

ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT: MEANING, ISSUES AND DILEMMAS

Dr. Inayatullah

The country that is more developed industrially only shows to the less developed the image of its own future.

Karl Marx

There is no reason for the Third World to imitate the impoverishing models that produce one dimensional men and women . . . If development is the development of man, as an individual and as a social being, aiming at his liberation and at his fulfillment, it cannot but stem from the inner core of each society. It relies on what a human group has: its natural environment, its cultural heritage, the creativity of the men and women who constitute it, becoming richer through exchange between them and with other groups. It entails the autonomous definition of development styles and of life styles. This is the meaning of an endogenous self-reliant development.

Dag Hamarskjold Foundation Report: What Now: Another Development, 1975: 34.

Time has come not to seek development alternative, but alternative to whole concept of development.

Majid Rahnema

From mid forties to the end of sixties there prevailed a high degree of certainty about the nature of development, characteristics of a developed society and the role of external prescriptions and assistance in promoting development in what were then called less developed societies. Indeed, there were debates about the most effective strategies of development, but no doubts that model of development for the developing societies was the developed West. Then occurred a degree of shift in seventies. Development came to be seen, at least among a group of development scholars, not a replication of Western model but as endogenous, that is, an open ended creative and self-reliant process aimed at realizing values important and specific to a society. Supported by some of the International agencies particularly UNESCO, the new approach gained a degree of academic currency and respectability among both thinkers and practitioners of development. This paper attempts to identify the meanings of endogenous development, analyze some issues it raises and dilemmas it creates.ⁱ

Rise of Western Development Model

Due to major scientific and social changes that occurred in the West in last several centuries, it achieved a developmental breakthrough, which transformed its political, social and economic structures. This process of transformation was facilitated as well as reflected in the emergence of a new institutional pattern whose major components were - liberal democracy, market-oriented economy, rational bureaucracy and nation-state and a new culture - secular and "rational". These changes enabled the West to gain technical and military superiority over non-Western societies and colonize most of them in 19th and 20th centuries. Within the framework of colonialism, the metropolitan countries became the models of development for the colonised people particularly for the local elite that had become part of the colonial state structure.

As a result, the Western model of development, with its definitions and indicators of development, its prescription about effective strategies for achieving it and its identification of conditions conducive for such development became the standard model of development for most of the remaining world. This was not as much due to its relevance, applicability and efficacy for solving the problems of the non-western world (Goulet, 1963: 613, Inayatullah, 1974:) as due to other factors. These included the structure of core and periphery relations prevailing between the West and non-Western societies, adoption of Western intellectual framework by some of the newly emerging intellectual and political elite of the non-western societies and co-option of the latter into the world power structure dominated by the western countries. Lure of aid and technical assistance and personal benefits resulting from it to this elite further facilitated the adoption of this model in the non-western world.

Spread of western model was also the result of expansionist structural tendency of world capitalism, it being the essential core of it. By exporting the western model, the world capitalism emanating from the West integrated most of the Third World into it (Wallerstein, 1984; ch. 8). In late 80s the same process is being repeated for the First World.

With the spread of this development model also grew an ideology justifying its

adoption and its relevance to the non-western world. Led by W.W. Rostow, an American economist, vast literature incorporating this ideology was produced in the West and spread in the Third World. One of its passionate advocates, however, was Daniel Lerner, an American political scientist, the author of *Passing of Traditional Society* (1958) who somewhat following Marx argued:

"From the West came the stimuli to change the material environment which undermined the traditional society of the East; for the reconstruction of Eastern society along modern lines, the West is still a useful model. Candor enjoins us to recognize that what the West is in this sense, the East seeks to become (1967: 115)."

2. Emergence of the Concept of Endogenous Development

For a quarter century since the end of Second World War, the relevance of the western model to the problems of Third World societies remained unchallenged and unquestioned. The process of questioning started in mid-70s. The initial thrust of it is summed up in the following quotation:

"It is ironic that, while the West itself has developed through innovation in science, technology and social organisation, providing new responses to new challenges, it expects that the non-western world should only imitate or adopt western institutions and should not disturb the creative monopoly of the West. But imitation does not and cannot release the creative energy in the imitator. It only perpetuates his dependence on the model (Inayatullah, 1967: 102)."

The questioning became more widespread in 70s facilitated by several factors some of them listed below :-

1. Weakening of the hold of US over the international power structure after its defeat in Vietnam and multi-polarisation of world power structure providing the Third World countries a certain degree of autonomy to choose development models;
2. Political and cultural assertion of Third World countries led by the Non-Aligned Movement and its concerted effort to build a New International Economic Order and a New International Information Order;

3. Failure of most of the Third World countries following the Western development model to make a developmental breakthrough.ⁱⁱ This in turn raised questions about the adequacy of western development oriented social sciences to comprehend the social reality of the Third World, suggest effective development strategies and exposure of their ideological role in projecting a development conception which legitimized western dominance (Inayatullah, 1975: 25-35);
4. Emergences of China as an alternative innovative development model attracting the attention of both Western and Third World scholars of development and political elite;
5. Greater awareness of mal-development and pathologies in Western societies and the fear of their diffusion in the rest of the world and need for insulation from them (Wolfe, 1986: 47, Goulet, 1983, 704);
6. Recognition that world as a whole was mal-developed and pursuing a model of development which was in the long run not sustainable and that underdevelopment of Third World was partly the consequence of such mal-development as well as center-periphery relation between it and First World.

Combined impact of all these factors was the questioning of assumptions, contents, strategies of western model in academic and political circles as well as in international organisations which were gradually coming out of the control of the West and had started reflecting the concern of its new and increased members from the Third World countries. As a consequence, the then prevailing development orientation subjected to a serious criticism and underwent change.

A major statement expressing the new orientation to development was contained in a report entitled "What Now: Another Development ?" prepared by Dag Hammarskjold Foundation on the occasion of Seventh Special Session of the UN General Assembly (1975). Summing up the new conception offered by several academics, statesmen and policy-makers the report identified four major elements of it:

1. Meeting of Basic needs, beginning with the eradication of poverty;
2. Endogeniety and self-reliance;
3. Harmony with environments and

4. Structural transformation (28-34).

One of the elements given great emphasis in this new conceptual framework was "endogeniety" (literally meaning growing from within) and self-reliance. This was in sharp contrast to the prescription of Western development model of providing Third World with the "missing" components through financial aid and technology.

To some extent, the elements of development stressed in "Another Development" had already been articulated in the resolution on New International Economic Order and documents produced to explain it. UNESCO picked up this thread and further elaborated some of the elements in the new approach to development. After questioning whether it was desirable and feasible to transplant " ... the pattern of development empirically evolved by the industrialized countries and the types of consumption that correspond to it" in Third World, it recommended the adoption of a development model which promoted "endogenous, independent development for every society." To promote such a development UNESCO assigned itself the task of contributing to the search for such a model or models and promote " a genuine science of development, a science both social and political, applied and practical (UNESCO, 1976: 99)."

Another UNESCO document summarized the essential elements of the new approach suggesting that development should be " integrated, global, equitable and endogenous (Ribes, 1981: 14)." Endogenous development was defined as follows:

"It should be endogenous which implies that different societies must retain their individual character, drawing their strength from their own innate modes of thought and action and adopting goals in keeping with these values with perceived needs and with the resources at their disposal (Ibid.)."

As it comes out from the above discussion, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation report and Unesco studies more or less achieved a consensus on what constituted endogenous development. One of their major departure from the western development model was the rejection of its narrow focus overemphasizing economic development and under-emphasizing the totality of development as a "cultural development process (Claus: 1985)."

As noted earlier the shift in stress from exogenous model of development to

endogenous ones was accompanied by aggravation in pathologies of development in the western societies. Therefore, development analysis which previously remained mostly focussed on the problems of Third World now, to some extent, was directed towards the problems afflicting the First and the Second World as they affected the rest of the World (Preiswerk, 1982: 193; Eppler, 1985: 57-64; Goulet, 1983: 613).

With all these changes the earlier certainty prevailing about the concept of development was undermined. The foundations of the high pedestal on which the goddess of western development model rested were now shaking. Earlier prodding that Third World should use western development as a useful model and not fall into the trap of ethnocentrism considered to be a major obstacle to development (Lerner, op.cit: 110) was now being replaced by a more sober evaluation of relevance of Western model. By 1985 an influential voice from the West was reminding the community of development scholars that development had "become synonymous with westernisation (Prince Claus, *ibid.*: 5) and " . . .that rethinking development first and foremost required curbing ethnocentrism (*ibid.*: 9)" both of Northern and Southern variety.

With greater awareness of mal-development of western societies, there also grew appreciation of the potential contributions which the non-western societies and cultures could make to the further development of the West. Advocating the need for international "cultural cooperation" Dag Hammarskjold Foundation report emphasized: ". . .there is here a vast field for real cultural cooperation (between Third World and the West) which could help the industrial societies to acknowledge at least the richness of human experience and to redefine their own life style (1975: 34)." With this, thinking concerning the relevance of Western development model to Third World problems and potential contributions which latter could make to the rectification of mal-development of western societies had come to a full circle (Goulet, 1983: 614).

II. Issues and Dilemmas in Endogenous Development

In the previous section the historical circumstances which brought about a shift in thinking about the relevance of western development and the need for endogenous development models have been described and major statements expounding the concept of endogenous development presented. In this section an effort will be made to identify the crucial elements in endogenous development and raise issues about making the concept operation and identify dilemmas about their mutual compatibility.

While a large number of elements of endogenous development can be derived from various statements about the concept, only four elements considered more crucial will be discussed here.

They are:

1. Culture specific values and cultural identity;
2. Self-reliance;
- 3, Popular participation; and
4. Creativity in sciences and technology;

1. Endogenous Development and Cultural Values and Identity

a. Cultural values

Most important cultural dimensions of endogeneity are:

- i. Developing a group's or society's own cultural heritage and preservation of its cultural identity;
- ii. Realizing culture-specific values;
- iii. Using cultural heritage and values as a framework for defining development goals autonomously and using them as motivating forces for achieving thus defined goals;
- iv. Achieving such development on the basis of one's own material and non-material resources, endowments and capabilities.

The emergence of the concept of endogenous development, indeed, has brought out the necessity of balancing development with elements that were missing or neglected in earlier conceptualisation either by default, by intention, or due to ethnocentrism of western development thinkers. Against assimilation in the contemporary western culture and civilisation supported by excessive external penetration came the stress on development of cultural identity and heritage of each society and maintenance of cultural diversity in the world. Against exclusive emphasis on realisation of "universal" values of development (which were in fact partly universal and partly specific to the West) emerged the significance of specific values of a society in defining and generating development. In place of the view that cultural specific values and traditions of

the non-western societies were an obstacle to modernity there emerged the more balanced awareness of the significance of diverse cultural values and their potential for positive contribution to the realisation of autonomously defined goals of development. Heavy reliance on imported technology, material aid and technical assistance to meet what economists called the "missing components" was balanced with stress on development of internal resources, reliance on natural endowments, human capital formation and its utilization guided by a general principle of self-reliance.

These much needed correctives, however, have raised several fundamental issues and questions and which need to be analysed and answered if endogeneity has not to remain a negative approach of rejection of the exogenous and become a sound set of principles which enables people, groups and societies realise their potentialities and achieve fuller and better lives.

The first important issue pertains to the relationship between maintenance of cultural heritage and development of a society. Indeed, there is no conflict between the two if two earlier assumptions about the process and consequences of development are rejected. First is the well-established view that development is an evolutionary and single-route process in which all societies at the lower level of evolution have to shed off much of the "burden" of their cultural heritage to become "modern" and "developed". Second, development would lead to global cultural homogeneity and convergence in various traditions and institutions that would help eliminate cultural conflict and achieve peace and harmony at the global level. Moreover, the maintenance of cultural diversity of mankind as an intrinsic value and as a shield against the excessive penetration of the exogenous western patterns of development and pathologies associated with it is not practical, even if desirable, due to homogenizing power of the modern technology.

Rejection of unilinear evolutionary view of development and acceptance of value of cultural diversity of mankind, however, resolves some but poses new dilemmas. The thesis of multilinear development of societies, cultures and civilizations may be attractive to Third World intellectually. Similarly cultural diversity of mankind may be a highly desirable value. However, these alternative assumptions and values have certain implications that need to be squarely faced. A first problem is that endogeneity and development may become incompatible if the culture of a society does not provide for change, growth and development regardless of its contents, as some of the classical cultures seem to lack such conception. A second problem emerges from recognition of

multilineal routes to development and absolute and unqualified commitment to value of cultural diversity. This leads to what is sometimes called "absolute cultural relativism" and "developmental agnosticism", both concepts rejecting universality of any value or set of values associated with development. This requires accepting an untenable proposition of equating the values of isolated tribes such as Eskimos and Bedouin, which may have superior capacity for adaptation to their inhospitable environments, with the values of a classical civilisation with considerable material and non-material achievements to its credit or even modern civilisation.

A third problem concerns the possibility of core values of a stagnant civilization developed at an earlier stage of its history becoming a source of dynamism and change necessary for endogenous development. In some cases, these values in their original form may not support development. If they need to be reinterpreted to achieve the contemporary objectives of endogenous development then another question would arise whether such a civilisation has an in-built mechanism of re-interpreting them in changing conditions or they have to be re-interpreted in the light of contemporary standards of evaluation. If these values are reinterpreted to serve contemporary ends, would they remain the same values particularly if they are interpreted considering contemporary Western values? A final question is whether societies with diverse values and social structures, previously stagnating over a long time can enter a new phase of cultural creativity on their own and without coming into contact with other societies and being subjected to new and external stimuli? If such contacts are a necessary condition for cultural creativity to promote endogenous development, what are the chances of a society maintaining its tradition and core values to guide the process of endogenous development?

These questions lead one to enquire into the relations between endogenous development and contemporary phenomena of cultural and religious revivalism which, in different forms, is fast spreading in the world particularly in Third World. The religious revival in various societies is a search for authentic values and identity which the imported Western development model and modernizing bureaucratic state tend to deny the non-western people (Kothari, 1984: 18). Revivalism can co-exist with endogenous development but under circumstances can provide a support to it depending upon the quality of values that a revivalist movement tends to revive. However, at another level they may be incompatible. Most of the revivalist movements aim at resurrecting institutional and cultural matrix of an earlier era preceding industrial age. Regardless of the

viability of such a resurrection in the contemporary context, the question arises what type of societies these revivalist movements would create and whether they can coexist and create a peaceful international order. The question assumes an added importance as some of the revivalist movements, generally spurred by messianic spirit, seek not only to reconstruct their own societies on their specific values but also struggle to create a world order based on them. In this process they destroy the values and cultural identity of other societies in some cases with the use of force. When several revivalist movements are thus oriented, they are likely to conflict with each other.

Furthermore, unless the search for authentic values is accommodated within the framework of a humane and tolerant social order, it may turn into dogmatism and fanaticism giving rise to authoritarian ideologies and state structures. Thus revivalism tend to become a self-defeating programme. In order to escape alien rule, rootless modernity and authoritarian bureaucratic state they end up either creating such a state or support "oligarchies and military juntas (Kothari, 1984: 18)."

Endogeniety can promote development of individual societies and simultaneously serve humanity if it is not based on "absolute cultural relativism" but qualified one. Cultural relativism must include ". . .the idea of the respect for the cultural identity of each society with that of the limits which should be imposed on exploitative and aggressive behaviour (Preiswerk, 1979: 7)."

The concept of endogenous development would lose universality, relevance and utility for promoting development if it is without a minimum core of values such as universal justice, equality, equity and freedom - the values incorporated in Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Without such a minimum core of universal values, it can become an ideology of status-quo and not of change and liberation and a tool in the hands of dominant classes in a society to defend their interests.ⁱⁱⁱ

b. Cultural Identity and Endogenous Development

The issue of preserving and strengthening cultural identity of a society as an essential element of endogenous development raises equally difficult questions. Indeed, the shattering of cultural identity through exogenous influences is a devastating experience both for an individual and a society making them rootless producing individual and social maladies. By emphasizing the need for preservation of cultural identity, respect,

esteem and dignity of each society endogenous development rightly seeks to strengthen these wellsprings of positive energy for development. However, there are several issues about the concept of cultural identity and its preservation which need to be raised.

First is the empirical problem of whether a single coherent cultural identity exists within a given society. If such identity does not exist or if there exist multiple identities, the question arises which one to strengthen or develop. Moreover, a single national or societal identity may be only an ideal never realised or a myth created by the dominant cultural groups. Taking into account the cultural diversity of values among various regional, ethnic groups and classes in the Third World, it would be doing violence to social reality to assume that each society or a country has a single cultural identity. In fact, the emergence of many ethnic movements in these countries and unusual concern of the "national modernizing elite" with nation building and national integration to the extent of it becoming an obsession indicate a weak preexisting national cultural identity. To integrate these divergent identities into one national identity is indeed a difficult task as the experience of nation building all over the world suggests. Given the difficulties involved in the process of creating a single identity tempt many a "national" elite to use subterfuge techniques of achieving it. These include injecting strong doses of nationalism through mass media, building expensive national monuments, indulging in national self-glorification through rewriting national history, manipulating ideological symbols, creating and invoking the fear of real or imaginary, internal or external, enemies and occasionally in desperation engaging in aggressive wars with these "enemies." These techniques or policies may temporarily produce "integrative" results creating or strengthening national identity. Ultimately, however, it leads to wastage of material resources and encourages destructive conflicts rather than promoting genuine development and peace.

As Preiswerk has pointed out the cultural identity could be used both as a tool of domination as well as liberation and development (1979: 2). Dominant cultural ethnic groups in a society could develop and impose cultural development policies that obliterate the cultural identity of weaker groups leading in worst circumstances to what is called "ethnocide." Concern with this negative aspect of creating cultural identity has now increased as formal decolonisation from western nations has been replaced by in some societies by what is called "internal colonialism." As a result of this awareness, the national cultural identity is not viewed to be incompatible with the preservation of regional, and ethnic identities, though few rulers in Third World would subscribe to such a view.

Acceptance of the legitimacy of sub-national ethnic and cultural identities requires the reformulation of the concept and policies of national development that incorporates what is called "Ethno-development." As defined by Stavenhagen ethno-development includes:

". . . the right to decide about their (ethnic groups) own affairs, to participate in the decision-making bodies and processes where their future is discussed and decided; to political representation and participation; to respect for their traditions and cultures; to the freedom to choose what kind of development, if any, they want. Ethno-development means that an ethnic whether indigenous, tribal or any other, maintains control over its own land, resources, social organisation and culture and is free to negotiate with the State the kind of relationship it wishes to have (Ibid.: 78)."

In short the doctrine of ethno-development extends to the ethnic groups, particularly those who are weak and under-represented in the state structure and dominated by other ethnic groups, the same rights which international community, at least theoretically, grants to nations including the right to choose an endogenous process of development. Such an approach obviously imparts a new dimension and meaning to national cultural identity and suggests greater tolerance of ethnic diversity analogous to global cultural diversity. Obviously, this approach is difficult to implement particularly by state institutions dominated by a few ethnic or cultural groups who by projecting their own interests as equivalent to the interests of the state, nation or country legitimize their dominant position. Such groups would find the new approach as a threat to "national" stability and cohesion and ethno-development an obstacle to the development of national cultural identity. ¹

2. Self-reliance and Endogenous Development

Self-reliance is an essential ingredient of endogenous development both due to internal logic of such development and for mobilizing resources for its execution. As has been stated and analysed earlier, transfer of exogenous development model to Third World from rich countries was made necessary by the political domination of the world by these countries and the internal logic of expansion of capitalist system into world peripheries to integrate them with the core countries. The ideological legitimation for such transfer was provided by the theory of "missing components" within the paradigm of

¹ For a cogent summary of the issues involved in translating endogenous development into a set of viable policies see Wolfe (1986: 67).

"modernization" stating that the poor countries cannot develop or rise by their own strength as the important ingredients needed for their modernization such as capital, technology and technical skills were missing in these countries which they cannot provide on their own (Streeten, 1980: 5). Hence, the need for the transfer of a development model and assistance to execute such a model.

The emergence of concept of endogenous development, as analysed in the first section of this paper, is the result of several changes undermining the earlier conception of development. This included, besides changes in world power structure and culmination of decolonisation process, the empirical evidence about the decline in the quantum of aid, doubts about the efficacy of it and its use to establish and strengthen exploitative relations between aid giving and aid receiving countries.

In these changed circumstances and changed perception of aid, self-reliance is a "necessity" for endogenous development. If western aid, technical assistance and transfer of western development model are of doubtful utility or exploitative, they cannot help promote endogenous development and therefore need to be dispensed with. Self-reliance is also essential part of internal logic of endogenous development. If a society has to promote its own cultural heritage and identity, realise its cultural specific values in combination with universal values, build its own material and non-material resources, and individual and collective capabilities, then external aid and technical assistance cannot be of much use to achieve these objectives. In fact, under certain circumstances such assistance could hamper the realisation of these objectives by creating dependence rather than strengthening a society's capabilities. Finally, endogenous development through self-reliance implies the termination of dependent and exploitative relationship with aid giving core countries. Any attempt to change such relations is likely to lead to antagonistic relations between the core and the periphery as the core would attempt to maintain the status quo, if necessary through coercive means. To face threats from the core and achieve true independence to pursue its own goals and values, a dependent society has to undergo a psycho-social transformation to inculcate fearlessness and invulnerability and social structural change to eliminate internal divisions and inequalities and national solidarity.^{iv}

Like other elements of endogenous development, self-reliance also poses certain dilemmas. Some of them are discussed below.

First is the issue concerning whether self-reliance means cutting oneself off from the rest of the world or cutting off some links selectively. Further, if some of the links are to be cut off then which ones. Second, whether a society should remain continuously isolated or only for a certain period in its history. Third, whether or not size and material resources of societies limit their freedom to pursue certain strategies of self-reliance.

Generally those who advocate self-reliance suggest that they do not equate it with autarky (Kuitenbrouwer, 1975: 14, Preiswerk, 1979: 18, Galtung, 1980: 19-20, Amin, 1987: 1140), that is, total self-sufficiency and recommend a strategy of selective delinking or what Preiswerk calls selective "dissociative strategy."² However, designing a selective strategy is not as simple a task as Streeten seems to assume (1980: 7). The poor and weak countries of Third World neither individually nor collectively can determine which linkages they should maintain and which one they should cut off with the rich world. Nor can they cut off the harmful ones without losing the beneficial ones as well. The failure of the negotiation on New International Economic Order indicates the complexity and intractability of the problem.

The issue of the stage of development a society at which it should seek to delink and relink itself to the rest of the world is also a complex one. Hirschman suggests that: "In order to maximize growth the developing countries could need an appropriate alternation of contact and insulation, of openness to the trade and capital of the developed countries, to be followed by a period of nationalism and withdrawal to take place. Thus, both contact and insulation have essential roles to play, one after the other (1971; 25-26)."

However, this strategy does not pinpoint at what time and stage of development a country should withdraw and then re-establish links with the world and which part of the world. Japan's experience of deliberate withdrawal at one stage in history and re-establishment of links later probably proved a successful strategy. However, the same strategy did not yield positive results in case of Burma. The case of China remains inconclusive.

Though selective linking or delinking may appear logically attractive option for a

²Somewhat in the same vein Samir Amin suggests that delinking strategy refers to "... the need to submit foreign relations to the logic of an internal popular strategy of development, as opposed to the strategy of 'adjusting' internal development to the constraints of the global expansion of capitalism (1987: 1140-1141)."

poor country pursuing endogenous development, there seems to be insuperable difficulties in translating it into concrete effective policies, given the nature of political elite, institutions, size of a country and the nature of response from the international system. In societies where political elite is co-opted into the world power structure, indifferent to the needs of the people or is oriented to serve its own narrow class interests and superfluous consumption needs, the adoption of selective dissociative or alternation strategies may not promote authentic endogenous development.

The size of a country, its geographical and demographic size, and natural endowment is an important variable in determining how much freedom a country has to pursue self-reliant strategies of development including delinking strategies even when they are selective ones. It has been argued that China, the often referred model of delinking and self-reliance strategy, could afford such a strategy at one stage of its development because it is a large country. Small countries are forced into unequal exchange and dependent relations by sheer necessity imposed by their size and limitations of their resources. Moreover, even if they want to implement such policies, the ruling elite in the Third World may not have the political and economic freedom and will to devise and implement them as the aid giving countries and financial institutions may insist on "package deals."

Of course, the advocates of self-reliance have argued that while a poor country cannot be self-reliant by itself, a region or Third World as a whole can opt for collective self-reliance by reducing or severing exploitative relationship with the rich countries and engaging into what is called south-south cooperation. However, problems involved in forging regional self-reliance and south-south cooperation are not easy to tackle as the limited success of recent efforts suggests.³

3. Endogenous Development and Popular Participation

As brought out earlier, the essence of endogenous development is reliance on society's own resources and endowment for development and building its individual and collective capabilities. Endogenous development can build such capabilities by focussing on human development (or what economists call "human capital formation") which releases creative energies of all members of a society and help them realise their innate

³For an illuminating discussion of resistance to self-reliance emerging from within and outside a society see Preiswerk's chapter in Galtung and others (1980).

potentialities through a "process of enlarging (people's) their choice (UNDP, 1990: 10)." To achieve this, all members of a society must be provided with their basic needs, access to knowledge and opportunity and freedom to organise to affect the decisions made at various level of society which influence their lives through direct or indirect participation. Thus popular participation being an essential means for human development is also an important element in endogenous development.

Popular participation can be both authentic and manipulated. Only authentic popular participation can promote endogenous and human development. Authentic participation requires a certain degree of commitment and activity to affect actions and policies of state institutions and invulnerability to manipulation by such institution.⁴ It also needs a political and economic institutional framework in which people feel a genuine sense of participation and share in power without being manipulated by the elite. Only when popular participation becomes institutionalise at the level of society and value of participation is internalized by individual can it become a vehicle of endogenous development (Huynh, 1986: 27).

While without popular participation endogenous development cannot be implemented, endogeniety does not by itself ensure popular participation. In fact, in certain circumstances, endogeniety can be, and sometimes is used, to limit or subvert popular participation as reflected in statements of some of Third World leaders that "western democracy is unsuited to the *genius* of their people." Often, authoritarian regimes have attempted to control popular participation in the name of endogeneity and invoked it to maintain them in power. Moreover, some of Third World cultures lack a conception of participation of all members of society in its affairs. Social structures of some of them institutionalise and legitimizes non-participation and exclusion of certain strata of society from collective affairs.⁵ Some of these cultures and social structures, in spite of contemporary cultural and social changes, continue to retain tribal and feudal character under the thin veneer of modernisation and inhibit popular participation. What is

⁴ Popular participation, according to a relatively comprehensive definition of it, consists of "organised efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions on the part of groups and movements hitherto excluded from such control (UNRISD, 1980 as quoted in WOLFE, 1986: 52)."

⁵ Whether this is due to the indigenous character of these societies as reflected in their tribal and feudal structure or is the consequence of the impact of colonialism and modern capitalism remain controversial. A school of thought, taking a somewhat romantic of the indigenous society, argues that colonialism and capitalism distorted and destroyed the communitarian and participative structures of traditional societies, such as traditional rural panchayats in India, and converted the presumably participative egalitarian communities into atomistic, individualistic and non-participative ones.

important for successful implementation of endogenous development is to identify those traits of these cultures and social structures that affect the quality of popular participation and change them to support it.

In many Third World societies, popular participation has not sprung from the womb of traditional social structure. However, in exceptionally conducive circumstances some small scale movements have emerged on the basis of local initiative incorporating the principle of popular participation. However, such movements have remained enclaves or islands surrounded by non-participative and authoritarian political and social structures, which have often undermined, weakened, or swept them away after they flourished for a limited period.

As the relationship between endogenous development and popular participation is not free from internal tension, so is the relationship between indigenous state structure and popular participation. First, the state structure in many Third World countries particularly those formerly subjected to colonialism are overdeveloped (Alavi, 1983: 42) and allied to classes dependent on it such as capitalist, traders and feudal class. This enables it to formulate state policies mostly in its own political and economic interests and, to a limited extent, serving the interests of the dependent classes.⁶

This matrix of interests and power effectively excludes the middle and lower classes, that is, the peasants, labourers and other deprived groups from participation in national and local affairs. Existence of this type of relationship between state structure and propertied classes, the participation of propertyless periphery, the masses, in state structure at various levels of political and social organisations becomes difficult, if not impossible. Whenever the propertyless classes form their own organizations for defending their interests the state structure and the powerful but dependent propertied classes try to control them failing which they destroy such organisations.

When aid giving countries and international agencies exert pressure on the state apparatus for "popular participation" to ensure integration of the propertyless classes into the existing system, the state apparatus responds by creating docile and "formal" organisations at the local level under its own supervision and ensuring that they operate

⁶The concept of "overdeveloped" state as used by Alavi, though quite insightful is somewhat imprecise. It can mean that state is more powerful, more rationally organised than the society, or has extensively penetrated it or taken over some of the functions performed by its other institutions leading to their atrophy.

only at limited local level and do not threaten the domination of the state structure. Community development organisations created in several Asian countries in late fifties and sixties are an example. Obviously, under such circumstances, the popular participation is not authentic and genuine but manipulated either to control lower classes or achieve centrally determined goals (Wolfe, 1986: 62, Inayatullah, 1988: 224-269).

In some Third World countries charismatic political leaders came into power in the post colonial era with ambitions to achieve national integration, glory and greatness, a place for them in international power structure and in national history. Occasionally, such leaders are moved by ideology of endogenous development and seek mobilisation of people for achieving national goals, a participation willed and directed from the center rather than emanating from periphery to control regulative institution and state structure. This leads to centrally controlled and guided "Popular participation" either through a bureaucratic structure or through a single party organization. This enables the state institutions to regulate the political behaviour of the excluded people rather than allowing such people to control the regulative institutions. Thus endogeniety may be used as an ideology by post-colonial bureaucratic state and the charismatic leaders to substitute manipulative participation in place of true and authentic participation.

If endogenous development is to succeed in achieving human development, it must expand the meaning of popular participation to have equitable access to material resources and public services by the excluded and propertyless people. Without it they cannot have the economic power to become self-reliant, meet their basic needs and improve their capacities and skills. Nor can they realise their innate potentialities and become autonomous and active participants in political process to influence or direct the state structure to make developmental policies favourable to them. This would require redistribution of resources and restructuring of the state and apparatus. This, however, is not an easy task to accomplish particularly if endogeniety is used as an ideology of maintaining the status-quo preventing changes in existing concentration of economic resources and political power in the hands of the privileged few.

4. Endogenous Development and Role of Creativity

Another important element related to the promotion of endogenous development is local creativity. To support endogenous development such creativity must occur in several

spheres and at various level of a society. The most critical area in which creativity is necessary to accelerate endogenous development is culture particularly in science, technology and social knowledge.⁷ Creativity in science, however does not necessarily mean that every society has to invent science afresh. It means, depending on its size and resources, that it should be creative in basic sciences and should not be totally dependent for basic scientific knowledge on scientifically advanced countries. To do so would perpetuate the present cultural and scientific division of labour which keeps Third World dependent on First World which is a serious obstacle in the way of endogenous development (Lopes, 1982: 108). Indeed, research in basic sciences is expensive in terms of expenditure of resources and infrastructure needed for it. However, there are scientific fields, such as theoretical physics, in which greater results can be produced with limited expenditure.

Creativity in basic sciences need not be pursued just for the sake of advancing frontier of knowledge but for their practical application for solution of concrete problems. Noble Laureate Abdus Salam has argued that "for a minority of Third World countries there is the need for basic scientists to help their colleagues in applied research work (1985: 47)." Obviously, if basic sciences are to help applied sciences, a certain degree of creative work need to be done in them, particularly in those which are closely linked to the solution of problems of development of a society.

While role of creativity may be somewhat limited in basic sciences and considerable knowledge in this area may be acquired from the scientifically advanced countries, there is much greater scope and need for creativity to apply this knowledge for the solution of local problems. Using knowledge of basic sciences for solving a problem is neither a simple nor an automatic process. Even applied sciences developed in one society cannot be easily applied for the solution of similar problems emerging in a different socio-cultural context. To use such knowledge for practical purpose, applied scientists have to fully comprehend the relevant laws of science, the nature of the problem to which they are to be applied, and socio-cultural constraints in which a given solution is to work. This doubtlessly requires considerable degree of creativity and imagination by local applied scientists.

Somewhat similar and analogous situation arises concerning transfer of

⁷ For an elaborate discussion of role of creativity in sciences, both natural and social, for implementing endogenous development see Khoi's chapter in Huynh and others (1986) specially pp. 60-73.

technology from the technologically advanced countries. In the hey days of importing exogenous development models, the basic principle advocated by intellectuals and policy makers of the rich countries was that the poor countries have to adjust their culture and social systems to the newly imported technology as a necessary cost of development. Now the position has swung to the other extreme advocating that imported technology should be adjusted to the existing social and cultural realities or new technologies should be evolved with the development of society and its culture. Therefore, the need for "appropriate" technology harmonizing with social structure and culture of a society is stressed (Schumacher, 1973).

Whether an imported technology is to be harmonized with the socio-cultural conditions or local technology is to be evolved which is in harmony with its environments, the role of creativity in this process cannot be overstressed. Local scientists, engineers, doctors have to creatively apply or adjust the imported technology to promote endogenous development.

A third area of creativity needed for endogenous development is in social sciences which can enable the intellectuals in a society to comprehend the forces, internal and external, shaping or determining social structural and cultural characteristics of their society and thus, in favourable circumstances, enable the policy-makers to develop policies which foster endogenous development.

In the first quarter century of "development era" (1945 - 70) the major tool for conceptualizing, planning, monitoring and evaluation of development in most of the Third World countries were the social sciences developed and imported from the West. During this period, the western governments and international organisations, with the cooperation of the Third World governments, encouraged the transfer of these sciences as part of development assistance. As a result they shaped the intellectual outlook and weltanschauung of the educated power elite (Alatas, 1972, 9-10, Inayatullah, 1975: 32). This was further helped by the fact that transfer of western social sciences somewhat undermined the hold of indigenous knowledge on this elite. Indeed, transfer of western social sciences in some ways broadened their outlook, gave a degree of objectivity to their thought orienting them to understand social reality scientifically and somewhat weakened romantic and utopian elements in their thinking. Still, capacity of western social sciences to impart objectivity to this elite remains limited as western social sciences grew out from a tradition peculiar to western intellectual development and during a period when

western colonialism was expanding into the Third World. As a result, these sciences got embedded in ideological stances legitimizing the interest of colonialism, imperialism or contemporary Western world's dominance. Occasionally they reflected the ethnocentric biases of the European history and culture and its peculiar economic, political, social and cultural development. All these weaknesses somewhat limited their relevance to the development of Third World. Besides, dynamics of internal growth of Western social sciences pushed them in the direction of universalisation and sectorialisation (Wallerstein, 1984: 177-78). This limited their capacity to help the Third World social scientists to develop an objective and truly scientific view of their social situation and broaden their world view. They also failed to help these scientists to appreciate the limitation of Western development model and its relevance to the development of their societies.

The traditional elite in the Third World was brought up on indigenous classical intellectual tradition and was only marginally exposed to western social sciences. This included, besides the religious elite and the landed elite, traders and occasionally even the capitalists. The world view of masses was mostly rooted in the folk knowledge. The conception of development derived from classical and folk knowledge was either revivalist seeking to resurrect cultural outlook and identity and institutional structure of an earlier era in history or seeking status-quo or occasionally both. Obviously, the endogenous model of development neither can be evolved nor implemented with the help of western social sciences given their present orientation nor with the help of purely indigenous classical or folk knowledge. A truly endogenous development would require local creativity in social sciences. This creativity may have to be simultaneously undertaken in the following areas:

1. While retaining their scientific and objective spirit and employing their methodology, western social sciences should be purified from their ethnocentric and ideological biases. Their tendency towards exaggerated universalisation and specialization need be restrained;
2. The classical and indigenous traditional knowledge as well as folk knowledge should be subjected to rigorous scientific scrutiny and cleansed from romantic, utopian and self-glorifying as well as status-quo maintaining elements;
3. The knowledge of thus reconstructed social sciences should be carried to the masses to impart them the capacity to scientifically and objectively analyze their problems,

examine their folk knowledge, retain what stands the test of objectivity and scientific standards and discard superstitions and mythical beliefs. In this way they themselves will become creators of scientific knowledge. Such knowledge then will enable them to become effective participants in the affairs of the society and contribute to the formulation of national development goals. This may provide endogenous development roots in scientific knowledge. The movement towards "Participatory Action Research" seems to be attempting to execute this task.⁸

In many cultures and societies in Third World, creativity when permitted, is limited to intellectual elite, the remaining actors, groups, classes and institutions are expected to perform their roles within the established traditional framework. In fact, many cultures in Third World frown upon creativity and innovation as elements that presumably would subvert their social cohesion and equilibrium. However, if endogenous development is to succeed, creativity must diffuse through the whole society including masses enabling them to develop new solutions of their problems.

While creativity in culture is an essential requisite for the success of authentic endogenous development, it has certain degree of tension with other elements of endogenous development. First, as noted above some cultures in general put narrow limits on creativity. Second, not all cultural specific values to be promoted as part of endogenous development, may promote creativity. Similarly, while the need for self-reliance may spur creativity in some institutional spheres, it may also inhibit it when strategy of total delinking from other cultures and societies as part of self-reliance is pursued. Creativity is less likely to occur in isolated societies than those which are exposed to other cultures and societies, although excessive external cultural penetration and over-integration with other cultures and societies may promote anomie and imitation which may retard creativity.

True and authentic popular participation seems to be conducive for creativity as such participation empowers individual and collectivities, thus helping them break the shackles of over-conformity and become creative members of their society. However, when popular participation is manipulative, mobilizing individuals and collectivities for ends and goals established by the elite in authoritarian political and social systems, it is likely to inhibit both individual and social creativity.

⁸ For a more recent statement on the concept of Participatory Action Research see Rahnema (1990).

III Conclusions

With the end of Second World War and beginning of `development era` social scientists, particularly economists, and practitioner of development, both from First and Third World, enjoyed a blissful state of certainty about the nature and strategies of development. For most of them all roads led to Western development model. For some there also existed an alternative route - socialism. By early seventies, as the world power structure underwent a change, traditional certainty started eroding and search for `another development' began giving birth to the concept of endogenous development. Before endogenous development could be seriously debated and discussed, world power structure and its ideological orientation underwent another change - ending the cold war and upsetting the socialist experiment in East Europe and Soviet Union. With this came the pronouncements from the First World about the victory of capitalism and western development model as well as "end of history." With this, except for the true believers in capitalism, another era of intellectual and ideological uncertainty is born.

While for the First World this may be the `end of history' and ideology, for Third World, with all the problems of underdevelopment -population explosion, poverty, disease, inequality, oppression, dependence, political instability, authoritarianism and exploitation, and crisis of identity - staring in our face, this may be the beginning of a new history. The deprived masses of Third World are knocking at the doors of world history which have been closed to them before and want to shape history rather being shaped by the historical processes regulated by the rulers of First World. If they succeed in knocking down these iron doors, they will search for alternative development models or may be "alternative to the whole concept of development (Rahnema, 1986: 42)."

Current ideological uncertainty may spur intellectual creativity to find new development models. In this process it may be useful to reconsider and evaluate the concept of endogenous development and integrate it to values such as equality, justice, freedom, creativity and human solidarity which are important for solving the immense problems facing the world in general and Third World in particular.

Above discussion of the concept of endogenous development, preliminary as it is, has brought out that endogeniety can be used as a shield against excessive cultural, political and economic penetration and domination of the weak and less developed

societies by rich and powerful ones. However, it could also serve as an ideological weapon for maintaining the status-quo. To become a vigorous doctrine endogenous development must be based on tolerance of cultural diversity within a nation and between nations, restraint on aggression toward minority cultural groups, self- reliance, authentic popular participation and creativity in science, technology and social knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Alatas, Syed Hussain. 1972. "The Captive Mind in Development Studies." *International Social Science Journal* 24. *pp.
- Alavi, Hamza. 1983. "Class and State in Pakistan." H.N. Gardezi and Jamil Rashid. eds. *Pakistan: The Unstable State*. Lahore, Vanguard Books Ltd.: 40-93.
- Amin, Samir. 1987. "Democracy and National Strategy in the Periphery." *Third World Quarterly* October, 9(4): 1129-1156.
- Bendix, Reinhard. 1964. *Nation Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order*. New York, John Wiley.
- Dag Hammarskjold Foundation. 1975. "What Now Another Development." *Development Dialogue*, No.1/2: 1-128.
- Eppler, Erhard. 1985. "Maldevelopment in Industrial Countries." *Ifda Dossier* 50 Nov-Dec.: 57-64
- Galtung, Johan. and others. eds. 1980. *Self-reliance: A Strategy for Development*. London, Villiers Publications.
- Goulet, Denis. 1983. "Obstacles to World Development: An Ethical Reflection." *World Development* 11(7): 609-624.
- Griffin, Keith. ed. 1984. *Institutional Reform and Economic Development in the Chinese Countryside*. London, The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hirschman, Albert. 1971. *A Bias for Hope: Essays on Development in Latin America*. New Heaven, Yale University Press.
- Huynh Cao Tri. 1986. "Cultural Identity and Development: Scope and Significance." *Strategies for Endogenous Development*. Paris, UNESCO: 1-17.

Huynh Cao Tri and others. 1986. *Strategies for Endogenous Development*. Paris, UNESCO.

Huynh Cao Tri. ed. 1986. *Participation in Development*. Paris, UNESCO.

Inayatullah. 1967. "Toward a Non-Western Model of Development." Daniel Lerner, and Wilbur Schramm. eds. *Communication and Change in the Developing Countries*. Honolulu, East West Center Press: 98-102.

Inayatullah. 1988. "Decentralization for Rural Development in Pakistan: A Critical Review." *Building from Below: Local Initiatives for Decentralized Development in Asia and Pacific*. Kuala Lumpur, Asia and Pacific Center: 223-270.

Inayatullah. 1975. *Transfer of Western Development Model to Asia and Its Impact*. Kuala Lumpur, Asian Centre for Development Administration. Occasional Papers Series No. 1.

Inayatullah. 1989. "Social Sciences in Pakistan: An Evaluation." *International Social Science Journal* (122) November: 617-633.

Kothari, Rajni. 1984. "Modernization in the Third World: Development Strategies in Asia and the Issue of Freedom." Michio Nagai. ed. *Development in the Non-Western World*. Tokyo, University of Tokyo Press: 3-20.

Kuitenbrouwer, J. B. W. 1975. "Towards self-reliant Integrated Development." The Hague, Institute of Social Studies. ISS Occasional Paper. *italics

Lerner, Daniel, and Wilbur Schramm. eds. 1967. *Communication and Change in the Developing Countries*. Honolulu, East-West Center Press.

Lerner, Daniel, and Wilbur Schramm. eds. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press.

Lope, J. Leite. 1982. "Science and the Making of Contemporary Civilization." Anouar Abdel-Malek, Gregory Blue, and Miroslav Pecujlic. eds. *Science and Technology in the Transformation of the World*. Tokyo, United Nations University: 90-115.

Pearse, Andrews, and Matthias Stifel. 1980. "Inquiry Into Participation: A Research

- Approach." UNRISD. Participation Occasional Paper Geneva, UNRISD. * italics
- Preiswerk, Roy. 1982. "Could we Study International Relations As If people Mattered.?" Kim Falk, and Mendlovitz. eds. *Toward A Just World Order*. (1), Boulder, Westview Press: 175-197.
- Preiswerk, Roy. 1979. "Cultural Identity, Self Reliance, and Basic Needs." Paper Presented at the GPID III meeting. Geneva, 2-8 Oct. 1978. Geneva, GDIP, United Nations UNIV. Programs: 1-21. * italics
- Prince Clause. 1985 "Western Model is not Usable for Reconstruction of Third World." *Compass* No.24/25. October. *pp.
- Rahnema, Majid. 1986. "Under the Banner of Development." *Development* 1/2: 37-46.
- Rahnema, Majid. 1990. "Participatory Action Research: The `Last Temptation of Saint` Development." *Alternatives* 15(2) Spring: 199-226.
- Raper, A. Ribes, Bruno. 1981. "Introduction." *UNESCO, Domination or Sharing: Endogenous Development and the Transfer of Knowledge*. Paris, The UNESCO Press. *pp.
- Salam, Abdus. 1985. "Science Transfer for Development." *Ifda Dossier*, 50 Nov./Dec.: 45-56.
- Sayeed, Khalid Bin. 1968. *Pakistan: The Formative Phase 1857-1948*. 2nd ed. London, Oxford University Press.
- Schumacher, E. F. 1973. *Small is Beautiful*. London, Abacus.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. 1987. "Ethnocide or Ethnodevelopment: The New Challenge." *Development, Seeds of Change*: 74-79.
- Streeten, Paul. 1980. "Development Ideas in Historical Perspectives." *Regional Development Dialogue* 1(2), Autumn: 1-31.

UNDP. 1990. *Human Development Report 1990*. New York, Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. 1976. *Moving Towards Change: Some Thoughts on the New International Economic Order*. Paris, UNESCO.

UNESCO. 1980. *Domination or Sharing: Endogenous Development and the Transfer of Knowledge*. Paris, UNESCO.

United Nations. 1986. *Popular Participation in Economic and Social Development*. New York, United Nations.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1984. *The Politics of the World Economy: The States, the Movements and the Civilizations*. London, Cambridge University.

Wolfe, Marshal. 1986. "Popular Participation In Development: Conceptual Framework." *Popular Participation in Economic and Social Development*. New York, United Nations: 47-80.

i... With increasing doubts about socialism as one possible alternative to Western development model and resurgence of faith among some of development thinkers in the efficacy of Western model, we may be entering another era of uncertainty about nature and effective strategies of achieving development. This uncertainty may end with the acceptance of the western model as the only model of development, as some of the advocates of the thesis of "end of history" seem to suggest. Alternatively it may lead to search for other models including that of endogenous development which combine some elements of both capitalism and socialism. Therefore, the discussion of endogenous development is as relevant in 90s as it was in 70s.

ii... The success stories of South Korea and Taiwan has not yet materialized not received adequate publicity in the literature. In any case their achievements were not the result of full implementation of western development model as both the countries failed to institutionalise liberal democracy and their development occurred under authoritarian regimes.

iii... The universality of values incorporated in the Declaration sometimes is questioned particularly by some of the revivalist movements which argue that these values are essentially Western and that mixing them with specific values of other societies would only disrupt their cultural integration and impede the process of their endogenous development. While acknowledging some truth in this, Preiswerk argues that acceptance of certain minimal values by all societies and cultures which "might prevent them from condoning, both within and outside their own cultural sphere, such forms of behaviour as genocide, torture, racism, blatant exploitation of the poor, cruelty to women, mistreatment of children, or the neglect of the aged (Preiswerk, 1979: 7) is indispensable for any conception of development.

iv... Viewed in this perspective, "self-reliance as a doctrine is located more in the field of psycho-politics than in that of economics (Galtung and others, 1980: 21)."