PALACKÝ UNIVERSITY OLOMOUC

Faculty of Science
Department of Development Studies

Bc. Jan Kellner

Redefining development: Beyond post-development theories?

Master's Thesis

Thesis Supervisor: doc. Tom De Herdt, Ph.D.

Olomouc

2015

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Tom De Herdt for his patience and freedom he had granted me with, as well as for inspiring thoughts he coined during my stay in Antwerp.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the secretary office of Department of Development Studies for important administrative support.

Lastly, I owe a big thank to my friend, Katerina Novotna without whom my final steps would have been so much harder, and to rest of my friends for staying patient and supporting me during the time of writing.

Abstract

Is course of development studies still recognizable within the discourse? How has developmental studies changed in socio-economic context and more importantly, in power positions over the time? How the main strand of theories formed and reformed within the multitudes of critiques and shifts of paradigms?

What really are development studies and where do they stand in the scientific discourse arena today? Multiplicity of cross-disciplinary approaches created entangled mesh of theories and views, while one's proclaim its necessity and usefulness and others point towards its hidden side of power abuse and hegemonic control.

Is there a way out from post-developmental ends, or is development mere tool of hidden agendas, far from the meaning of the official narratives?

In the light of rising tensions between civilisations, with the experience of several economic crises, with unfavourable environmental prospects the multidisciplinary field of development finds itself (yet again) in an uneasy situation.

With the reconstruction of historical progression of development studies together within critical discourse analysis I will attempt to identify current status of development and draw possible scenarios for the future.

Nevertheless with the slight hint of overstatement, standing at the end of Fukuyama's history, Hart's meltdown of neoliberalism, cunning nature of capitalism by Zizek or Escobar's collapse of development, it is much easier to imagine end-points than alternatives.

Key words: *ciris of international development, post-development, future of development, paradigm shift, narratives of power, knowledge, power.*

Abstract (Czech)

Je aktuální vývoj mezinárodního rozvoje stále dostatečně koherentní disciplínou? Jak se obor změnil důsledkem socio-ekonomických faktorů a diskursem moci? Jak se dominantní narativy vyvíjely a transformovaly ve světle změn paradigmat a rostoucí kritiky?

Jaká je dicsiplína mezinárodního rozvoje dnes, a jak si stojí na poli ostatních věd? Mnohovrstevná multidisciplinarita oboru znesnadňuje nalezení jednotných východisek a teorií, a věčná rivalita rozdílných názorů neoddiskutovatelně tvoří páteř celé sféry rozvoje.

Je možné odpovědět na kritiku post-developmentu, nebo se mezinárodní rozvoj stal mechanismem moci oficiálních institucí? Ve světle rostoucího napětí mezi civilizacemi a zkušeností mnohých krizí, jak ekonomických, tak environmentálních, se mezinárodní rozvoj nachází opět ve složité situaci.

V této práci se pokusím identifikovat aktuální krize v oboru pomocí rekosntrukce historického vývoje a diskursní analýzou nahlédnout na aktuální statut opozičních proudů. V závěru zmíním i některé možné scénáře dalšího směřování oboru.

V situaci Fukuyamova konce historie, Hartova pádu neoliberalismu, Žižekovy proměny kapitalismu nebo Escobarova konce rozvoje, je jednodušší sáhnout po pesimistických závěrech, nežli po hledání východisek.

Klíčová slova: *krize mezinárodního rozvoje, post-development, budoucnost rozvojových studií, změna paradigmat, narativy, moc.*

Declaration of Academic Integrity

I hereby declare and confirm with my signature that the thesis is exclusively the result of my own autonomous work based on my research and literature published, which is seen in the notes and bibliography used.

Bc. Jan Kellner

…..

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

DS	Development Studies
EBA	Everything But Arms
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG	Millenium Development Goals
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programmes
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

Introduction

How can we read today's development when there is just too much knowledge produced, too many ways synthesized, too many theories being implemented, while the 'colossus' of the mainstream theory only reluctantly moves forward; resisting proposed pitfalls and paradigm shifts and even the critical and opposing theories embodied in post-developmental world, which position questions the very place for such discipline. Now at the brink of a closure yet of another scene, marked with mainstream project called Millenium Development Goals, the revision of crisis appears once again. As many argued, development is closely tied to crisis knowledge and solutions, and even the crisis in the constitution of disciplinary frameworks needs to be reviewed. If one considers development to be a crisis management is therefore possible to miss out the approach of narrative construction? Who has the entitlement to identify crisis?

Rising critics of International development has spurred a wave of coordinated set of objections which range from post developmental critics to modern sociology and anthropology challenging the very core of developmental paradigm (if there is any). In their strands, there can be two crises to identified within the course. Ontological and epistemological crisis mostly coined by post developmental thinkers, and methodological and theoretical crisis stemming from multiplicity of overlapping disciplinary divisions. In my work I will focus on these two branching ideas that can bring about the end of development. As some says: development just failed to deliver (Hickel, 2015). The future of Development Studies might be at the crossroad once again, when the promising strategy won't bring about the results once again in the history of development. This tension might lead to different reactions and adaptations in concepts of the whole DS theory, agenda and practice. The Theory and practice lags within each other - so how will theories react to the proposed partial failure of massive project that "should have solved world's poverty"? Will we face revival of new grand theories, disappearance into multi-faceted micro-theories or confirmation of a 'dead-end' coined by post-development?

The disciplinary course during the time frame of last two decades has shifted rather substantially; from global to local, from macro to micro and from grand theories to partial location-specific theories and from national to individual levels. When we consider all of these changes that has been made in spite of search for 'development' and the progress that has (not) been made, voices of the critiques sounds loud, so are we in time of the end of development as we know it? Is there a repetitive pattern such as Kuhn's paradigm shift in these academic fields? Can this signify a reborn of relativist period, such as the 90's were, right after the Structural Adjustment Program failure, which can bear some similarity with other grand theories and not far from closing MDG's? Will then fragmented fate of micro and local views be again exchanged with big projects and the cycle will go on? Is this problematic lag of theoretical adjustments from developmental practices to blame for unending cycle of unsuccessful development, or are we just unable to see its outcomes properly? Will be the late proposed modernisation, globalisation or industrialization of countries or simple notion of "catching up" with the northern part of the world, "the trend setter"? Are we witnessing grand visions with unified goals within practice once again - as it could be also disguised within history of Structural Adjustment Programmes on national level under the label of MDGs? Where there are knowledge structures built upon Marxism, social movements and participative approaches on the counterweight? Has the disciplinary arena changed or is it just the change of names? Any why are the same post-war developmental institutions still holding at the position of independent scientific expertise?

There are concerns about inequity in developmental approach. Western or Northern countries developers facilitate theories and projects located for different parts of the world, while overlooking development relevancy in their own regions. Inequality and exclusion, as few of the hallmarks of development foci, has in the past years risen substantially in developed world as well.

Decentralization of the development processes has never evolved fully, leaving many countries in an state of unhealthy dependency on donor countries. Other questions raised by the recent evolution of development studies about its future can be revised with Kuhn's theory of paradigm shift. I argue, that

mainstream theory weavers, embodied in global institutions such as UN, WB, IMF has reached the position of power, which backed with appropriate scientific disciplines and political structures allows to omit or co-opt theoretical criticism and opposition resulting in steady situation with only overt changes. The ability of mainstream development to partake in discourse with other theories, while responding with minor to no reflection in outcomes, sheds impression of change, where no true change had taken place.

Problem: just another crisis of development?

In the light of rising tensions between civilizations, with the experience of several economic crises, with unfavorable environmental prospects the multidisciplinary field of development finds itself (yet again) in an uneasy situation.

Titles such as "The Death of International Development", "Reinventing Development", "Impossibility of Development", "Postcolonial Enchantment", "Development, The Devil We Know?", "Development Hoax?", "Whose Development?" and many more might be but a fragment of the critical responses towards the course of development. But were they sound enough to provide the basis for transformation of the field? And even if they were to any degree, was the shift significant enough to epitomize the "thrive for change"?

Since its political and practical nature, every shift of mainstream development field in history had created appropriate responses in forms of ideological and physical resistance. Depending on time frame of analysis, authors like Pieterse identify birth of development as early as in atmosphere of industrial triumph of the Pax Britannica and colonial reign over the world of 19th century. Other writers, post-development thinkers included, usually set the existence of developmental(ism) from post-war period on. Either as a tool of reconstruction of war-torn Europe, starting as early as in 1948 with introduction of Marshall Plan, soon to be transformed towards other nations, or more often, manifested in speech held by Henry Truman in 1949, where narrative of modernity has been explicitly delivered. The opposition to mainstream development is then embodied within counterpoint and critical theories, as Buch-Hansen and Lauridsen (2012) frame.

One might argue for the similar ambivalent nature of constant questioning and revision in science. If we could designate Development studies a science, principle of verifiability and refutability would create the same atmosphere. And as Thomas Kuhn shows, once the infallibility is grasped for, the power to sweep irregularities under a rug strengthen. To the analogy, the evolution of all strands of development is an intertwined, dynamic process, where counteracting forces shape each other, one of the "missing values" is the distribution of power in this battle. It can be argued that mainstream skillfully adjusted its paradigm to the extent of sufficient combination of co-opting and muting the opposition voices. Nevertheless, with the slight hint of overstatement, standing at the end of history (Fukuyama), neoliberalism (Hart), capitalism (Zizek) or development (Escobar), it is much easier to imagine end-points than alternatives.

Deconstructing Development

"Development studies is an unusual enterprise. It is committed both to the principle of difference (the Third World is different, hence the need for a separate field of studies) and to the principle of similarity (it is the job of development policy to make 'them' more like 'us')" Corbridge, 2007: 179.

Adjusting our theoretical apparatus will decide what we will see and what will stay hidden. For the good and for the bad likewise. In scientific sense the ability to examine certain events, observer needs to set boundaries and methods of his work. "Theory is based on simplifying assumptions which make an understanding of the phenomena which are being studied possible within the complexities of the world" (Sumner Tribe 2008:86).

These adopted lenses will then serve further discoveries of different objects or we can adjust our point of view and re-examine current issues to receive multiple measures from different angles. This revision standard stands at the core of science in the same way I perceive any acquirement of knowledge: that is to repeatedly question current findings by changing the lenses of the theoretical corpus. Such operation leads to multi-faceted ascertainment, with rather robust credibility.

Plurality of approaches connects closely to the above stated quotation of Corbridge. Development studies as a field is build around diverse theoretical basis. From my point of view, the main question lies in the idea of diverging or converging progressions of world civilizations, which theme I borrow from Samuel P. Huntington's Clash of Civilizations (1996). Even though contention between convergence and divergence theories, or one might even say paradigms, has been in case of development won mostly in favor of the later one, there is a tendency for disparities to increase, intentionally (e.g. in the pursuit of social identity) or unintentionally (e.g. as the result of Gramscian variability of power at different levels). The meaning is that our premise for development to bring different subjects to the universal goal of "satisfaction", "well-being" and

"sameness" is inconsistent with the tool used for differentiation of the spectrum of "quality of life", which is linear and points the other way, towards possible convergence. This represents a paragon of development, that the convergence of (human) variable levels of development is reachable by identifying differentiation and commitment for permanent adjustment towards the ideal (Corbridge, 2007). Here I come close to Escobar's (1995) view that sees an incompatible discord within development foundation. It does not matter which of the two abstractions is pursued, but the very idea of conjuncture, that means building similarity from variance, is flawed, since the historical and political basis of subjects of development had evolved radically different.

Allow me to present a trans-disciplinary swipe to elaborate on my statement more profoundly. Diverging dynamics rarely allow for return to harmonious state in natural science. Actually there is never any return. Since social structure is shaped by multiple levels of interactions, there is no way back, only forward. In the same sense, we can not unlearn development narratives, we can only invent new adaptation, discover new angles to approach them. Same "arrow of entropy" applies to the biological evolution itself and is also identified across other natural sciences. Therefore stating differences that will be made equal by the system that interacts with the subject is naïve at best. It is not far from Young's double-slit experiment in quantum mechanics. The presence of observer inherently affects the observed (Bohr et. al. 2010).

Obvious contradiction in the heart of the developmental thinking then gave rise to opposing and rather incompatible strands of theories. Even their delimitation is far from settled. Authors like Corbridge, Pieterse, Buch-Hansen, Lauridsen, Sumner and Tribe, Hart and many others devoted fair share of their ideas to characterize actual trends of development.

Searching for identity of Development Studies (and within)

This section will be dedicated to two contested questions and their denotation. First, is it possible to recognize a certain paradigm within development sphere? If so, is there a shift of such paradigm traceable? Second, can we consider development studies a particular science or discipline? Implications of any possible answer consequently alter the approach to development's theoretical and practical apparatus to substantial amount as well as in differentiation into branching recourses.

> *"Economists, sociologists, and anthropologists, for example, may find it easier to interact with environmental scientists than to work with one another. When multiple strains of social scientists all work on the same topic, they seem to talk past each other"*
> Lélé, Norgaard, 2005:973.

Before venturing into pitfalls of current situation in development, it would be wise to frame the outer picture of what is the meaning or interpretation of development itself. There has been countless definitions and semantics of this term sounded for the sake of further research. As Sumner and Tribe (2008) poignantly sum up in their work, definition of development is utmost controversial and unstable, taking on shapes of its historically and politically embedded prolocutors.

Although the explanatory features do shift, the process of power and institutional agency behind the theories hasn't changed much, but this will be discussed later. Also to note, not many definitions resisted the danger of selecting and focusing the 'appropriate' measurements, that will consent the idea, while omitting wider interconnections, which might have proven the theory less valid. This is a special case of non-historicity and apolitical view, that both while used cunningly refine certain narratives while intentionally obscuring broader reality. Historical and political discontinuity in development narratives has been one of concerns of post-developmental thinkers, which will be introduced closer in later chapters. But drawing out of the multitudes of Development studies, is it possible to form a

single definition, an ultimate mergence of various underlying ideas, so called paradigm?

Many authors would be at odds with such statement, since evolving nature of development thinking is, closely tied to reflection of actual political and economical domains, from which as many authors (Sumner, Tribe, 2008; Cowen, Shenton, 1998; Gore, 2000 and others) argue development as a field of knowledge stems from. It is also impossible to state one definition since the core argument of the Development studies itself is loaded and contested research as it has been discussed earlier (Mehta et al, 2006 in Sumner and Tribe, 2008).

Discipline of Development

> ”[...] Different disciplines have different ways of problematizing
> issues and they use different languages’ and ‘the social sciences
> … exhibit their own languages, methodologies, and assumptions”
> Haddad (2006: 2) and McGregor (2006: 33).

Can we consider DS a scientific discipline? Sumner and Tribe present one possible view that DS is not a sole discipline which implies further consequences. “[...] DS is an umbrella area of study – covering a range of constituent disciplines – rather than being a discipline in itself. A more appropriate conception of DS is perhaps as a ‘subject’ (Sumner and Tribe, 2008:64)”. They further point out the difference between “subject” and “discipline” such as the later includes culture, specific social environment and certain type of “guild” or “tenet” coherence. These aspects are according to the authors missing within the field of DS, since most of the experts enter DS from their specific disciplines and thus not create united development community of knowledge.

The lack of clear profile of DS poses several problems. Multiple disciplines, such as economy or social science offer wide and often incompatible array of epistemologies, ontologies and ethics. Assumptions about developing countries presented in principles of difference and sameness than hint towards Positivism, whereas Relativism of diverse characteristics of political, cultural, economical, social and other contexts is supplied with critical strains. Different

values pursued are thus inconsistent within development field presenting one of the inter-disciplinar barriers accentuated by Lélé and Norgaard (2005). Approach towards goal of development differs as well, Relativism plays a key role in nature of post-development, grassroots and participatory agenda, while policy-makers seek solutions with generalizations, reduction and categorizing features entailing Positivism.

Distinct values, methods and assumptions avert possible fusion of development into compact discipline, Sumner and Tribe (2008) suggest that the closest one can get in development is multi-disciplinarity where each of the study brings only limited insight.

Development thus consist of variety of different knowledge elements. What are the fundamentals it incorporates from it in its methodology, ethics or theory creation? Sumner and Tribe (2008) distinguish between a) sociological process of long-term changes, historically embedded and value-free view, b) policy related, economically oriented, medium-term time horizons of development, presented by MDGs for example, c) post-modernist philosophical discourse, an ethnocentric and ideological aspect of Western-born concept. They also mention the difference between economic science umbrella on one hand and sociology on the other. The features can be roughly divided into two strands in DS, that affect knowledge creation processes on all levels. Ranging from defining ontology, epistemology, theory, methodology and methods, positionality in DS strongly affects research preferences between qualitative and quantitative, positivist or relativist approach in theory identification and much more (Sumner, Tribe, 2008). Pieterse (2010) brings in dichotomous division between development as a political ideology and economically viewed social science. He emphasizes the fact that one should employ the middle-road concerning both aspects equally.

In Kuhn's words, once the scientific community can answer following questions, "What are the fundamental entities of which the universe is composed? How do these interact with each other and with the senses? What questions may legitimately be asked about such entities and what techniques employed in seeking solutions?" (Kuhn, 1970:5). These questions roughly

correlate with Sumner and Tribe's anchoring of foundation of knowledge, where scaffold of learning is mentioned followingly: Ontology -> Epistemology -> Theory -> Methodology -> Methods. If we would consider DS a particular field within science, since there is a valid set of methodology, epistemology and theories, we might revise Kuhn's words of early stages of science in order to comprehend the shifting and unclear aim of contemporary situation. Kuhn coins that:

> "Early developmental stages of most sciences have been characterized by continual competition between a number of distinct views of nature, each partially derived from, and all roughly compatible with, the dictates of scientific observation and method" Kuhn, 1970:4.

If we then abstract the academic field as a science in this meaning, we can discover the imbalanced state and possible power discrepancies between theoretical strands, that take place within development, as well as unclear position of paradigm shift mechanism, which puts mainstream into hegemonial state, that allows for its dynamic resistance. The notion of science "[...] seeing the world and of practicing science in it" (Kuhn, 1970:4), can relate to the ambiguous positionality in views varying through theoretical frameworks. Such as neoliberalism, post-development or any other, which arbitrary elements such as history, and personal accidents differ vastly (Kuhn, 1970).

> "The status of development theory reflects the theory-lag between development studies and social science generally, a 'colonial legacy' in knowledge and a recurring impasse in the development field. The decolonization of knowledge is a matter of ongoing contestation"
> Apffel-Marglin and Marglin, 1996; Dahl, 2008; Pieterse and Parekh, 1995:122.

According to Pieterse and Parekh (1995) development field thus suffers from two sources, lack of it's original foundation within scientific field, as it has been examined by Sumner and Tribe (2008) and historical and political context, which has been a major nexus around which different approaches has been adopted.

Nonetheless this historically reflective approach to colonial legacy was not always present in this open sense within the development discourse. It was a rising critique of the post-war politics sounded by Truman's speech in 1949 where the roles of "us" and "them" or the double principle examined above has been established in a new political narrative. Post-development writers (especially Esteva, Escobar, Fergusson) argue that paradigm did not really changed from the colonial hegemony between dominating and subordinate concourse of states and nations of global North and South. Discourse that has been brought since, proved as a valuable tool for deciphering new layer of problematique within development sphere, as it will be uncovered later.

Paradigm of Development

> *"'Truth' is a product of the dominant 'paradigm'. Scientists are not objective"* Kuhn in Sumner and Tribe, 2008:57.

It might sound even tautological to define meaning of paradigm, before closing in on unwinding of developmental paradigm, I will present few key ideas of authors involved in this matter. The idea of paradigm has been worked out by Thomas Kuhn in his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolution" originating in 1962. His prehension of 'paradigm' was "[...] the entire constellation of beliefs, values and techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community" given the sociological dimension and "a shared example or model [replacing other] explicit rules" (1962: 175). Most of the authors within development incline towards the former extent, in Kuhn's words 'sociological', since the unambiguity of definition. Nevertheless I consider the second 'philosophical' point of view insomuch relevant to the power analysis of developmental discourse.

Notable concern in Kuhn's work is shift of paradigm in natural science, which can be roughly translated to changes observed within development theory and

practice. For Kuhn, the pivotal cause of paradigm shift is influx of new ideas coined by consequential generation of scientists. I propose that against this change stands the paradigm inertia of shared example, embodied in its dominance and guarded with constitution of 'normality' spectrum as understood by Foucauldian dispositif or Scott's effect of hegemonial normalization. Escobar demonstrates this dominant rigidity on a case when past theories are being reinforced with the new ones:

> *"Although the discourse of development has encountered many structural changes, the 'discursive formation' that cemented development in the period 1945–55 remains unchanged – making it convenient and possible for it to adapt itself to new conditions"*
> Escobar in Andrews and Bawa, 2014:925.

Nonetheless, many authors like Rahnema, Schuurman, Gore or Pieterse, operate with nature of paradigm shift in development. It is important to recognize different meanings and impacts of such change. Idea of three phases of paradigm evolution originates from Kuhn's work – First, 'pre-scientific phase' specific for lack of consensus and multiplicity of incompatible competing theories. Second, 'normal science', the dominance of particular theory, that encapsulates certain set of methods, terminology and world-views, while according to Sumner and Tribe (2008:62) [...] "unpacking the 'promise of success' of new ideas". Third, 'scientific revolution', as a consequence of accumulation of [...] "key anomalies build up against a body of theory leading to its rejection and to a paradigm shift" (ibid:62).

As it was unfold, Kuhn's paradigm structure does not necessarily hold true for development case, if considered as a (part of) social science as Pieterse (2000) points out. It is therefore crucial to distinguish between paradigm in original sense of Kuhn, which treats science and paradigm used within social sphere, and paradigm in the field of development which lacks certain cohesion and often changes in a very subtle and swift manner or not at all, unlike paradigm

shift encountered in natural science, which is far more clear-cut and usually marks end of certain episode of ideas and particular models of thinking.

In my view, beforementioned three steps of paradigm shift described by Kuhn can happen with greatly reduced impacts, while not truly changing, but rather adjusting, adding-on, to current "mainstream" that consequently co-opts "opposition" instead of being exchanged by it. In this language Pieterse (2000:352) rules out "alternative" or "counter-point" paradigm breaks merely as "[...] a rhetorical consensus, often values contributed by alternative development as "alternative" are quickly embraced by mainstream development, without any paradigm shift, since same values are added". To go even further, Escobar (2000) revisits post-development theory to go "beyond paradigm" since its "one-size-fits-all" nature by abandoning the idea of theoretical and methodological fusion into a coherent entity at once.

This clarifies the position of paradigm within three recognizable strands of development, which I borrow from Pieterse (2000): mainstream, alternative and critical. These categories differ within theoretical spread of writers, for example Buch-Hansen and Lauridsen (2012) place mainstream against critical and counterpoint theories, but at the end of the day both approaches cease to defend the existence of the "middle" category, that stands between mainstream and it's counterpart with Pieterse abandoning the term 'alternative' completely, for the lack of distinction in its paradigm from the mainstream.

While critical views seek radical rejection of normalizing knowledge of paradigm (which is also an important point of their criticism), mainstream development then draws on different paradigms from disciplines of economy in case of its methods and practices and finds affinity with anthropological paradigm in theory construction. There are these two contrasting ends in spectrum of social science, as Sumner and Tribe (2008) coined, that create particular, often inconsistent views, being united under development studies. Development than is subject to dichotomy in theoretical and practical apparatus, which interaction creates reflective lag, based on the different speeds of shifts and adaptation to their original paradigm source, that of economy and anthropology (sociology).

Schizophrenia of Development?

In previous text I have tried to outline complicated situation standing at the very essence of development, that might lead us to further analysis in order to disclose proposals for the future direction in the atmosphere of surcease.

Development faces crisis of identity. Since it lacks a coherent scientific community, where experts from different domains contribute to the basis of knowledge, but settle within the field just in a limited manner, it does not constitute a scientific discipline and hardly it can achieve any consensus in its theoretical frame, paradigm. Nevertheless some authors identify paradigm within mainstream development, yet again, how and whether it evolves is again, a matter of contestation.

All the same, there is a limited possibility to trace developmental paradigm, not so paradigm shift in Kuhn's view. No real 'new world view arrived', just the ideology and methods of pursuing the same "goal" of development changed. In this sense, the well-known principle coined by post-developmentalist authors "search for alternatives to development, instead of development alternatives" is at hand. What caused the misapprehension between mainstream view that change of paradigm is happening and that of critical scholars? I am convinced it is the very definition of how is the meaning of paradigm perceived and constructed on first place.

For the sake of answering the core question, why there are quite a few voices considering development in crisis, one of the pivotal challenge may lie in its specific foundations. Idea contributions done have their core embedded in disciplines with different epistemes where result leads to sharp breakdown into wide spectrum of approaches and theories. Having only "freelancing" scholars operating and presenting within different epistemologies and utilizing different paradigms, development is built around a frail nucleus.

Multiplicity of Development Frameworks

> *"Different theoretical frameworks capture and miss different things. For example, different frameworks identify different people as 'poor' because they have differing perspectives and definitions of poverty and wellbeing"* Sumner, Tribe 2008: 86.

Capturing and missing different things relate to creation of the framework and production of certain narrative, that is build around the exploration of the established structure. In short, this is the process of creating particular knowledge and thus exerting certain power over subjects of concern. Positionality of power will be approached in later chapters, however this process is initiated by the very identification of varying developmental methodologies. We can draw further from breakdown in mainstream, alternative and critical positions by revealing following stances within DS introduced by Sumner and Tribe (2008).

It takes a battle of different sets of values and measures to arrive to the result of development's architecture. Sumner and Tribe (2008) present a three dimensional view of generalized trends in approaching development. They recognize different vantage points, that of societal and structural change, that took place in 50' and 60' during colonial liberation period. This view expands in a long-term period, and its notion of inherent change finds reflection in linear, evolutionary sense captured by Rostow's model of stages of growth, but also in Marxist ideas, where different stages of social evolution are sorted in succession. As Sumner and Tribe show, this approach offered greatest scope of different variables, which resulted in "grand vision" within path from traditional to modern society, and closely correlated within Cold War meta-narratives, which were nevertheless deemed obsolete by critique. It is argued that post-war development narratives were created as an 'alternative to communism', which, given the specific historical consequences, made political sense (Nustad, 2001).

> *"Yet if development is not about growth, what is it? One option is to redefine development as social transformation"*
> Pieterse 2000: 353.

Another form of defining development is based on policymaking and practice with aim on poverty reduction through considering medium to short-term character of projects prepared by development agencies, such as Bretton Woods institutions and NGO's. Such approach rules out issues beyond measurable and while often focused solely on poverty reduction or specific goal-oriented indication it is by many (Gore, 2000; Hart, 2009; Sumner, Tribe, 2008) viewed as overly technocratic. This position if usually employed by development institutions, that are criticized by post-development strands for its apolitical effect of the outcomes, but this topic will be covered in the third section of this paper.

The third position is derived from post-developmentalist, post-modern rhetoric of identifying and challenging western domination and narratives of power through lenses of discourse, building its foundation on the work of Michel Foucault. Post-developmentalist stance stands critical towards previously mentioned approaches based on linearity of the modernization paradigm of the former, and on ahistorical and apolitical nature of the latter. Instead it seeks to bring alternatives to the whole concept of development, arguing for it's toxicity and redundancy. Many development thinkers agree that in spite of its unwithered critique, the lack of feasibility of proposed alternatives precludes further application.

Dichotomous arena of views?

Is it possible to trace back sequence of leading development milestones and their theoretical features in order to gain new understanding of the current situation? Venturing not so far into the history, quite a clear cut dividing theories and practices can be observed. Functionalist positivist approaches and opposing relativist socio-anthropological views can bring us closer to the truth.

Functionalist approach presents aspect of rationality, that can be viewed as a property of every agent (actor, stakeholder). One of the basic premises is that any activity executed by actors has a rational meaning, that is builds up on form of benefit for the actor. Within this approach, the use of 'benefit' is mostly expressed economically. As Richerson (2002, in Adger, 2006:1) puts it :"[...] any decision (made by actors) … does not come about without perceived gain

through the bargain." The idea of trade of gains, transaction costs, materialistic values of resources, isolated homogeneous entities, static nature and clear boundaries between scales is central to the 'rational actor' theories (Mehta, 1999, Colomy, 1986). In this case bargain and negotiation processes is where functionalist views place the aspect of power.

The sociological and anthropological approach, gaining notable mainstream developmental attention from beginning of new millennium, but first introduced in 80's (Ekasinght, Letcher, 2008), on the other hand, features social dynamics, and construction, unbounded interactions related to time and space, negotiation of meanings, and brings into the debate discourses of knowledge and power.

It might seem that functionalist approaches have been left in the course as a panacea for criticism, confirming the propriety of sociological view. In response to the criticism of lack of empirical and historical specificity, inability to recognize power and conflict in social processes and overemphasis of engineering structural change, developmental functionalist direction evolved further towards reflection of mentioned opposition (Mehta, 1999, Colomy, 1986). In philosophy, this criticism has been formulated during 70's but it took much longer to be mirrored within developmental studies.

In analytical means, the two views also originally presented different tools for solving problems. High reliance on creating functionalist models to predict outcomes and impacts required substantial measure of reduction of meanings and categorization while preferably utilizing quantitative, statistical methods, whilst sociology-based approaches ruled out generalization with local-specific phenomena explained mostly with participatory approaches and case studies (George, Bennet, 2005). Those had become a favorite tool to prove or back-up theory in many developmental documents notwithstanding the approach. But are the outcomes and meanings of case studies universally veritable, or can they be presented to serve views of their researcher?

In the course of last decade, the increasing popularity of opposing theories based on sociology and anthropology debunked the uniform, isolated, rational nature of human beings (actors). This started a slow erosion of the

functionalist narrative of sterile, profit-seeking, computably behaving unit, influencing some authors in consideration of broader range of variables interfering in the processes, while still being sworn to functionalist premises to major extent. The reference to text written by Mehta (1999) can explain the original status of division between functionalist, in her text labeled as 'mainstream' and socio-anthropologist approaches, named 'emerging'. Nevertheless, the identification of clear functionalist or sociologist approach is harder since the two are recently often being enhanced or combined into new forms. Since some of the theories share features of both 'original' approaches, it is no longer possible to "black-box" them into two opposite categories. The goal of the following section will be to identify shifts and new positions of conceptually essential aspects of power.

Disentangling Overlaps of Meanings

> *"The power to define reality is a crucial aspect of power and one of the major means by which certain groups … … are silenced and suppressed"* Booth et al., 2006: 12–13.

Why does study of power concerns development field? There can be multiple possible answers responded. Many of those I will present here can show connotation to Schuurman's (2003) work on social capital and its conceptual disputes. First, emergence of interest in power relations can be explained naturally by unsatisfactory results of previous theories in solving development problems or by sounded criticism of mainstream theories. Second, topic of power became important aspect of concurrently evolving theories in different fields (i.e. institutional approaches). Third, In the context of origin (here consider adoption from European strands of philosophy), it may implicitly seem central to the materialistic conflict of interactions between social and physical world. Fourth, similarly as Schuurman (2003) views role of social capital, power can serve as a new (temporary) "missing value" for political agendas. Fifth, in this sense it can be used as an external, "objective" justification of economic, social or other inequalities, either directly as result of unequal power, or indirectly, as a failure to

recognize overly complex structure of power. Sixth, power is, same as social capital, institutions or any other narrative phenomena, immeasurable and equivocal, giving upper hand in individualized explanation, but lacking cohesion and measurability.

Despite of this possible negative agenda behind all the interest put in power in development, it may prove valuable to understand multiple overlapping phenomena, just to be familiar with the trend for useful contribution in further discourse of development.

In my quest for unification or simplification of meaning of power in the literature on development, it came clear that most of the authors described power relations with set of common features. Typology of power, role and position of knowledge, existence and function of structures and actors, forms and reality of resistance. Focus on these features and changes in their grasp amongst the spectrum of theories, should help us in better understanding of the role of power in development. Importance of power emerged from two opposing approaches in the development. As it has been mentioned earlier, what could be possibly identified as economic functionalism and socio-anthropological origin of ideas and theories, cannot be analogically used for identification of distinction between variety of power relations. Authors from whole spectrum of development backgrounds adopted various theories and fragments of power from sociological and philosophy disciplines.

Contouring aspects of power

In development literature considering the theories of power, approaches seems to differ between authors in views on equality, type and distribution of power. Adapted in literature on development, from the mesh of different approaches few conceptual values keep emerging. Usual configuration and their specific differs in existence, position or function of variables like knowledge, structure, agent, resistance and power itself. Problem is, that these central values of theories of power come from multiple authors defending different ideas and coming from different disciplinary backgrounds, that react towards competing theories of the time and build upon them or waive their ideas. Venturing into sociology and bringing out evolution of theories of power takes a different research, but my goal will be to approach these categories within frequently cited philosophers and sociologists in development.

Due to emergence of new theories within certain fields, namely sociology and philosophy, new sets of values entered the arena. Authors quoted within development literature analyzing issues of power, just to name few: Michel Foucault, Stephen Lukes, James C. Scott, Pierre Bourdieu or Anthony Giddens had brought international development into novelty contestation. Now, the concepts of these authors offer vast range of approaches, while some of them are mutually preclusive or overlapping in comprehension of development reality. I will try to expose these specifically on approach of the theories on previously mentioned values while analyzing historical surroundings of their emergence.

Power

Probably the most diverse and robust identifier of typology, exercise or manifestation of power is expression of its meaning, function and appearance. Beginning with Lukes view in short, he proposes three-dimensional view on power, while first two dimensions are not particularly attractive for development issues, since they build upon idea of power in Hobbesian tradition as an enabling capacity in decision-making, which might connect to Amartya Sen's views of capability, but leaves the substantial part of the view behind. That is, third

dimension, where power is expressed as power over, in form of domination and ability to change subordinate's values and interests in favor of dominant. (Gaventa, 2003, Dowding, 2006, Lukes, 1974 in Hindess, 1996). This is commonly adopted sense of oppressive nature of intentional agency of development, but it is necessary to restrain from idea of one sided direction of this power. Sovereign power does not necessarily represents the only force at stake, but also certain response from the side of overtly subordinate always takes place. This concern is formulated in Scott's work, known as phenomena called 'false consciousness', where he elaborates deeper on the reality of acceptance of dominant ideas by subordinates. Scott distinguishes between 'thick' and 'thin' description according to the real believe or mere resignation of subordinates, while he endorses the latter. Both, Scott and Lukes accent the ambiguous nature of actions by all actors, expressed in overt and covert, or public and hidden arenas (Scott, 1990, Lukes, 1974 in Dowding, 2006).

Obviously, these two authors created subsidiary views on power, unlike theory of Foucault, which protrudes from the power debates, and became central domain of post-development writers. Gaventa (2003) notes that Foucault is one of the most misunderstood author, and imposition of his theories often serves blankly as an arbitrary source. In a sense of intended executability of many developmental approaches into physical forms of action, Foucault presents rather relativistic and intangible ideas (Dowding, 2006). It is no wonder, that application of his views is highly impractical in projection to applied approaches, but proves valuable in theoretical discourses. Power in Foucault's view is not represented or wielded by any subject, but is dispersed and present in every action, "it is the name we give to a complex strategic situation in a particular society" (Foucault in Gaventa, 2003:4). As opposed in other theories, Foucault's power loses the negative aspect presented in domination and hegemony, power is not intentional and thus acts as a moral-free force producing realities. There is a sharp distinction between sovereign or dominant power, that is based around rule-over and subordinance, visible in relations between European powers and colonies, and 'biopower', that can work alongside the sovereign power in technological and

constructive way of structuring and redefining order of lifes, renders the value-laden debate dismissible (Brigg, 2002)

> "[...] biopower is a 'power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them"
> Foucault 1981: 136.

For the latter, Gaventa (2003) uses term positive power. In my view, this central idea can be roughly compared to embracing nature of power structures, with the difference of dissolution of roles of dominated and dominating subjects, which practically hampers implementation into situations of identifying inequalities between them (Dowding, 2006). With the historical shift in post-war narratives, where execution of sovereign power was no longer acceptable and colonies became "Third World", the agency of power changed into promotion of welfare and benefits. The universal direction of deductive power of sovereign ruler winded up into entaglement of mutually active forces of assent and resistance, exemplified for example on ex-colonies entering UN and other international operators. Important to note is idea coined by Cooper and Packard, that this shift towards development as we know it "[...] represented a liberating possibility in the early postwar period for many Third World nationalists" (Cooper and Packard 1997, in Brigg, 2002:6).

Following two authors share some theoretical similarities of structuralist school, Giddens and Bourdieu. Their central idea of interconnectedness of actor and structure and their mutually reshaping interactions can be related to theories concerning agency and institutions. Giddens identifies transformative power as capability of agents and domination within structural power. In his view, dominated agents replicate the structures of power with their actions, disregarding their interests, which is a step back from micro-sociological perspective of Scott and Lukes (Gaventa, 2003). Bourdieu, while representing similar concept of structure-actor reproductive process (with minor differences), on the other hand reflects that within the system of domination, 'misrecognition'

(or false consciousness) affects subordinate to legitimate constructions of dominant agents (Gaventa, 2003, Hindess, 1996).

Broader use of the mentioned theories in development literature on the theme of power can be found for instance in the documents of Risseeuw: Bourdieu, power and resistance: Gender transformation in Sri Lanka, Brigg: Post-development, Foucault and the colonisation metaphor or Buller and Hoggart: Non-decision-Making and Community Power: Residential Development Control in Rural Area.

Framing of the power within literature

As the two streams of functional and social theories has been identified earlier, it is much more challenging, maybe even impossible, to match concrete theories of power to them, mainly because of conceptual and cross-disciplinar conjuncture. Often, combination of many theories leads to theoretical forum-shopping, Gaventa (2003) uses term "cherry-picking", resulting in ambiguous, incompatible or even contradicting statements. In many texts, the arbitrariness of forced incorporation of power theorem reaches impressive levels, where multiple authors are quoted within a paragraph without any further connection towards the enclosure of the text. Unsurprisingly, this phenomena is mostly encountered within econometric, post-functionalist literature, which incorporated some of the features of recent debate with sociology, understanding the necessity of encapsulation of 'new missing value' of power. Central terms of transaction costs applied on social interactions, vision of multiple stakeholders on different scales representing agents and division between different social groups or identification of winners and losers, are in most cases rather incompatible for introduction of sociologically and philosophically nested theories of power.

Process of reduction and categorization is for analytical nature of functional approaches essential. Complexity of real interactions is out the scope, since its huge informational basis offers very little possibility of constructing a model for further studies (Haas, 2007). Stemming from this theory, most of the social interactions has been isolated and categorized within different scales, but after the considerable change in reflection on cross-interactions (Adger, 2002,

Armitage, 2005) the integration of new logics happened. View on the spatial dynamics, characterized with global (transnational corporations, institutions – WB, IMF etc.), national (state actors), regional or local (community participation, collective power), household and individual levels, has emerged into further interrelation (Obi, 2001, Barnett, 2001). Kassimir (2003) sees the beginning of the scale interconnectedness: "[...] through privatization and other structural adjustment measures, as well as the expansion and pluralization of global networks, more spaces have opened for direct global–local connections to be made, transboundary flows of commodities, people, ideas, cultural products, and technologies to be transited, uncontrolled by state institutions" (Kassimir, 2003:110).

One of the responses to encompass diversity of newly identified power relations between heterogeneous groups related to interaction between different scales I have encountered, is psychological approach of Allison and Hobbs (2010). In my view it reaches a contradictory state though. Comprehension of individual character based on socio-biological features is noted as a key variable needed for successful action within local social environment but conclusively, quantitative categorization into four types of human characters emerges. Perhaps this case shows us the limits of application of human psychology into post-functionalist developmental project and sheds light on troublesome nature of analysis across multiple scales.

Another example in case of cross-scale interaction is network system in development Natural resource management scheme elaborated by Adger et.al. (2006). The core idea builds upon institutional economy, but authors pick aspect of power between stakeholders for explaining different transaction costs determining existence of interactions between them. The idea itself, if conducted rigorously, would bridge the two streams of theories successfully. That case would probably called for cooperation of multidisciplinary team. Unfortunately, the main explanatory feature, power, is framed rather poorly, resulting in reader's confusion. Power relations, determining the nature of interactions in the paper are firstly supported by Lukes, where authors frame power as application of action, knowledge and resources. Then they employ Few's division of sociological tactics

of agents on one hand, and structural power, that implies distribution of resources and influence. The grand finale begins where authors combine overt and covert nature of different cross-scale stakeholder's interaction partially overlapping Lukes' and Scott's theories and quotes Long's inter-actor and Few's actor-structure relations while acknowledging Foucault's dispersion and pervasiveness of power. Everything of this intensive discourse happens within three paragraphs and authors further use case study to prove their theoretical findings.

This is most probably not the correct way of how power in development literature should be approached. Sadly, the modern implied cross-boundary-ness reforges the standards of robustness and rigorosity, often leading to interpretation shortcomings. But not all works grounded in functionalism fails to incorporate theory of power as seen in example, but it should be advisable to gain deeper understanding of different power theories and follow their compatibilities, while avoiding forum-shopping that creates unintelligible bodies of information.

Functionalist authors like Francis Cleaver and her theory on institutional crafting (institutional bricolage) approaches the power less broadly, but still incorporates structural power relations of Giddens into her work. The agents have certain knowledge and power to reshape existing institutions, which can be perceived as structures (Cleaver, 2001). Cleaver is also aware of incompatibility of pursued goals across different scales. Mainly she identifies this divergence between governmental structures (bureaucratic institutions) and local co-management (socially embedded institutions).

In my view placing power aspects onto a supportive position without overly combining the theoretical basis and to cease from trying to invent analytical tool that would reach across all spatial and disciplinary dimensions, is the accurate way of tackling the conceptual gap for functionalist approaches.

Knowledge

Position and function of knowledge alters between different views. Some refer to it as a container of information and valuable resource (Lukes, Bourdieu), but in Foucauldian approach it stands equivalently with power in the center of the whole theory. Still, other authors also consider role of knowledge to certain extent.

Foucault places relation of knowledge and power, in my view analogically to role of Giddens' nature of structure-agent cycle. "No body of knowledge can be formed without a system of communications, records, accumulation and displacement which is in itself a form of power and which is linked, in its existence and functioning, to the other forms of power. Conversely, no power can be exercised without the extraction, appropriation, distribution or retention of knowledge" (Foucault quoted in Gaventa, 2003:4). Foucault also brings meaningful explanation of knowledge embedded within further structure and its interactions of normalization, as dispositif.

> *"Dispositif comprises of [...] 'discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions' and so on - and the 'system of relations ... established between these elements'"*
> Foucault 1980:194, in Brigg, 2002:11.

This broader sense allows us to observe knowledge production and establishment by institutions on any level, be it global, or local, and their mutual reactions on the 'battlefield of knowledge', that involves different types of resistance and co-option. Dispositif also explains power mechanisms on macro-level with setting the boundaries of 'normality' which physical manifestation will be discussed in detail in the following section (Brigg, 2002).

Lukes perceives knowledge as a form of resource composing power, adding expertise, but does not directly address this aspect. Expertise is seen here as self-generated value entitled to the objective entities, which can roughly translate into actors of development agenda. Scott mentions knowledge in his Seeing Like a State as a domain of conservation of subordinate values functioning as defense in a sense of incompatibility with public or external dominant knowledge, which promoters aim for normalization of local patterns to be governable (Scott in Carson, 2011). Aspect of governmentality and relationship between macro and micro levels is further elaborated by post-

development stream. The social construction of knowledge as a tool of structurally replicated domination in sense of reproduction of norms, traditions and narratives is embodied in Bourdieu's function of 'habitus' (structure) (Guzzini, 2006). Giddens relates institutions (structures) to actions while defining agent's knowledgeability as a form of consciousness (Karp, 1986). He also postulates that agents posses implicit knowledge about rules and social realities. This is based on reflexivity of structures through agents, but I argue that it can relate to inherent rationality, rational actors and other functional premises, which are challenged by socio-anthropological theories and can be misused in narrative creation.

Comprehensive work by Gaventa and Cornwall (2001) summarizes genealogy of knowledge as resource to decision-making, production of knowledge as tool of domination or strategy of resistance and knowledge as a self-awareness, reinvention tool.

Expert Knowledge and Measures of Development

"[development experts] … have to construct the field in which they want to intervene in such a way that intervention is possible. Therefore, a local, technical perspective is substituted for a more global, political perspective on the processes that produce poverty in the first place" Nustad, 2001: 482.

Knowledge, as previously approximated, can be then seen as a verbal prerequisite (or ex-post clarification) for actions. In summarized view, knowledge can take on many different roles, from excuse or alibi for dominant behavior through explanative apparatus of research to hidden narrative of resistance. The former stays behind the need of any discipline, that is, to measure its impacts in legible and rational way. It is beyond scope of this paper to inspect ontology of rationality, nevertheless it can stay as an inspiring impeachment of this topic.
Framing a relevant questions to ask: "Who says who is the recipient of development, 'Third world', 'poor', 'underdeveloped' … etc.?" Once the definition of such knowledge has been created, accepted and replicated, consequent part

arises: "What has changed after the interaction, how to measure the effects?" Both of these questions constitute the core of nearly an endless variety of development indicators, constructed in order to verbalize, express doings of development actors. It also answers to failures and critiques of certain projects and ideological eras. Every adaptation or a new approach usually comes with unique apparatus of measurement. Therefore it is possible to match certain changes in development with the invention and abandonment of specific indicators. This holds true mainly for economic and quantitative oriented theories with strong sense of deductive approach, since their practice relies heavily on numerization of realities (Sumner, Tribe, 2008).

Measurement in development studies is further complicated by the unavailability or incontinuity of necessary data, discrepancies in it's series and finally by the very nature of quantifiability of observed phenomena (ibid).

The positionality of expert knowledge as has been argued by critical authors (e.g. Esteva, Ferguson, Escobar, Brigg, Nustad) lies in Western (European) universalism. Brief notion on invention of modern science by Kuhn illustrates the narrative well:

> *"Every civilization of which we have records has possessed a technology, an art, a religion, a political system, laws and so on. In many cases those facets of civilizations have been as developed as our own. But only the civilizations that descend from Hellenic Greece have possessed more than the most rudimentary science. The bulk of scientific knowledge is a product of Europe in the last four centuries. No other place and time has supported the very special communities from which scientific productivity comes"*
> Kuhn, 1962: 167-168.

The problem with the primacy of science in "objectivization" of reality is its easy exploitability for pursuing non-scientific goals, despite of its proclaimed apolitical nature. It is important to understand, that in no way I reject invention and scientific evolution descending from, as Kuhn puts it Hellenic Greece, rather I call

for careful inspection of how the entitlement of 'independent' and 'objective' is a double-bladed sword which can swiftly turn into a powerful knowledge and narrative constructor.

Primacy of European civilization

It is not a concern of this paper to reveal historical evolution of different civilizations, nevertheless identification of influences of European civilization (in this sense It includes also North Americans of European descent) onto actual world serves as an important vantage point for further development analysis. I base following conception on Teschke's view on role of Europe in international relations, Kuhn's formulation of science, and Zizek's opinions on global capitalism and Huntington's perspectives on civilizations.

State as an universally accepted international unit has its modern form rooted within the end of Thirty Years War in Europe. This institutional structure has evolved global since Westphalian peace from 1648. Originating in processes and treaties of nations of one civilization, it has affected the whole world respectively. A thing to note, it was by no means simple and direct advancement, development of states had undergone many shifts, contestations and transitions (Held, 1995). Nowadays, it poses a recognizable and only feasible grouping of peoples of one nation within the international order. Enriching a sense of post-development alternatives, existence of nation-states has undoubtedly important ties to the historical dominance of European civilization (Teschke, 2002).

The structure of science as it has been discussed above, also descends from single civilization origin and stretches throughout European history till today. It provides widely accepted (yet not as universally as state) explanatory apparatus (Kuhn, 1962).

Further area of dominance can be exemplified on global monetary system, namely capitalism. This concept, as Zizek points out, also found its modern manifestation in European monetary and fiscal institutions and respectively, their operations. I will further unroll the power behind global capitalism in later chapters focused on post-development, which draws primarily

from neo-marxist ideas, which I will try to adjust and update into the context of today's development (Zizek, 2014).

Last field of European primacy is its globally spoken language. Nevertheless it is one of a less consistent and conspicuous factors, with dwindling applicability since the lowering number of English speakers worldwide, it still plays an important role in national identification and cultural specificity since it is the medium of knowledge dissemination (Huntington, 1996).

On one hand, identification and refusal of European patrimony then functions as an important tool of national mobilisation and identity definition. On the other hand, it is stunning how many times opposition unknowingly accepts the rules of the games of their pronounced enemies, such as initiative of Islamic State to actually create a state, which implies its compatibility and global "normalization". Another example to follow is capitalism of Chinese communism. Pursuing identity through resistance thus not always necessarily means that dominant knowledge is condemned. This implication then constitutes a deep objection in seeking alternatives to development, as it will be mentioned in the last part of this text.

Structure

In this overview, structure is directly addressed only in works of Giddens and Bourdieu, and in a sense of power environment and impersonal domain interacting with agents (Gaventa, 2003, Hayward, Lukes, 2008). But if one can adjust approach to structure as a conceptual spatial composition of all manifestation of power, suddenly new indications for theoretical logics can be recognized.

In recent work of Lukes (2008), structure plays a role of operative space for agency. In Foucault's view, power reaches well beyond any constructed phenomena, such as institution, structure or possession, since power itself formulates these. Originally there is no major importance of structure in his work. Despite of different appellations, I dare to say that with a little shift, capacity of Foucauldian dispositif and power/knowledge interactions can be seen equivalently, as an environment (structure) or arena of power constructs.

Similarly to case of Foucault, I could not trace any direct mentioning of structure in Scott's work. Probably the only glance of it is social structure, that due to its local based specificity can function as a resistance towards dominating power (Carson, 2011).

On the other hand, structuralists approaches place structure in the center of their theory. As outlined above, Giddens regards to duality of structure, meaning that "structures, as rules and resources, are both the precondition and the unintended outcome of people's agency" (Baert in Gaventa, 2003:7). He also makes notion that structure does not exist without action, that structuralize it in time and space.

Bourdieu entitles structure a 'habitus' that in his words is defined as "structured structure predisposed towards acting as structuring structure" (Bourdieu in Gaventa, 2003). This predisposition mirrors the structure-agent interplay of structural reproduction as well as grasp of knowledge forming narratives.

Structure as a scale

If we take step aside, to approach structure as a scale, on which power manifests itself in different phenomena, we can zoom in on developmental problematique of micro and macro, whereas different actors or in case of development concretely institutions are employed to transmit power. There has been sounded questions within mainstream development, on how to connect macro institutions with operationability on micro level. Since many projects has been identified to fail because of differing and incompatible structures on decision-making level and operational level (Ghimire, 2009). Issue has been approached in many forms, such as participative and community-based management project with essential intermediation of NGOs or different union movements. The later stands out of macro frame, since the connectedness usually happens between public and government of one state. Involvement of NGOs thus presents much more challenging position, where global, macro decisions of development institutions can be transferred onto micro, local or even individual level. This puts NGOs into

very difficult role between gaining trust of civil society and appealing to the national government stances (Sianes, 2013, Pegler, 2009).

Another important point is that power is scaleable and as Nustad (2001) together with Scott (1998) showed, transformation of power from macro scales onto micro is by no means directive and simple. It meets with resistance but also with fortification of local structures of power. This idea thus questions the participation paradigm, where external intervention brings more power to local elites, which are in many cases (Giles, 2001) the ones to connect primarily with NGOs and other agents, unlike locally subordinate people. Not to mention that disentangling local power structures and identification of nodes of power is near to impossible for external observer, since it will posture in the system as another source of power.

Agency

Previous focus on structure of development would be incomplete without precisely defined actors interacting with(in) them. Since literature of power builds around actions of actors, identification of the role of agency is fundamental.

In Lukes' view, power is attributed to agents, and their consecutive exercise of power is enabled or constrained by institutions and other frameworks (Lukes, 2008). This statement somewhat enhances original Lukes' notion of three dimensions of power with structuralist perspectives.

Scott focuses on differentiated types of agency between dominant and subordinate. While the former employ strategies to maintain their power position, the latter constitutes resistance through retaining opacity and acting within hidden transcripts.

In Foucault's work, agency have assertion of participation in the discourse, which is a process of redefinition of subjects themselves and knowledge. In other sense Foucauldian agency seems inessential due to absence of intention in power. Individuals may not be aware of contributing to wider strategy of power, while their personal creeds seemingly may not be satisfied.

In Giddens work, structure is reproduced unintendedly by agents while agents are formed by structures. Agency thus plays a vital role in creation of power through action, but more detailed look at agents reveals their shrouded reasons. Giddens proposes certain implicit knowledge of order in every agent, but also assumes shaped consciousness that: "Only by accepting a model of the agents as reflexively monitoring their actions, will we be able to account for how the members of society produce their structures" (Karp, 1986). Could it mean that the very first structures objectified by action of agency stemmed only from implicit, unreformed knowledge?

Bourdieu ties agency directly to struggle over resource capital within 'fields' (structures) (Guzzini, 2006) and the role of agents in gaining dispositions and meanings from 'habitus', and their role in reflective replication of this structure (Gaventa, 2003).

Agency of development institutions

The units of developmental concern as it has been uncovered previously can have different forms. Stat played a key role and until break of Keynesian economics during 70's, where its position has been suppressed in favor of liberal streams of economic and decisions of multinational institutions in development interpreted by Structural Adjustment Programmes. But Andrews and Bawa (2014) built a point that can be loosely connected to a recent crisis of neoliberalism presented in works of Hart (2009), that is return of the state, as a mean of new resistance with renewed importance as an actor.

Brigg holds views on state characteristics in development which can be traced to the state disclaim and neoliberal counter-revolution:

"The state is simply not sufficiently omnipresent, omnipotent, or efficient to manage the intricacies and differential motivations of institutions and people which emerge at the site of development efforts" Brigg, 2002:13.

Macro institutional agency had to find means of setting up their stance on local levels. Those nevertheless operate with different narratives and within localized structures of power, meaning they are implicitly incompatible and therefore resistant to the macro powers. Process of 'normalization' coined by Scott (1997) with combination of Foucauldian dispositif held by expert institutions thus works as 'compatibility tool' to broaden reach across multiple scales.

Modern institutional framework for normalization has seen its birth with the establishment of United Nations, International Monetary Fund and The World Bank in the post-war period. Brigg (2002:16) sees this as: "[...] the establishment of an inclusive single international social field and the norm of development [that] constitute the field of differentiation and basis for a massive operation of power in which entities from individual subjects to nations states are acted upon and act upon themselves in relation to the norm of development". Seen from the other side, Corbridge (2014) reacting to Platteau notes that trying to externally change local structures is even with employment of normalization very slow and multi-generational process leading usually to status quo due to differing moral values[1].

Resistance

> "The terrain of development discourse and the range of aid-funded interventions have become ever more inclusive to encompass the reshaping, or transformation, of political and social and, by implication, cultural) as well as economic institutions and practices"
>
> Bernstein 2005: 116 in Hart, 2004:13.

As an action of change, resistance should respond to dominance as an equalizer of power relations, if they are to be established. This puts act of resistance into highlight of development, mainly for top-down approaches, but the action itself is not deeply examined in most of the literature on power.

---

[1] Theory of 'generalized morality' by Platteau (1994) offers a refurbished cultural explanation to failures of development programmes despite of 'good governance' indicators fulfilled.

Lukes' discourse is directed towards manifest of domination, power-over. In my view, sense of resistance can be indirectly facilitated as formation of opposing dominance, but Lukes focuses more on stability of power, than on its dynamic change (Shapiro, 2006).

On the other hand Scott's idea of resistance is paramount to his understandings. Every attempt of normalization, rationalization and governability taken by dominant power is coupled with strategic response from the subordinates, in this sense resistance in forms of non-compliance or act of 'thin false consciousness'.

Foucault does not go into detail on act of resistance, but in his view, power is bonded to resistance, which may occur at every point through the process of discourse, he describes it subsequently: "[...] discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy" (Foucault in Gaventa, 2003:4). Concept of resistance based on Foucault has been profoundly evolved by Laclau and Mouffe and De Certeau.

Giddens concedes resistance as a power subordinates influence activities of superiors with. Since power is manifested through actions and actors are reshaping structures, there is a notion of possible change (Gaventa, 2003).
In work of Bourdieu, direct investigation on resistance is unclear. Perhaps in his phenomena of 'symbolic power', power over meaning of social reality and cognitive instrument of its construction, one can argue, that existence of resistance through specific knowledge should be present.

Building Identity Through Resistance

As one well known quotation attributed to Chinese military general Sun Tzu tells us: "You need to know your enemy in order to know yourself" and as well as idea interlinked through whole Huntington's book, that of identification of enemies bolsters group identity, importance of this aspect cannot be overlooked. Development presenting certain external power structure objectives is embedded within European civilization thus necessarily creating tension within societies of

other civilizations (Huntington, 1996). As Hart (2004) notes, the top-down approach must sprung adequate bottom-up reaction.

> *"Resistance to development was one of the ways in which Third World groups attempted to construct new identities. Far from the essentializing assumptions of previous political theory (for example, that mobilization was based on class, gender, or ethnicity as fixed categories), these processes of identity construction were more flexible, modest, and mobile, relying on tactical articulations arising out of the conditions and practices of daily life"*
>
> Escobar, 1995: 216.

In order for development to work as intended, it had to attempt to reconstruct identities of other nations, since that would be the only way of its acceptance. Otherwise it will always cause resistance. This is where post-development ideas of abandoning the whole concept of development and search for alternatives to it comes from. Many authors (Pieterse, Corbridge, Sumner and Tribe, and others) perceive such statement as flawed and definitively nonconstructive, but unless the 'language' of development thinking is not adopted by recipients through normalization, it can seldom be successful (Nustad, 2001).

In disgruntled societies of development intervention, reaction to development by resisting it became new way of finding identity. Post-development writers are well aware of shift in true participation and civil representation, and the models abducted by mainstream under the same name. NGOs, central governments, international financial institutions changed narratives to be locally acceptable and readable, but under the guise of resistance, power of neoliberal actors has been given a human face but stayed unchallenged. Even worse, the false consciousness of resistance gave dominators even more power, while covering the obvious dominance with public camouflage (Hart, 2004). More detailed effects of submerge and adaptations of developmental forces will be covered in last part of this paper.

Pattern within variety

What are the meanings of these categories encountered in northern narratives? They might contain the variety of views and theories related to the same phenomena. Are there really that many types and breakdowns of power, functions of structures, powers of agency, roles of knowledge or actions of resistance? Or can all the different ideas be 'deconstructed', "de-verbalized" into the universal, neutral meaning? One of the answers is at hand: "It can not, since we are locked inside of our replicated ideologies forming our cognition", but behind this concrete exemplification, there is a whole theoretical area of processes of creating accepted narratives. I would like to unroll this theme in the following part of the paper.

Power, domination and hegemony in narrative creation

The main strands of theories of power gives us many different explanations, ultimately leaving lots of questions unanswered, since one can seldom locate any consensus. Resolution of dichotomy in power relations such as if power is exercised by agents or agents are being operated by power has been skillfully evaded by all authors. Some (Giddens, Bourdieu), suppose mutual relations, some (Foucault) created relativization of nearly tautological meanings ('performative contradiction').

Perhaps it can be said, that even theories on power appertain to some sort of power, while their legitimacy and academical or better, scientific validity symbolizes certain notion of dominance over the less accepted theories. The popularity of theory, scientifically manifested in sense of heavy reference and frequent conceptual adoption, can be viewed in lenses of power as a hegemony of certain body of knowledge. Knowledge is base for narratives, reshaping subjective realities (in Scott's words, by creating 'false consciousness'), that allows for maintenance of dominant position (third dimension of power in Lukes') for whoever is entitled with producing such knowledge. Barnett (2001) identifies this dominant position as 'authority', which in Webber's (1978 in Callaghy et. al. 2001) interpretation :" [...] links it to domination that has been legitimized, and the

effect is that an actor's commands that are emitted are obeyed for reasons other than overt coercion" (Callaghy, 2001: 55). I would propose, that legitimized domination, that reached enough reception among subjects can be called hegemony. In more concrete terms, theory serves here as a legitimate explanation of any actions (interventions) of superior over subordinate. Science, as a fabricator of theory has a proper camouflage in being designated apolitical, and non-economic, legitimate and deliver highest empirical objectivity (Escobar, 1997; Barnett, 2001). Rules within this field are delegated by set of political institutions, that deliver 'organizational bias' which basically creates unequal validity of knowledge amongst actors. The narrative of superiority of 'expert' knowledge over 'lay people' is an outcome of such domination (Schattsneider, 1970 in Gaventa, 2001). In similar way McNeill and Bøås (2004) perceive this situation as hegemony of 'conventional wisdom' which' power distorts any opposing ideas. Nevertheless as Brigg (2002) points out on behalf of Foucault, approaching power simply as one dimensional dominance over subaltern as seen within colonial period is no longer possible, since the unicity of this view hinders the ongoing recognition of power meshes. For analysis of entangled modern history (archeology) of power, we need to reconsider more covert, biopower.

The beginning of the modern scientific bias in development can be seen paradoxically within economic and political reasons behind its establishment after the World War II. The ebullience about economic productivity tied to Keynesian models and post-war atmosphere, was main motor of the asserting position of science. "The key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge (Truman, 1949 in Escobar 1997:3)." The domain of the forming hegemony has long been placed within international institutions set up by national entities, especially USA (Bøås, McNeill, 2004). The recent emergence into multilateral institutions (UN, IMF, WB, OECD, WTO, ILO etc.) resembling the form of Foucauldian 'dispositif', is an intersection of neo-liberal ideology and globally powerful entities freed from national scale assessment (Gaventa, 2003, Bøås, McNeill, 2004, Bernett, 2001). Once powerful enough, these institutions cyclically reinforce their authority through actions justified by their narratives, that at the same time constitute their expertise over

affairs. "UNHCR claims to be the "lead agency" on refugee matters, an authoritative claim that it makes based on its decades of experience handling refugee flows. The World Bank prides itself on being the foremost development expert, an authority it arrogates to itself by virtue of its possession of technical expertise and years of involvement in such matters" (Bernett, 2001:60).

The mainstream development actors narrated plenty of scientific or academic theories throughout history, just to name few, well known Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons model has been used to blame incompetency of local structures and justify interventions in resource management for more centralized control (Benjaminsen, 1997). The course of this narrative reversed, after its application has been proven nonfunctional. Another use of narrative to shift responsibility from global actors towards local formations, was the wave of theories based around social capital (Schuurman, 2003). But we are still seeing just the 'big picture' of the public transcripts (Scott, 1997).

The call for devolution of power and decentralization embodied in participatory approaches started off-stage as a criticism towards the centralized ideas, but this position shifted into the mainstream strands (Shackleton et. al., 2002). As many argue (Akbulut, Soylu, 2012, Kassimir, 2001, Blaikie, 2005) this hegemonial adoption resulted in turning emerging ideological opposition into co-optation. This turnover can be viewed as a transposition of Lukes' third dimension of power or Scott's process of creating false consciousness, from agents to ideas, theories or structures of knowledge. Resistance on this ideological (level of ideas) field, can be seen in post-developmental discourse that fences off this dominant power successfully by creating polar narratives.

In the end, the theoretical arena of development theories can be projected as unending struggle of heterogeneous narratives, where power relations constitutes hegemonial order of the dynamic environment through scientific disciplines. But is there enough capacity to follow into the upcoming era?

Can history help us in the future?

In pursuing the answer of where is the course of development heading nowadays, one might encounter a problem in multitude of overlapping information structures and basis. As Corbridge (1995) coins: "there is just too much to know" (Corbridge, 1995: 10). And knowledge production during rather short existence of Development Studies was quite abundant. The evolution of employed philosophical concepts in development lags behind the original field itself. It is likely caused by challenged anchor of development; that is disciplinarity and paradigm. Result is the overlap of multiple disciplines, most casually described as ranging from economy to sociology and with the time passing, new strains are employed within the arena, such as philosophy.

> *"The dimensions of development are extremely diverse, including economic, social, political, legal and institutional structures, technology in various forms (including the physical or natural sciences, engineering and communications), the environment, religion, the arts and culture. Some readers may even feel that this broad view is too restricted in its scope"*
> Sumner and Tribe, 2008:11.

In order to identify and describe the complicated situation, or perhaps a theoretical stalemate, epistemological schizophrenia or conceptual dead-end, I will try to unfold the historical overview of development to demonstrate increasing complexity of the field. This complexity presents another obstacle to set a consensus and loads the field with new issues. The process resembles a vicious circle, where in order to respond to certain issues, new theoretical and methodological bodies are introduced, and with them a yet new set of different problems arises, which calls for a new adjustment to the previous approach, and so on. Are we then about to witness an age of theoretical overload? Time of an endless fractal proliferation of ideas, with diminishing differences but impassable inconsistencies? Or on the contrary, future of singularity, an ultimate melting pot

of science and technology? I will attempt to reconstruct two views on history of DS to find some answers, that might help us see the evolution of this field in a different way.

Brief History of Development

> *"Instead of presenting a monolithic version of a given period, we must reveal how any given period reveals "several pasts, several forms of connexion, several hierarchies of importance, several networks of determination, several teleologies, for one and the same science, as its present undergoes change"* Foucault, 1972:5.

Within the evolution of theoretical structures appeared the discussion about need of historicity of development as well as in any social science (Sumner, Tribe, 2008; Kuhn, 1970; Buch-Hansen, Lauridsen, 2012; Escobar, 1995; Pieterse, 2010; Mehta et. al., 2006) The changing perception of importance of historical embeddedness is being adopted within multiple strands throughout the course of development. Detachment from historical influence as a value-free discipline is coined by many authors from the the normative, positivistic spectrum of developmental epistemologies. On the other end, the call for increased historicity in the field can be heard from relativist, interpretative side. Is presence of historical background an obstacle for clear, objective analysis, or is it an inherent part of any narrative, we create with all its meta-influences and hidden transcripts? Can the debate over the past realities viewed mostly from Western angle turn flawed picture of development from lacking important reflective tool into enhancement of future developmental opinions?

Quote attributed to Winston Churchill, that 'history is written by victors' can serve as a basic illustration of power of knowledge, but under rather a limiting view of truism. Nevertheless it is never just one static course of historical events of powerful accepted universally. Identities are shaped, produced and contested also in less apparent areas, which turns understandable if one employs Foucauldian notion of dispersed nature of power.

42

Before venturing into abstract discourse of historical narratives, I propose to look more closely onto what history of development theories and practices in the light of historical societal changes can tell us. As grasped by different authors (Sumner and Tribe, 2008; Escobar, 1995; Pieterse, 2010), question when the discipline of development studies actually started is rather a complicated one. Because of disputes over its scientific classification, unified answer is missing. Some authors talk about "Development" as early as from governance of first colonies. This would suggest an evolution of colonial studies into development as we know it today.

> *"The idea of the intentional practice of development was not an invention of the post-1945 international order"; rather, "it had been invented to deal with the problem of social disorder in nineteenth-century Europe through trusteeship"* Cowen, Shenton 1996:60 in Hart, 2009:3.

Based on development literature, there is a necessity to define a view we approach progression of history. What Cowen and Shenton (1996) stress out as a continuity, others (Hart, 2009; Corbridge, 1997) dismiss as a series of heterodox eras, with distinguishable conditions of power.

Pieterse (2010) with Cowen and Shenton (1996) trace history of development from the beginning of 19th century into the social upheaval in Europe. The modus operandi was based on colonial trusteeship with Hobbesian notion of sovereign power. This view also cherishes view on meaning of development as immanent process and intentional practice. Unintentionality of the former gets disagreeably close to the modernist view on perquisite evolution of nations, as mentioned earlier. It also produces a sense of continuity of developmental history and inherent dichotomy of developmental practice and an independent force shaping the course of states, which is challenged for number of reason. For example Hart (2004) reconstructs the idea of un/intentionality thoroughly by presenting behavior of global systems inspired by Polanyi's double movement of capitalism, which explains intertwined nature of development

intervention adjusting structure and perpetuating call for a new intervention. He then distinguishes between 'Development' as executable projects of intervention and 'development' as the global structure of capitalism and its tendencies. Further to add, in the light of post-development literature, operating with arbitrary vis maior within development, such as 'immanent process of history' is an excuse to its practical failures and a pragmatic search for a 'missing value' that would defend its doing.

Secondary view on history of development sets its birth into the period after the World War II, varying in slight differences, such as post-developmentalist emphasize of the importance of Truman's speech in 1949, which intentional proclamation, marked by post-developmentalists, needs to be taken in moderation, as Brigg (2002) shows. This markedly shorter time span is loaded with substantially more dynamic evolution in other disciplines contributing toward overall developmental course. Paradigm differentiation has been changing in the span from centuries to decades, and in case of latest progress even that is questionable.

It is crucial then, to recognize the shift of power in development throughout history, with every paradigm change meaning general drift from overt into more covert manifestation of power, from sovereign hegemony into meshes of dispersed Foucauldian biopower. This evolution points towards great adaptability of dominant meta-narratives and agents of discourse.

Development History Chart

I attempted to reconstruct two outlines of different historical orders elaborated by Pieterse (2010) and Willis (2005) and compare them to events of different crises relevant to development contributed mostly by Escobar, Nustad, Hart, Brigg and Corbridge followingly (crises are written in italic):

1800s Classical political economy, Remedy for progress, social Darwinism

1800 > *Crisis of Industrial societies*

1870 > Latecomers Industrialization, catching-up

1850 > Colonial economics Resource management, trusteeship

1930 > *Imperial Crisis*

1940 > Development economics, Economic growth – colonial industrialization

1945 > *Crisis of liberal economy and Trusteeship*

1947 > *Cold War crisis*

1950 > Modernization theory Growth, political and social modernization

1960 > Dependency theory, Accumulation

1970 > *Crisis of Bretton Woods Regime*, Alternative development

1980 > *Crisis of state-led development*, Human development, Neoliberalism

1990 > *Crisis of democracy*, Post-development Authoritarian engineering

2000 > Globalisation, Millenium Development Agenda, New Emerging economies

2008 > *Neoliberal crisis*

2010 > BRICS, Shift of neoliberalism

2015 > Return of the state, New Grand Theories?

(Source: Author's adjustment of Pieterse, 2010 and Willis, 2005)

Identifying history of crises and shifts of power in North - South relations

Short overview of developmental decades above is by no means exhausting and complete. Certainly many different crises and world events can be identified, mainly in recent years, but it is my goal to highlight and analyze those frequently found within development literature.

As it was already announced, Shenton and Cowen (1998) place the beginning of developmental agenda in early 19th century, as a mean to balance and control for population and urban issues that rose within colonial nations after social transformation due to industrialization. It can be said that in reaction to certain crisis, the stream of mutually economic and social thinking was defined. Economically approaching colonies for extractive purposes to further fuel their dominions resulted in definite end of Mercantilism and gave space to Smith's ideas of market powers. Following evolution of 19th century was not progressing uniformly, it is just the focus given to the more recent events, that stands behind scarcity of details in the above summary (Pieterse, 2010).

End of industrialization period together with vanishing of Pax Britannica at the brink of the First World War followed by Great Depression of 1929 and overall imperial crisis resulting in waves of militant resistance in West Indies and Africa and liberation movements in the colonial world, brought new crisis of trusteeship regime that has been established between colonized countries and their rulers. Some authors like Cooper (1997) places the origin of development as a necessary narrative adaptation into this moment of dissolution of explicit colonial reign in form of trusteeship into challenged model of development economics, interventions and assistance (Pieterse, 2010; Hart, 2004).

With the end of WWII and as a result of market failures, push for Keynesian ideas of state-centered appeared in most developed countries, and with it also the European model of economic growth that should be followed by others. With the USA and Soviet Russia being non-colonial powers, the tendencies to accept colonial state independence grew stronger, also due to "advantage" that was missing in case of the newly established powers. With the

consolidation of post-war institutions such as United Nations, which unlike League of Nations was inclusive and Bretton Woods institutions, International Monetary Fund and future World Bank, the mainstream development corpus was formed (Brigg, 2002). In this sense development agenda was in the time of beginning of the Cold War aimed at reconstruction of war-torn Europe with Marshall's Plan and also became increasingly valid as an anti-communist arrangement (Nustad, 2001) while former colonial powers sought to restore their hold over colonies. Nevertheless the process had to be adjusted, now with new players involved and international situation seeing dramatic economic changes. National-state focus amidst the Cold War saw a sharp decline during oil and debt crises culminating in 70s, that was also the time, when under the influence of sociological behavioralism from 60s (note the lag), development theorists started to re-evaluate the position of pure economic growth-led models exemplified in Rostow's stages of growth. According to Gowan (1999 in Hart, 2004) Bretton Woods Regime ended in early 70s with the shift from adjustable rates of exchange to dominant dollar regime, that fills the role of international reserves and main traded world-wide currency, which he sees as a new phase of American Imperialism. Watts (2001 in Hart, 2004) emphasizes the effect of vast numbers uprisings and guerilla wars in developing countries within the nationalist tone of development. This situation brought the aim from national projects onto regional, due to believed effectivity of small-scale production. Basic needs approach orientation coined by UN, gained new popularity, while arguably being seen on the background of still applied centralism. The first notions of environmental finity and ecological capacity was, according to Willis (2005) based on neo-malthusian views of that decade.

The shift in economic paradigm, that followed the fall of state-centric models forefronted neoliberalism wave with switch onto private enterprises and focus on the market by the end of 70s. The role of the state has now been seen as an obstructor to development, which further strengthened power of international institutions, now entitled with even stronger role than during the adjustable exchange rates in the global economy. Solution to the loan crisis and banking sector presented the major shifts during 70s, symbolised a smart move

from what firstly appeared as a crisis and down-fall into further spread of overt power of certain global actors.

Following focus on people's choices, neoliberal doctrine of treating "bad governments" and ultimately conditionality of Structural Adjustment Programmes continued to tie and control the southern countries with heavy debts. National governments had been suspended with agency from IMF and WB experts and ordered to liberalize and decentralise in order to open doors to global markets in the name of capitalism. Gender, sustainability and grassroot movements first received recognition and focus of the development agenda (Willis, 2005). But such changes turned out to be new programmes of normalization of local, narration and control with a 'human face' as post-structuralists sound in the following decade of 90s (Escobar, 1995).

Dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of Cold War bolstered the promotion of liberal democracy as the victor over any other form of government (Held, 1995). Together with market-oriented capitalism this political and economic duality was indirectly placed at the top possible global structures. Well explained in Fukuyama's End of History, where this turn did not leave any other viable options for the future structuration. The idea of democratic primacy is in its sense tautologically undemocratic. Democracy should allow for unlimited composition of political streams to compete freely for voter's trust, but in the absolute sense, competition is not allowed in the light of only dominant form of government. Besides, complete democracy would result in hypothetical must for participation of everyone over any decision, which, as will Zizek uncover, poses a serious threat to "do anything else besides actively participating in one unending process of vote over possible actions". Post-development critique brought into the developmental theoretical arena new views on functioning in the form of discourse, and emphasized importance of omitted values, such as power relations, cultural differences, local divergence and overall challenge to the existence of the very field. These new concerns were soon adopted by the mainstream but without one important factor. The main actors of development stayed unchanged. Washington Consensus which marked new development agenda for rest of the decade has been hallmark of neoliberal echo within

development, and has been adjusted with the course of post-development critique, to be replaced with the Paris Declaration, after the millenium to shift onto gentler adjustment and local participation path and deeper agency cooperation completely (Hart, 2001). Linking global and local issues was also encapsulated in massive project of UN - Millenium Development Goals. With its narrative of ending poverty not far from grand theories of the past, and somewhat resembling Jeffrey Sach's Big Push. With the goals hardly finished by the end of the term, new critique is lurking. Which is not surprising, since one can argue that "nearly everything" has been tried within the development agenda, without succeeding in promised goals.

This situation was fittingly mapped by Buch-Hansen and Lauridsen (2012) in their paper concerning the future of development. The actual devolution of power from North to South never happened, more likely what happened is that: "[...] traditional development concept is receding with the economic and political power gradually shifting to the East–South led by the major emerging economies" (Buch-Hansen, Lauridsen, 2012: 299). The new crisis of development thus calls for new adaptation, to keep the international institutional power-house running, or it faces replacement from emerging powers, such as countries of BRICS, and mainly China. Hart (2009) identifies introduction of H.Clinton's "smart policy" by promoting Defense, Democracy and Development as an export package of Obama's administration. Andrews and Bawa (2014) opt for return of developmental state as an recently missing mediator between global and local actions. UN also prepares new long-term agendas within the mainstream, so are we going to face revival of old theories and agents in Neo-Keynesian model, mainly after the global financial crisis of 2008, increased military presence in the South within "smart policy" to counter Chinese presence or return of Grand theories?

Post-development revisited

"What emerged was a regime of objectivism in which Europeans were subjected to a double demand: to be detached and objective, and yet to immerse themselves in local life. This experience as participant observer was made possible by a curious trick, that of eliminating from the picture the presence of the European observer" Escobar:1997:7.

Topic of power is much more profoundly studied in stance of post-developmental authors. This stream derives from sociological and anthropological approaches, and due to its critical attitude towards mainstream development, is considered to be radical. According to Ahorro (2008) there can be two waves of post-development ideas recognized. First wave of post-development begins in the early 90s (mainly presented by Escobar, Ferguson, Rahnema, Shiva, Illich) and brought critique and new views on issues but offered no alternatives, as Pieterse, Corbridge, Schuurman and others pronounced. Unlike the first wave, second wave, starting around 2000 was aware of its critiques, such as romanticization of grassroot movements and peasant lives, demonization of modernity, overly blaming development studies for the causes of poverty and self-righteousness of ideas. Ahorro argues that the second wave aims does not seek to end development as whole, but to reconstruct it's ways in an alternative way, which in my opinion does not change the original post-developmental idea much. Escobar (2001) reacts to the critique in his "Beyond paradigm" where he stresses the importance to set 'beyond-paradigm' concept of alternative development. Post-developmentalists step into the political arena with the idea of development studies becoming 'neo-colonialist agenda' (institution devoted to colonial and post-colonial studies are established in the academic sphere), which is discourse that would (and to some extent already is) challenge the legitimacy of development narratives (Sharp, Briggs, 2006). Gaventa (2003) recognizes three strands of concepts of power within post-developmental literature, that adopts mostly discursive nature of power based in Foucault's views.

First of these ideas approaches the creation of conceptual categories, that is expressed in sense of redefinition of cognitive reality. "Representations of people in the South as underdeveloped, traditional, poor and vulnerable sustain 'the reality that feeds such an image' (Parpart 1995: 262 in Gaventa, 2003)." Escobar sees the creation of narratives alike: "Development proceeded by creating abnormalities ("the poor," "the malnourished," "the illiterate," "pregnant women," "the landless") which it would then treat or reform" (Escobar, 1992:25).

After the narratives are created, the indicated abnormalities "[…] became subjects of an expert body of knowledge and thus subjected to normalising techniques" (Foucault in Gaventa, 2003:13). The second view analyses the role of experts in development, that publicly sustain high legitimacy while employing organising and normalising strategies to open way for "[...] 'governmentality' that make populations 'legible' and therefore governable" (Scott, 1998 in Gaventa, 2003:13).

Third post-developmentalist description emphasize process of political situations transfigured into developmental technical solutions, embodied in various projects and missions; and ability of governments to justify their interventions (Gaventa, 2003).

After summarizing its main features, there is no wonder, that post-developmental discourse has highly disruptive influence on traditional (mainstream) development strands and functionalist approaches in particular. Some of the post-developmental authors go as far as Briggs (2002), who based upon Marxist theories enhances Foucauldian discourse with aspects of agency and domination, translating development into 'neo-colonialism', that serves as a domain of power retention North has over the South. The transposition of approach to power towards embracing global level, where dominance and hegemony of powerful narratives penetrates to micro levels is one of the important contributions post-development brought into the discursive arena.

Post-Development Alternatives: discourse and movements

Substantial amount of mainstream authors as seen above criticized post-development for lack of proposed ends. Brigg and Nustad show why accepting

even the theoretical critiques without practical impacts is crucial for the future process of shaping of development thinking. I will try to present the essence of post-developmental goals as presented in works of highly notable and consistent author, Escobar (1995).

Escobar opts for new balance in the development, abandoning the hegemonial Western census and bringing multitude of new knowledge and experience into the discourse - this will bring rise of new nuclei of developmental knowledge which will be anchored in social movements, grassroots and local knowledge - we must abandon the pursuit of modernity and growth - the natural state of things can historically lead the other way: "This may or may not entail new objects and concepts; it may be marked by the reappearance of concepts and practices discarded long ago" (Escobar, 1995: 217).

By the time unpredictable idea of revival of developmental-state falls under such theory as well. Its form had been thought of differently, as Dinerstein and Deneulin (2012) examine, the emerging change of 'hope movements' would create different epistemology of aggregated social and economic arrangement. Such type of 'public-state' would in their vision present the desired alternative to development structures. Together with abandonment of paradigms as Foucauldian ossification of relations (power), this highly localized mean of governance can be roughly seen within some resisting groups across the world (e.g. Chiapas in Mexico).

Escobar further specifies the two principles of alternative constructions of the movements. First is to defend cultural identity "[...] not as a static but as a transformed and transformative force" (1997:226), and second revolves about creation of non profit values and economic opportunities. The idea of identity maintenance and reformulation is increasingly relevant topic in the globalised nature of today's societies (Escobar, 1997).

Post-modern approaches look for system of alternative values so that the categorized subjects are not stigmatized, but searching for alternative solutions requires changing of the structures and institutions as whole. The problem of institutional established network transformation is questioned by Pieterse (2000:355): "If alternative development is about wide-ranging synergies between

communities, government agencies, international institutions and business, then its profile must be both distinct and acceptable enough to generate support in institutional circles and diverse interest communities." Another issue rises with the self-regulation of systems. If some alternative proposals call for complete liberation of technology and economy (e.g. to lesser extent EBA's) it is necessary to emphasize the enormous control that has to be maintained in order to hold conditions for global accumulation of capital within neoliberal system compact (Hart, 2004).

Nonetheless, it is crucial to mind that power is present cross-scale, so any external facilitation of desired local structures would lead to disgruntlement of invisible meshes of power. Thus participation agenda employed by development agents should accept this understanding from post-developmental knowledge: It is thus impossible to be sensitive to local power structures from the outside, because any action will always increase the imbalances power within the system, leading to result that has been fought against at firsthand. Even movements thus succumb to the power aspects and will necessarily lead to formation of certain leaders and submissive (Dinerstein, Deneulin, 2012, Brigg, 2004).

Infinite Search for a "missing link"

> *"We must halve poverty once, then halve it again, and then nearly*
> *halve it a third time—all in less than one generation."*
> Jim Yong Kim, World Bank's 2013 Annual Report.

Prefered indicators used within the development course changed over time together with shifts in its paradigm, the mixture between economy and sociology has yielded many different values to measure the effect, thus proving and vindicating its avail. Gross domestic income per capita, is still in use, but after the participatory turnover in development mostly for other disciplines. It was soon to be argued about representativeness of such an indicator had on real changes in poverty rates, so other means of measurement had to be employed (Sumner, Tribe, 2008). Enhancement in econometric values perception can be observed with income inequality of Gini's Index, which signifies proportion of population to

income. Nevertheless it still means mere monetary progress, far from Sen's Capability approach or held against the light of today's global consumption and ecological capacity, which impact is far reaching (Broad, Cavanagh, 2011). For the distance from pure financial aspect, Human Development Index was created by the UN to aggregate expectancy of life, schooling and income per capita to indicate "human development" of nations. Nevertheless it proposes the values that are likely to be improved with modernity and adaptation of certain aspects of the Western civilization, such as school curriculum, and medicine. It is not my intention to discuss the ethical and moral aspects of previous idea, just to draw the attention to the imported matter. Unlike other technical indicators, I would argue that 'freedom' and 'happiness' are one of the purely subjective, and yet, there have been attempts to quantify these as well.

The existence of a need for measurement in sake of development, points toward active production of specifically recognized progress. Can this evolution be approached from constructivist side, e.g. "Can we facilitate development?" Or does questioning apply such as conscious (intentional) thrive for change is inferior to the unconscious (unintentional) one?

If society and trajectories of human being life are envisioned as highly chaotic structures with just a limited scope for explanation and rationalization of interactions involved, there is simply no formula for describing the reality as a mathematical, reduced "model" of the way everything happens. Mainstream development claims its definite recognition:

> "[...] development paradigm, i.e. defined visions and related activities regarding the functioning and evolution of socio-economic systems" Bellù, 2012:2.

How can we identify and reduce reality into quantifiable world of statistics, mathematics that we rationalize over the empiricism? For a good example of statement of definition, I will borrow core idea of Isaac Asimov's famous piece Foundation. That is - social interactions on planet Earth are too complicated, chaotic and intertwined for any level of scientific reduction, thus rendering

impossible to create a model smaller than the original object of research for scientific purposes. Those are in case of this book strategic foresight of global social political inclinations, not far from "predicting possible future scenarios" including review of consequent adaptive operations. These functions appear vastly in development itself. Preparation for crisis scenarios (environmental, social, conflict, economical etc.) and an adequate reaction to prevent or mitigate consequences is on different levels concern of policy, national and development likewise.

But how crisis with relevant responses appear? Again we arrive at the Foucauldian nexus of social reality construction:

> *"Slavery wasn't a crisis for British and American elites until abolitionism turned it into one. Racial discrimination wasn't a crisis until the civil rights movement turned it into one. Sex discrimination wasn't a crisis until feminism turned it into one. Apartheid wasn't a crisis until the anti-apartheid movement turned it into one"* Naomi Klein; The Guardian 6 March 2015.

Poverty has been declared a crisis, so were other knowledge-made indications such as malnourishment, education etc. Development then acts as a sanctified mean to mend crisis, after situation is internationally framed into one. Every sounded critique and shift in mainstream brought new variety of theories with yet new indications, as post-development critique stands:

> *"Development proceeded by creating abnormalities ("the poor," "the malnourished," "the illiterate," "pregnant women," "the landless") which it would then treat or reform. Seeking to eradicate all problems, it actually ended up multiplying them to infinity"* Escobar, 1992: 25.

As it has been unrolled, the one who sets the narrative of issue is the powerful one. Post-developmentalists argue that most of the indicators are facilitated

within Western norms and besides being remote from the real problems, they often fulfill role of responsibility shift onto arbitrary and vague measures 'identified' in the developing countries by the expert apparatus. For example one such underlying theory of consecrating development in 60's was Rostow's model of stages of growth, meaning that all countries will inevitably follow capitalist progression, thus allowing for interventions in the name of change, as well as distinguishing between advanced and underdeveloped. The determinism of this theory followed the Darwinian natural evolution and the 'survival of the fittest', which is ethically unacceptable idea when seen on human level. Similarly, interesting form of linear progress towards the goal can be read from the official rhetorics of UN within MDG's. Countries are on track or off track in reaching the designated measures, while gently shifting responsibility of eventual unattainment from organizing donors onto the target recipients.

> *"The turn to "the local" has gone hand in hand with the invocation of "civil society" understood – in good liberal fashion – as a distinctively separate sphere from "the market" and "the state", and a key site for the production of social capital"* Hart, 2004: 12.

Followed by another reaction to unsuccessful development perceptions few decades later, such as it has been in the case of construction of measure of Social Capital. It was designed as a new tool used by the mainstream to describe changing environment of making development bottom-up or more localized and to find reasoning to developmental failures based upon incompetency of the recipient side. This cultural determinism, in measuring capacity to adopt institutionally to particular economic models has a similar basis in induced results on corruption being appertain to certain regions, cultures or nations. Jared Diamond (1997) goes in his book Guns, Germs and Steel as far as to rationalize primacy of Western civilization based on geographical and biological principles, which in turn serve as an objectivized and seemingly impregnable excuse for its dominant position. Additionally, manipulative speech of social capital and other mentioned abstract values proposes the vision of goal, that is achievable under

conditions of imported knowledge for everyone. This contrasts with deterministic meaning of Diamond, where some nations are just overly disadvantaged in order to compete with others. This ambiguity that operates within the "missing link" narrative can be used for both, reasoning for intervention as well as alibi for failures.

So why there exist this insincere contradiction, between narrating the deficiencies of 'the other' and simultaneous rhetorical rejection of notion of inherently imbalanced progressions in the name of ethics and morality?

Development always one step behind

Drawing on post-developmentalist train of thought, development theory weaving is recognized as crisis setup and following interactions and practice as crisis solution, whole process can be then seen as artificial construction and solution of problems. Escobar (1997) points out that flawed nature of the whole cycle where imperfect solutions bring yet new issues, create sustained perpetuating system of crises. Previously mentioned lag in realization of practice and adaptation of theories from power relations reflection, the disciplinary interconnection between multiple schools and formulation of meta-narratives cause inevitable lag between realization of reality and possible adjustments within the developmental apparatus.

Such progression can be demonstrated on paradigms in national institutional setting and formation of civil society. "[...] Definition of development as structural societal change, were deemed to be unsatisfactory in explanatory power in the late 1980s" Hickey and Mohan (2003: 4), but until then the it was believed that structure of state functioning can be reached similarly as in Western countries. Vision of particular stages in creation of normalized governments and states left the newly liberated colonies in 60s with old colonial structures purposely tinkered to serve sovereign's needs, artificially aggregated elites and governments tied to the former powers (Brigg, 2004). As Corbridge (2007) encloses, the rise of civil society and the push in development for 'empowerment of the public voice' responds to the nationalist and autocratic states, that are also bases in Western origin, just in form of previous crisis solution model of 'liberalization'.

In the Western case the formation of civil society formed governments and then responded to it, or at least under democratic conditions this is supposed mechanism of the system. In the case of former colonies the relationship is reversed. Governments has long been established by sovereigns and appropriate society was formed around and "bounded" within them. It was thus not continuous historical growth and exchange of dialogues between public and political spheres, but more imported political system that has adjusted its functions to respond to previous powers. Public reaction responded by created resistance, which later was to be cured by empowerment because crisis in functioning of authoritarian states has been recognized. Mind that this is simplified version omitting many historical events, it serves primarily to exemplify the lag and types of responses between public and political under different courses of history (Corbridge, 2007).

Every change within the government released reaction in resistance, as Hart (2009) shows on Brazilian example of neoliberal changes during 80s, that privatized water and natural resources simultaneously created popular movements against this changes. In the same manner the anti-capitalists and anti-globalization protests in 1999 in Seattle answered the WTO millenium renegotiations. And even the post 9/11 'War on Terror' springing fundamentalism, perpetuating aggression and resistance.

Development then examines society creation with employing empowerment of civic movements with "social capital", generalized morale, or other strategies, but is is again few moments too late. Civic society has in many cases already been created according to the mixture of ill shaped institutions and there is no possibility of un-learning or de-invention of social knowledge and experience - just like post-developmental authors appeal to: 'un-making' of the Third world.

Events had already happen and there is no reversive option for going back, just a new adaptation for the future can be made. This has further reaching implications, such as narratives behind sustainable development or critiques of global carbon emission reductions from the South. By the same token one can not roll-back inventions and technology, there is hardly any way of technologically

advanced societies to stop using petroleum products, motorized vehicles, use of communication gadgets, dramatically changing their diets etc. Situation can only adopt to a new form, for the better or the worse.

To return to the example of civic society and it's focus by DS, it is once again too late to mend or try to 'unlearn' imperfect relations created by the insertion of the institutions that basically shaped and formed this societal atmosphere and its way of identification. Now mainstream developmental theorems are focused on micro, traditional, participative, indigenous, but deep adaptational process of targeted subjects has already taken place. So curing civil society now will result yet in another failure. Additionally it also depends on what is considered a failure and which position is the event looked at. Is the intended course taking different path from donor's concept? If it is so, it might be a good solution to learn how to accept differences, such as the adjustment of normality within the spectrum of sameness and to accept and abandon the principles coined by Corbridge – principle of difference and its normalization function applied to the third world abnormalities and principle of similarity – commitment to make 'them like 'us'. Shortly, there is a need to decentralise Foucauldian dispositif.

Renaming Development studies to "Social evolution studies"?

The recently addressed issues of civil society and wide focus onto local and traditional has manifested penetrating nature of capitalist ideas. As Zizek (2014) and Mishra (2014) show the latest crisis observed can be that of identity. Return of nationalism and grow of religious fundamentalism can be approached as adaptation of resistance towards Western neoliberalism and capitalism. From the different angle, Pieterse sees the crisis in lack of response towards dominant paradigm thus providing with model presenting lack of dynamics in monopolized environment.

> *"There have been plenty of critical positions but no coherent ideological response to the neoliberal turn, the crisis is further due to changing circumstances including development failures, the*

growing role of international financial institutions, and conflicts in developing countries" (Pieterse, 2010:5).

The failure of neoliberal ideologies as seen by Pankaj Mishra (2014) leads to renegotiation of social identities through many different ways, that are specific to civilizations (Huntington, 1995). The easiest way to redefine self-identification is to turn back to religion structures, nationalism, extremism, totalitarianism and/or a homogenizing national state building such as seen in China.

Crucial point is to realize the adjustment, not rewriting of current systems. This means capitalism has already penetrated into many aspects of these societies and is forwarded in less obvious way, however still present. As Slavoj Zizek (2014) shows "capitalism hideously overtakes our thoughts and dreams". He proves on example of China, Singapore and India, that emphasis on traditional, local, non-western, allows capitalist structure grow into perfection. The last bastion of resistance against capitalistic absolution is liberty of hedonism and individualism of Western civilization. This aspect is often the main profile of anti-western thinking, generally in Asian cultures, the standing of societal above individual needs, traditional family structure, obedience to authorities or caste system, rejection of individualism all boosts the effectiveness of monetary capitalistic functioning. Fidelity to premodern values are the very features that allow capitalism to produce in even more radical fashion than it would be possible in western liberalism. Justification of brutal practices is thus based on "traditional" values, that are accepted and not resisted, since the narrative of resistance is their own underlying meaning.

One of the concerns of governments is therefore finding and shaping societal identity, which shifts between nation and individual frames, such as building civil society differs from homogeneous views of western scholars. It stems as a reaction, which is in "sterile" inserted environment impossible.

This example shows the victory of once hegemonial and reproduced system that adjusted in new environments under different scheme of values. World influenced by West has been made and accepted, and once a coherent enemy now dissolved into opposition. Narrow nationalism as today's common

resistance that accommodates well in local cultures proves that capitalism does not need western values to function (Zizek, 2014), and further, that certain types of resistance turned into replication of dominant knowledge, that has unintentionally transformed over time.

In untangling the effects of power of dominant narrative, the view onto liberty of western mode of participatory democracy offers two more aspects to be reckoned with. The power of participation is said to ensure vocalization of all, including subdued public voices. Yet the rules of the game often transform genuinety of this representation into controlled space for allowed, and sometimes even recommended opposition. Resonating with Scott's (1997) false consciousness, Zizek (2014) presents the idea of allowed resistance as present in every system, to offer space for participation and opposition identification but without any serious effect on shift of real power. That is also Brigg's (2004) remark, that this situation, where overt forces are identified as the real enemy for created resistance, the true nature of power working behind the exposed mechanism is further evading. This finding has a strong implication on rhetorics of post-developmental school, that is understanding world institutions in a hegemonial, sovereign and neo-colonial way. Such imposition leaves them (institutions) with option to openly shrug off the dominant narrative, while keeping and fostering the covert side of their force. This is the process of evolution within mainstream, that is to vividly focus on local, traditional and micro as a response to critique, while securing the position of their power underneath.

Double crisis of development

"Before envisioning the global civilization of the future, one must first own up the responsibility of creating a space at the margins of the present global civilization for a new, plural, political ecology of knowledge" Nandy, 1989 In Escobar, 1997:266.

The situation in development under the previously mentioned problematique leaves us in front of rather unpleasant junction. As Klein (2015) argues, so far the development failed to deliver any notable progress even with its own 'metric system'. The comparison of vast number of different approaches and methods employed to results is striking. Worth mentioning is also deterioration of income distribution equality and poverty rates in the West. While this schizophrenia of development, the inability to help others with simultaneous worsening the situation at "home" some core elements that used to hold within this civilisation are also being reformed. Such as the paragon of our civilisation, democracy.

Zizek (2014) and McKenna (1992) rise objections against the absolute meaning of participation in democracy. That is, in the times of world wide web and possible individual manifestation onto global scale the gained emancipation within the rules of the game took dangerous twist. According to authors, while keeping the feel of genuine realization, the real power of individual drastically diminished. Zizek also postulates the crisis of democracy in these entangling and in fact disempowering tool. Where every subject has to vote about the very basic decisions, just because the emancipated power of others allows for casting a vote, which in the end results in stalemate on civic level, making it governable and normalized for the upper political sphere. In the society where even the most outrageous ideas now have to be discussed about in the name of democracy and right to expression, leads this society in pitfalls of bureaucratization and endless conflicts. Zizek then mentions practical exposition of this view on debates over rape, where in some societies, this allows for serious debate wherever the rape was caused by the victim itself and so on.

The dynamics postulated development is then much less isolated and much more challenged than in natural science; within the lens of power you can

see there was no real shift apparent in development. The neoliberalism as reaction to keynesian, the sustained power of dollar system (Hart, 2009), the theoretical and rhetorical shift and adjustments of the same garniture, all of the above making the real resistance and change even more difficult. Development institutions stayed the same and the agency build around the principle of paradigm of "us and them" was never truly challenged, as Huntington (1996) suggests, civilisations will always be inherently divided, it's the nature of the mankind. Any glimpse of paradigm shift then stayed as merely a rhetorical alibi for the overt change, when rarely anything changed in power aspects, rendering them only less obvious and better adapted.

As it was mentioned, problems of the 'third world' are in recent years increasingly visible in the 'first' as well. Mehta's (2006) view of world interconnectedness should concern the development in the North with the same values imposed in the South.

"Why is it alright to do development "over there" but not "here"? [we need to] change vocabularies and common strategies of inclusion across "First" and "Third" Worlds. 'Development' is often only considered within the context of the Global South when there are problems of inequality and marginalization within Northern contexts as well" Jones, P.S. 2000:1.

Irrelevancy of indication of income per capita without reflection parity in rising prices of commodities, the overall volume of Northern trade and other indicators of 'overall growth' had obscured the lurking division between income disparities. For example proportion of income to living expenses for certain social strata had in many countries, that are considered developed worsened in the way to lower capacities. The notions of disappearing middle-class across the mass media (e.g. The Guardian, 2012-9-22, The Spectator, 2013-8-24, The Huffington Post, 2015-1-24) can also signify such changes. Paradoxically this issues has been addressed in different countries of the world, but not in the countries of the knowledge origin. 'Good governance' as an indication has been pursued

elsewhere, but the ability to secure trustworthy governance in our own countries vanished.

Post development theories might have marked the end of recent applicability of development studies. As Sumner and Tribe (2008) pointed out; the process of fading out of relevancy of colonial studies might be followed in development studies as well. Nevertheless the increasing volume of academic publicity in DS; the call for change, as always, can be a rallying cry. It is discutable whenever the critique raised by the oppositional theorists and critical theorists is reflected by the mainstream ideas, or is successfully omitted and co-opted under the sphere of stagnation and half-done progress. The hegemonial power inertia might mark the end of academic discourse in science in general, alas in DS.

> *"Development research can avoid the same fate of colonial studies and emerge as a way of learning about development and exclusion in both rich and poor countries, and lead the way in terms of forging new approaches in connecting global and local issues, policies, solutions and researchers. To do so we must start by forging equitable relationships between northern and southern researchers and institutes and decentralizing research processes"*
> Mehta et al., 2006: 5.

Unified global society is within the light of recent world events of aggression and rising tensions definitely a naïve idea, in correlation with Huntington (1996) I propose that we need to turn development studies into Western studies about ourselves due to locality of increasingly multiplying problems in our own place, we need to create appropriate civilisational strategy for its own nations, not one of our vision interposed on the others.

Conclusion

"We have mastered the art of identifying differences, now it's the time to master accepting them."

I tried to unroll the topic of crisis of development by identifying tensions of power in the field starting from visible areas, like competing theoretical strands and analysis of multitude approaches to power, continuing through explanation of theories in implications of practical processes, finishing with deeper view on power problematic within development domain itself. Putting pieces together and uncovering the issue of hegemony of narratives might have left a strain of theoretical deadlock, but I consider it important to decipher hidden transcripts behind the popular stories, regardless the cost of losing preceding ideals. It can be just another adaptation to facilitated notion of crisis, but I propose, with authors like Mehta, Briggs and Nustad, that development should reconsider its aims from 'others' to its own architects. Since the targeted problems of the discourse seemingly arise in the North as well. Besides such shift would offer appropriate answer to the civilizational incompatibility theorem of Huntington's Clash of Civilizations, which in the time of international tensions on the eastern border of the Europe, unsolved Middle-east chaos, economical rivalry on global scale, dawn of Pax Americana, and countless other events, I believe holds the truth more than ever.

> *"[...] if we can only know reality through discourse then why should we believe any one account (such as that of the post-modernists) more than any other – each account might be equally 'socially constructed'"* Sumner Tribe, 2008: 16.

Thereby I conclude that in the sense of power of narratives, this piece of text is also a narrative of its kind, since it uses and combines ideas of various thinkers, enlinks them together and reforges the meanings into forms of novelty grounded in historical discourse. The systemic requirements of academia are bound to

perpetuate the process of narratives, where entitlements of expertise are granted to the coiners of proper works, who in return continue contributing to the endless stream of discourses, some of which are placed in the scientific mixture of narrative hegemony.

Bibliography

- Adger, W, N. et. al. 2006. The Political Economy of Cross-Scale Networks in Resource Co-Management. *Ecology and Society* 10(2): 9.

- Ahorro, J. 2008. The waves of post-development theory and a consideration of the Philippines. Cited 15-03-10 from: http://www. cpsa-acsp. ca/papers-2008/Ahorro. pdf.

- Akbulut, B. Soylu, C. 2012. An inquiry into power and participatory natural resource management. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* vol. 36, 1143–1162.

- Andrews, N. Bawa, S. 2014. A Post-development Hoax? (Re)-examining the Past, Present and Future of Development Studies, *Third World Quarterly,* 35:6, 922-938, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2014.907704.

- Bair, J. 2005. Global Capitalism and Commodity Chains: Looking Back, Going Forward. *Competition & Change*, 9/2. June 2005,153–180. New Haven.

- Barnett, M. 2001. Authority, intervention, and the outer limits of international relations theory. in Callaghy, et. al. 2001. *Intervention and Transnationalism in Africa Global – Local Networks of Power.* Cambridge University Press. UK. 47-65.

- Bellù, L. G. 2011. *Development and development paradigms: A (reasoned) review of prevailing visions*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome.

- Benjaminsen, A, T. 1997. Natural Resource Management, Paradigm Shifts, and the Decentralization Reform in Mali. *Human Ecology*, Vol. 25, No. 1. 121-143.

- Blaikie, P. 2005. Is Small Really Beautiful? Community-based Natural Resource Management in Malawi and Botswana. *World Development* Vol. 34, No. 11, 1942–1957.

- Brigg, M. 2002. Post-development, Foucault and the colonisation metaphor. Third World Quarterly, 23(3), 421-436.

- Broad, R., & Cavanagh, J. 2011. Reframing Development in the Age of Vulnerability: from case studies of the Philippines and Trinidad to new measures of rootedness. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(6), 1127-1145.

- Bøås, M. McNeill, D. 2004. *Global Institutions and Development: Framing the World?* Psychology Press. 1-17.

- Buch-Hansen, M., & Lauridsen, L. S. 2012, November. The Past, Present and Future of Development Studies. In *Forum for Development Studies* Vol. 39, No. 3, 293-300. Routledge.

- Buller, H. Hoggart, K. 1986. Nondecision-Making and Community Power: Residential Development Control in Rural Areas. *Progress in Planning.* vol. 25, 131-203. Pergamon Press, UK.

- Carson, A, K. 2011. Legibility & Control: Themes in the Work of James C. Scott. *Center for a Stateless Society.* Paper No. 12.

- Callaghy, et. al. 2001. *Intervention and Transnationalism in Africa Global – Local Networks of Power.* Cambridge University Press. UK. 335p.

- Cleaver, F. 2001. Institutional Bricolage, Conflict and Cooperation in Usangu, Tanzania. *IDS Bulletin* Vol. 32 No 4. 26-34.

- Colomy, P, B. 1986. Recent Developments in the Functionalist Approach to Change. *Sociological Focus*. vol 1. April 1986.

- Cooper, F. 1997 Modernizing bureaucrats, backward Africans, and the development concept. *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge.* Berkeley, University of California Press. 64-92.

- Corbridge, S. 1998. 'Beneath the pavement only soil': The poverty of post-development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 34(6), 138-148.
- Corbridge, S. 2007. The (im) possibility of development studies. *Economy and Society*, 36(2), 179-211.
- Corbridge, S. (ed.) 1995. *Development Studies a Reader.* London: Arnold.
- Cowen, M., and Shenton, R. 1998. *Doctrines of Development*. London: Routledge.
- Dinerstein, A., & Deneulin, S. 2012. Hope Movements: Naming Mobilization in a Post-development World. *Development and Change*, 43(2), 585-602.
- Dowding, K. 2006. Three-Dimensional Power: A Discussion of Steven Lukes' Power: A Radical View. *Political Studies Review*. Vol.4. 136-145
- Escobar, A. 1992. Imagining a Post-Development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements. Social Text, No. 31/32, *Third World and Post-Colonial Issues*. 20-56.
- Escobar, A. 1997. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press. N.J. 301p.
- Ekasingh, B. Letcher, R, A. 2008. Successes and failures to embed socioeconomic dimensions in integrated natural resource management modeling: Lessons from Thailand. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* 78. 137–145.
- Foucault, M. 1986. Space, Knowledge and Power, in Rainbow, P., Ed. *The Foucault Reader*. 239-56. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *Archeology of Knowledge*. Tavistock Publications Limited. New York. 254p.
- George, A,L. Bennet, A. 2005. Case studies and theory of development. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Ch.1. Mit Press. 331p.

- Gaventa, J. 2003. Power after Lukes: An overview of theories of power since Lukes and their application to development. unpublished paper, *Participation Group*, IDS, Sussex.

- Gaventa, J. Cromwall, A. 2001. Power and Knowledge. *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. pp 70-80. Sage Publishers, London.

- Ghimire, S. 2009. Macro development and micro social processes: Development as discourse in Nepal. *Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology*, 11, 221-243.

- Gore, C. 2000 'The rise and fall of the Washington consensus as a paradigm for developingcountries', *World Development*, 28 (5): 789–804.

- Hayward, C. Lukes, S. 2008. Nobody to shoot? Power, structure, and agency: A dialogue. *Journal of Power*,1:1. 5-20.

- Haas, H. 2007. Migration and Development: A Theoretical Perspective. *COMCAD Arbeitspapiere - Working Papers* No. 29, Germany.

- Hart, G. 2009. D/developments after the Meltdown. *Antipode*, 41(s1), 117-141.

- Hart, G. 2004. Beyond Neoliberalism? Post-Apartheid Developments in Historical & Comparative Perspective in Padayachee, V. (Ed.). (2006). The Development Decade?: *Economic and Social Change in South Africa*, 1994-2004. HSRC Press.

- Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Stanford University Press.

- Hickel, J. 2015. Essay: The death of international development. *Red Pepper UK.* February, 2015. Cited 15-03-05 from http://www.redpepper.org.uk/essay-the-death-of-international-development/.

- Hindess, B. *1997. Discourses of Power, From Hobbes to Foucault.* Blackwell Publishers. UK, US. 1-105.

- Karp, I. 1986. Review: Agency and Social Theory: A Review of Anthony Giddens. A*merican Ethnologist*, Vol. 13, No. 1. 131-137.

- Kassimir, R. 2001. Producing local politics: governance, representation, and non-state organizations in Africa. in Callaghy, et. al. 2001. *Intervention and Transnationalism in Africa Global – Local Networks of Power.* Cambridge University Press. UK. 93-112.

- Klein, N. 2015. Don't look away now, the crisis needs you. *The Guardian.* Friday 6 March 2015 12.25 GMT. Cited from http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/mar/06/dont-look-away-now-the-climate-crisis-needs-you?CMP=share_btn_fb.

- Kothari, U. 2005. From colonial administration to development studies: a post-colonial critique of the history of development studies. *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies*. Ch.3. Zed Books. 256p.

- Kuhn, T, S. 1962, 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* The University of Chicago Press. Second Edition. 222p.

- Lélé, S., & Norgaard, R. B. 2005. Practicing interdisciplinarity. *BioScience*, 55(11), 967-975.

- McKenna, T. Sheldrake, R. Abraham, R. 1992. *Trialogues at the Edge of the West: Chaos, Creativity, and the Resacralization of the World.* Bear & Co; First Edition edition. 192p. ISBN-10: 0939680971.

- Mehta, L. et. al. 1999. Exploring understandings of institutions and uncertainty: new directions in natural resource management. *IDS Discussion Paper 372.* University of Sussex, UK.

- Mehta, L., Haug, R., & Haddad, L. 2006, June. REINVETING DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH. In *Forum for Development Studies.* Vol. 33, No. 1. 143-148.

- Mishra, P. 2014. Absolute power corrupts, goes the old truism. *Adbusters*. 14-10-14. Cited 15-03-10 from https://www.adbusters.org/magazine/116/pankaj-mishra.html.

- Nustad, K. G. 2001. Development: the devil we know?. *Third World Quarterly,* 22(4), 479-489.

- Obi, C, I. 2001. Global, state, and local intersections: power, authority, and conflict in the Niger Delta Oil Communities. in Callaghy, et. al. 2001. *Intervention and Transnationalism in Africa Global – Local Networks of Power.* Cambridge University Press. UK. 173-193.

- Pieterse, J. N. 2000. My paradigm or yours? Alternative development, post-development, reflexive development. *Development and Change,* 29(2), 343-373.

- Pieterse, J, N. 2010. *Development Theory.* Theory, Culture & Society, Sage Publications. 273p.

- Pegler, L.J. (2009). Development through global value chains and the achievement of decent work : challenges to work and representational processes. *ISS Working Paper Series / General Series* (Vol. 485, pp. 1–35). Erasmus University Rotterdam. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1765/18708

- Richerson, P. J., Boyd R., Paciotti, B. 2002. *An evolutionary theory of commons management.* 403-442 in Adger, W, N. et. al. 2006. The Political Economy of Cross-Scale Networks in Resource Co-Management. *Ecology and Society* 10(2): 9.

- Risseeuw, C. 1991. Bourdieu, power and resistance: Gender transformation in Sri Lanka In Davis, K. Leijenaar, M., Oldersma, J. (eds.), 1991. *The Gender of Power*. Sage Publications. 154-79.

- Schuurman, J. 2003. Social Capital: the politico-emancipatory potential of a disputed concept. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 24, No 6, 991–1010.

- Sianes, A. 2013. Shaping the Future of Mid-range Northern ngdos: ten challenges, ten proposals. T*hird World Quarterly*, 34(8), 1458-1474.

- Sumner, A. Tribe, M. 2008. *International Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice.* Sage Publications. 191p. ISBN 978-1-4129-2944-8.

- Scott, J,C. 1990. *Domination and the art of resistance.* Yale University Press, London. 45-108.

- Sharp, J., & Briggs, J. (2006). Postcolonialism and development: new dialogues?. *The Geographical Journal*, 172(1), 6-9.

- Shapiro, I. 2006. On the Second Edition of Lukes' Third Face. *Political Studies Review*. Vol.4. 146-155.

- Sharp, J. Briggs, J. 2006. Postcolonialism and development: new dialogues? *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 172, No. 1. 6–9.

- Shackleton, S. et. al. 2002. Devolution and community-based natural resource management: Creating space for local people to participate and benefit? *Natural Resource Perspectives*, Vol. 76.

- Steenkamp, C. Uhr, J. 2000. The Makuleke Land Claim: Power Relations and Community-Based Natural Resource Management. *Evaluating Eden Series Discussion Paper* No.18. IIED.

- Teschke, B. 2002. Theorizing the Westphalian System of States: International Relations from Absolutism to Capitalism. *European Journal of International Relations.* SAGE Publications and ECPR, Vol. 8(1): 5–48

- Willis, K. 2005. *Theories and Practices of Development.* Routledge. London. 253p.

- Zizek, S. 2015. *We Need to Censor our Dreams.* London School of Economics and Political Science. Recorded 11 November 2014 in Sheikh

Zayed Theatre, New Academic Building. Cited 15-02-19 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YnzqY7qSzt0