and water. The water was impossible to drink and bathe in because of disposal of toxic wastes from the manufacture. It dumped the waste only after midnight in a far away coconut plantation farm, and said it is a bio-fertilizer. When that was discovered, the company distributed “free fertilizer” to the villagers of Plachimada, which was later reported to be merely a sludge of manufacturing waste, full of toxic levels of cadmium and lead. Is this what we call development of a community? Because a multinational company moves in and creates few jobs at the cost of thousands others, local environment, and their livelihood. I find it hard to believe. In 2005, the villagers protested and were successful in shutting down the company, only to be displaced to another village where there are fewer contenders for water. While, Coca-Cola still maintains that they were not responsible for the local water problems.[\[16\]](#)

With a very anthropocentric definition of development, the bias evolves in our intellects as something very natural, and we, at our best, have been more than successful to neglect everything except human existence. It is not the preservation of environment nor is the protection of wildlife species that we stand for in international conferences, but it is our own self-serving purpose of human-centered utilitarianism.[\[17\]](#) The nature and non-human beings are considered as something to be exploited and put a value on, all for human amusement. The Utopian world of ‘sustainable development’ appears to be inhabited by a new phenomenal version of *Homo sapiens*, when the threats of its extinction clouded over it. But hardly noticeable is the version of sustainable development from a fish or a bird, because they are all too non-conscious of their existence, and human beings are the only self-conscious intelligent beings? Therein lie the pitfalls of our basic assumptions and misjudgments, that we cannot take down the anthropocentric glasses, and thus narrow our vision, too myopic, too exclusive.

Nature is all-inclusive. When nature becomes an object of political and economical value, it is interchanged with 'environment'. It is misleading to interchange two concepts, when nature, in itself is a whole, while environment is only a physical construction of nature. Throughout our academic understanding, we have represented nature as just 'environment', which is completely void of intrinsic qualities and too swallow to grasp a value. Tagging the label 'environment' to nature makes all lively qualities non-existential, and thus, nature as nothing more than lifeless, passive, dispensable object to be exploited for human purpose. This is 'white-men's nightmare'.<sup>[18]</sup> In Nepal, the concept of "Prakriti" (nature in Nepali) supersedes human understanding of environment, and is considered as 'mother' figure. Prakriti permeates every plant, every animal, every non-living objects, humans, and microorganisms. There are no bias, and thus, no exceptions. Prakriti is a gift, and thus is to be worshipped and lived in harmony with. Through the developmentalist eyes, this concept of Prakriti is inimical for the growth of societies and nations. For them, nature is a static, lifeless embodiment of resources, waiting to be acted upon.

## **Development vs. Democracy**

It is a staple in developmental and institutional literature that a pre-condition for development, at large, is a full-functioning legal and constitutional democracy. Of course, democracy may be ideologically a flawless concept for promoting development and property rights, but it is not always visible that democratic states have thrived and authoritarian regimes failed. In contrast, countries like China and Taiwan have slowly loosened up the clutches from authoritarian to democratic by giving durable and predictable contractual environment for economic activities.<sup>[19]</sup> And they have reached heights of development in aspects of economical, social, cultural and institutional. In today's political world, there is a mixed advocacy of democracy depending on specific region, nation, society, history and culture. There is no one rule of democracy that applies to all societies in the world. And it is far less seen that democracy facilitates development in all nations. Worst, in cases such as India and Nepal, democracy has worsened and deepened the social and political problems.

Democracy is obsolete, and we are mistaken by the belief that democracy is the egalitarian solution for all problems. Can the solution be a problem in itself? Just as any other form of

governance - totalitarianism, monarchy, despotism or feudalism - democracy has degenerated by its own traditional ideologies and theories. Have we ceased evolving since Phoenicians? All other alternatives to democracy have done their best to re-modify "democracy", but have fallen short of their own virtues. Will it not be monolithic idolatry to regard democracy as 'the religion'? Global environmental imbalances have given us, *homo sapiens*, a self-created pivotal 'Holy Grail' to ensure our meaningful existence through trifling engagements - just as a child plays with a newly bought toy. This insurgency permeates all circles and squares of our reality - government, economic growth, natural resources, and human and baboon societies. What we are facing now are not the consequences of our recent acts, but of those that were done 50 years ago or earlier - and mostly by democratic industrialized nations. What China and India is doing now (just as the USA did 50 years ago) will have greater impacts in future. A working-class Chinese layman says, "We need economic growth, more jobs, more money ... we can ofcourse take care of environment later."

Western liberal democracies with emphasis on individual liberty and free-market economy devalue environment and community second to individual. Any individual given such freedom, can and, will exercise all his/her rights to maximize whatever benefits favor him/her regardless of any short/long-term consequences to the society and environment. Hypothetically, it is healthy to idealize that all democracies give birth to free-market economy. Indeed, it is true and fact. But, therein lies the pitfalls of itself. Free-market economy implies open market competition, both national and international. This gives a much wider zone for larger economies to prey on smaller ones, and stump on them with their cheaper products, thus, killing whatever small economy one has or had. Free-market also means that when own people refuse to be enslaved to ground-level works, such large economies always have an option to have 'liberal slaves' in the poor economies at the price of an ant. What such imperialism might cause to the local environment is of less concern to the locals (because they need food), for parasitic elephantine economies to care about others' environment is far from reality (because their environment is saved at other's cost). This is "liberal democracy".

Another challenge for democracy is its limitedness within a national boundary. While environmental issues and economies have blown out of proportion to global, democracy can only stretch its associative arms till its geographical boundaries. For global environmental problems to be solved requires global consensus and regulations beyond boundaries. The virtue of democracy is taking all the affected groups 'on board' and giving the 'first-class seats' to the economically important. Liberal democracy can easily be a quarry of its own inherent qualities, such as corporatism. This means that the power relations between the affected parties are skewed depending on their financial resources. Because liberal democracy heavily depends on economic growth, its time horizon is just as short as the 'free-market' economy. How does this help to solve the perpetuating global problems?

In the name of democracy, when President Bush declared war against Iraq, it was all too clear for many intellectuals that it was something more than a war against terrorism. And the motive was not to liberate Iraqi citizens, but self-serving purpose of imposing his beliefs upon someone else's.<sup>[20]</sup> Everyone is entitled to hold his/her beliefs and exercise them within oneself. There can be no problem in that, whatsoever. The problem starts when we feel the responsibility of convincing others to accept our set of beliefs, and discard his/hers because our beliefs seem more appropriate and good for all. Thus, we invade others mind and thought, both with weapons of mass and thought destruction. In regard to this, the developed countries have never ceased to convert the rest of the world to its own unquestioned beliefs, be it in religion, economics, social values, democracy, political views and alike. While democracy and such beliefs may have worked in ways beyond question in one country, the invasion and imposition of such beliefs in another country have caused disastrous negative development. The ideology of democracy is practically eroded in many democracies in the West by other inevitable 'ism' such as racism, nationalism, socialism, fascism, religion, individualism, and so forth. The idea of democracy does exist in books and ideological discussions, but in practice, it is losing its grounds in all democracies.

## Development or Evolution?

In the last 50 years, the mainstream definition of 'development' has proven itself hazardous for all - nature, human and non-human beings. What is 'development' after all? How mainstream literature defines 'development' is analogical to how a horse with narrow sight pulls the chariot. All that is predominantly visible is the economic growth, material gain, increase in life span, and alike. It is not the fault of intangible aspects for its invisibility, nor is our myopic vision. It is the tendency of our human nature to dwarf such intangible assets with loads of tangible gains. Such 'development' can and should come about any cost is the forwarding message of developmentalists. All too often, we are willing to sacrifice traditional knowledge, culture, social cohesion, nature, and everything that we can only experience and feel but unseen.

Can we think of an alternative to development? Or at least a more humane version of development? I prefer to use the term evolution, instead of development. Firstly, because it is a natural phenomenon in all living beings in the nature. It takes into account the transformational phases, and allows the subjects to adopt in time. Secondly, our human history is of considerable time, of millions years. To have been developed so far, as complex as we are now, is not a result of 2000 years. Hence, just as we are doomed with myopic vision, our concept of development is myopic too. To fumble upon something so transitory as development creates illusion of permanency, and hence, we loose the systemic distant vision. For evolution accounts for greater and longer time, it is to be understood that these processes of development will rise and fall before the holistic scenario of evolution.

I understand that the term 'evolution' is all too biological. And this is third reason why I choose to use it. Aren't we all biological beings living in a biological world? Nature is full of life, and evolution puts life into the process of development, unlike lifeless "development". But for the sake of this essay and not to upset the advocates of development, I am assigned to use the term 'development' in its true sense. Today, the idea of development is held above all frontiers, and is blindly considered to be 'the' solution for all of our problems. The irony is that the development paradigm is the cause of all problems that we face today. Could we have prevented the course of development? No. For human nature, it is illegitimate to stay stagnant.

We have to keep growing and developing infinitely, however finite be the environment or choices, but redefining the widely held belief of development.

With a singular definition of development, political leaders, policy-makers and international organizations are all gearing up for the journey in development process. Governments all over the world are relentlessly fighting for the same vision of economic goals to solve the current problems. However, for the developmentalists, the problems have nothing to do with development and economic growth, instead, it is highly desirable, in fact, necessary to all societies. Through empirical facts, a distinction has to be made between what ideal development is and what represents the today's form of development. A clear definition of the concept is necessary without being influenced by our mis-beliefs about development.

The reasons for the reconstruction of the paradigm of development are evident. A country becomes developed, and privatizes the common resources and introduces institutions to legalize social and economical pyramids. Consequently, natural resources, once common, become private, and a mere commodity to be sold to highest bidder. Social values, culture, tradition, personal morals undergo similar objectification, and hence are object to be traded for monetary capital. This creates the flow of labor into the market, and thus, gives rise to 'free market' economy. Once that stage is achieved in the process of development, human are no more than any other resource, but to be trained to sell themselves to their masters, of course for slavery. This simplifies the scenario for neo-liberal economists that a developed country is a self-functioning free market economy where everything can be bought and sold. Hence, there are no human values, let alone nature and its pity life creatures. Everything is a commodity in a developed country.

To this historical understanding of development, the process of development has fallen prey of obsolete theories that distort the vision of world we live in. By no means, I am here to propose a set of 'must do's for my knowledge is far too minimal to comprehend the complexity of the reality. But, I am convinced that the paradigm of development is to be revised to solve the problems we face today. Some of those revisions can be led by including more than just human factors into the equation. Nature is not to be treated as a commodity with a certain economical

value but 'being in itself'. The problem of poverty cannot be solved until and unless there is a commitment from the dominating countries to reduce their own levels of consumption, so to share the resources equitably. For a society to emerge as a developed society, not just economically, but culturally, environmentally, socially, spiritually and politically, it should encompass every aspect of the individual society, and create a far-sighted holistic vision.

## References:

- [1] Korten, David C. 1995. When Corporations Rule the World. Earthscan Publication Ltd. UK. p. 28
- [2] Bidwal, Praful 2006. From what now to what next. What next? Vol. 1. p.51
- [3] Coronel, Sheila & Dixit, Kunda 2006. Setting the context. What next? Vol. 1. p.24
- [4] Bidwal, Praful 2006. From what now to what next. What next? Vol. 1. p.45
- [5] Dollar, David & Kraay, Aart. 2002. Spreading the Wealth. World Bank. p.123
- [6] Sirowy, Larry & Inkeles, Alex 1990. The Effect of Democracy on Economic Growth and Inequality: A review. p.142-147
- [7] Lindahl, Claes 2005. Wealth of the Poor. Sidastudies no.14. p.46-52
- [8] Bidwal, Praful 2006. From what now to what next. What next? Vol. 1. p.35-37
- [9] Pogge, Thomas W. M. 2002. World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms. Cambridge Publications, 2002. p.196-197
- [10] Wikipedia – Poverty. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty> (14.03.2009)
- [11] Coronel, Sheila & Dixit, Kunda 2006. Setting the context. What next? Vol. 1. p.17
- [12] Child Labor in India. Embassy of India, Washington D.C. [http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Child\\_Labor/childlabor.htm](http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Child_Labor/childlabor.htm) (14.03.2009)
- [13] Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. Globalization and it Discontents. p.23-26
- [14] Sachs, Wolfgang 1999. Planet Dialectics: Exploration in Environment and Development. p. 99-101
- [15] Wikiepdia – Mahatma Gandhi. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohandas\\_Karamchand\\_Gandhi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohandas_Karamchand_Gandhi) (14.03.2009)
- [16] Flow: For Love of Water (2008) - A documentary. <http://www.flowthefilm.com/> (14.03.2009)
- [17] Evernden, Neil. 1993. The Natural Alien: Humankind and Environment. Second Edition. p. 73-84
- [18] Korten, David C. 2006. The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community. p. 175-182
- [19] Bardhan, Pranab. Democracy and Development: A complex relationship. University of California at Berkeley. p. 3-5
- [20] Rist, Gilbert 2006. Before Thinking About What Next. What next? Vol. 1. p. 76.

## Bibliography:

1. Bardhan, Pranab. Democracy and Development: A complex relationship. University of California at Berkeley.
2. Bidwal, Praful 2006. From what now to what next. What next? Vol. 1.
3. Coronel, Sheila & Dixit, Kunda 2006. Setting the context. What next? Vol. 1.
4. Child Labor in India. Embassy of India, Washington D.C. [http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Child\\_Labor/childlabor.htm](http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Child_Labor/childlabor.htm) (14.03.2009)
5. Dollar, David & Kraay, Aart. 2002. Spreading the Wealth. World Bank.
6. Evernden, Neil. 1993. The Natural Alien: Humankind and Environment. Second Edition.
7. Flow: For Love of Water (2008) - A documentary. <http://www.flowthefilm.com/> (14.03.2009)
8. Korten, David C. 2006. The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community.
9. Korten, David C. 1995. When Corporations Rule the World. Earthscan Publication Ltd. UK.
10. Lindahl, Claes 2005. Wealth of the Poor. Sidastudies no.14.
11. Pogge, Thomas W. M. 2002. World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms. Cambridge Publications, 2002.
12. Rist, Gilbert 2006. Before Thinking About What Next. What next? Vol. 1.
13. Sachs, Wolfgang 1999. Planet Dialectics: Exploration in Environment and Development.
14. Sirowy, Larry & Inkeles, Alex 1990. The Effect of Democracy on Economic Growth and Inequality: A review.
15. Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. Globalization and its Discontents.
16. Wikipedia – Mahatma Gandhi. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohandas\\_Karamchand\\_Gandhi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohandas_Karamchand_Gandhi) (14.03.2009)
17. Wikipedia – Poverty. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty> (14.03.2009)