

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

ASHRAFUZZAMAN, M.¹ – RAHMAN, M. S.^{2*}

¹ *Department of Anthropology, University of Chittagong, Chittagong, Bangladesh.*

² *Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Begum Rokeya University, Ranpur, Bangladesh.*

**Corresponding author
e-mail: sayedur34[at]gmail.com*

(Received 23rd December 2021; accepted 18th March 2022)

Abstract. The concept of ‘development’ is one that could be likened to running after a moving train. It is a concept that has been constructed in a particular history, culture and time, linked with industrialization, economic growth, and social transformations through economic, political and social re-arrangements creating a modern ‘state besides over the years the world has been confronted by a number of development challenges. Critical perspectives on development such as post-development, reject the idea of development as a universal necessity, as something desirable and a moral imperative, and as something that the Western world is entitled to bring about in other regions of the world. Post-development argues that the west proclaimed development as a universal and ahistorical process based on its own local experience. The starting point of this paper is the following question: What is the role of the notions of agency and power in the post-development Critique on the development discourse and Practices? Hence through review of the scholar's analysis this paper tries to reflect that development as a eurocentric myth, economic hegemony, economical dependency, legitimacy and power and geopolitical tool which is ruining the social system of development partitioner. Therefore, based on this background, this study will try to analyze the development process according to the power relations between the participants.

Keywords: *development, cultural hegemony, economic hegemony, dependency, geopolitical tool, neo-liberalism*

Introduction

Jones thinks that unless a study is conducted on an in-depth and thorough analysis of development itself, its relationship with the power structure, and its ideological framework, there will always be an expectation to eliminate issues such as hunger, poverty, health and hygiene, disease, and gender inequality (Jones, 2009) There must have some reasons for which the words such as fairness, equality, human dignity and self-realization in the dominant development discourse, are unheard even though they are sometimes used in unclear interpretation. Although Truman has given a speech for more than 60 years, the world's problems have not been eradicated (Kernell, 1976). Some authors believe that today's situation is worse than when Thurman gave his speech (Seligson et al., 1988). With this in mind, a reasonable question must be raised: While continuous development, the inequality gap continues to widen, is development itself a problem? This will be the main content of this paper.

Pierre Bourdieu in his book "The Reproduction of Education, Society, and Culture" (1990), analyzed the mechanism of how class elites reproduce existing power relations in society. To briefly summarize the arguments in his book, he believes that to reproduce existing power relations, ideological devices create a paradigm for every part of the superstructure, which affects all aspects from the media to family life and even the economy (and Contrary to Max's view, the superstructure is only affected by the

foundation). The relationship between the ruling ideology of the social system and class, production and power structures, and how to legitimize and perpetuate them, is the basis of sociological projects. In "Reproduction", Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron analyze education (in the broadest sense, it includes not only The process of formal education). They showed how education can carry out an essentially arbitrary cultural program, although it is not actually in appearance, it is based on power. In a broader sense, the reproduction of culture through education plays a key role in the reproduction of the entire social system. This analysis is not only carried out theoretically but also through the development of testable propositions within the broader framework of the historical transformation of the education system (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). Although his work is mainly based on culture and education, this kind of thinking can also be used in development politics. Therefore, we believe that development is (among other things) a tool for reproducing dominance relations. It can be seen with certainty that today's main development trends are based on neoliberal ideas (Desai and Potter, 2013; Milanovic, 2012).

Cultural Hegemony-development as a eurocentric myth

Vincent Tucker's "Development Myth: A Criticism of Eurocentric Discourse" provides a powerful argument for the flaws of the Eurocentric development paradigm. Tucker believes that development dialogue provides false hope, and a thorough examination of the world portrays the dismal failure of development plans. He believes that people in developing countries are in a worse situation because of the inability of Western countries' plans to improve living standards (Munck and Hearn, 1999). Tucker regards development as an invasion of the lives of people in developing countries by the "North" of industrialization. When he asserted, he made a harsh observation of the relationship that exists between developed and developing countries: development is a process in which other nations are controlled, and their destiny is based on a Western concept and perceive the world to shape. Development discourse is part of the imperialist process, in which other nations are deprived and become targets. This is an important part of the process of economic, political, sociological, and cultural management, control, and even creation of the third world in the "developed countries" (Munck and Hearn, 1999).

To understand development, we must study how ideas about development are generated. Although development is nothing new people can be traced back to modern development thought in the Enlightenment (Desai and Potter, 2013) and rational. In addition to the field of thought, the advancement of new technologies, especially the creation of human steam engines, began to feel the advantages of contrast with nature, which were considered objective and static (Cowen and Shenton, 1996). The latter becomes important for how science is formed and how to view reality. The new era in Europe was mentioned above, "this is the period when the modern economy, the modern state and the concept of universal sovereignty in free and democratic forms" (Munck and O'Hearn, 1999). These heralded great achievements and the idea of "progress" was born (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1997). The form and essence of "progressive" are inherent in some countries in Western Europe. It has become the eternal norm of the European superpowers, which all countries should follow, and become the basic rationality for the defense of colonialism and imperialism (Munck and O'Hearn, 1999). Therefore, development is not only a tool of reproduction, and an economic power relationship but also discourse and cultural relationship. It can be said

that the developing traditional society, "Third World" and other ideas are European creations.

Economic Hegemony

Hegemony is an analytical term used to conceptualize a historical period that is different from the historical background of 1945 after the merger of two major events: the collapse of the international political order based on European colonial empires and the establishment and evolution of a free international economy after the war. Nowadays, the term hegemony is often used to describe the relative dominance of a set of specific ideas and their related tendencies toward common sense and intuition, thereby inhibiting the spread of alternative ideas and even clear expression. The related term hegemony is used to identify actors, groups, classes, or countries that exercise hegemony or are responsible for spreading hegemonic ideas. Realists usually define hegemony in terms of overwhelming power first, and then the ability to use this power to dominate others. However, the main trend among realists is to equate hegemony with overwhelming material power. Realists usually regard the most powerful country in the international system as hegemony. A country with extremely superior military and economic capabilities. According to this view, power is synonymous with "capability", and a country's capability is just the sum of several loosely determined national attributes. These may include population size and territory, economic capacity, and military strength (Augelli et al., 1988). In the sub-discipline of International Political Economy (IPE), the concept of "hegemony" or "leadership" comes from two aspects: the concept of hegemonic order or world domination in the early 1970s. The economic issues clarified by Immanuel Wallerstein's theory of the world system (Wallerstein, 1974) and Charles Kindleberger's analysis of the "Great Depression" triggered a new realism debate. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has become an unparalleled and unprecedented global superpower moreover, in modern history, no country can develop so large in the rest of the world (Ikenberry, 2001). Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger believes that the United States has an advantage that even the most powerful empire in the past cannot match. He also claimed that the United States has unparalleled global advantages in weapons, entrepreneurship, science, technology, higher education, and popular culture (Kissinger, 2002). John Ikenberry also expressed a subtle understanding of hegemony. Look at the international order after 1945 from the perspective of liberal institutionalism. There is much literature on the theory and history of hegemonism in IPE, and the continuous development of the world economy has caused many discussions (Ikenberry, 2001). Critics of hegemonism place state power and behavior in the socio-economic structure of capitalism, and also regard class agency as the center of the establishment and evolution of hegemonic order (Agnew, 2005).

In the entire historical society, societies influenced each other in very different ways and even defined their courses. This is at least achieved through direct rule and imperialism (Rushton, 1999). Besides in the new colonies, the Roman Empire would build roads, bridges, and aqueducts, establish public health centers, and establish new taxation and administrative management systems. From Alexander the Great, American colonization to the Napoleonic Wars and the modern world, therefore, in a sense, the scale is unprecedented development is by no means a new concept, although its form and implementation have obviously changed (Cowen and Shenton, 1996). The Roman Empire, like all the great powers in history, is the culmination of a complex story. This

story makes a country surpass its neighbors, even beyond the general state, and then collapse with the rise of other great powers. The proper starting point for the story of the Roman Empire is 390 BC. That year, the Gauls from the north ransacked the city of Rome and affected the hearts of Romans forever. In the next century, the Romans will transform their tribe into the most feared fighting force in the world (Connell, 1989). The importance of national borders is decreasing (Seligson et al., 1998), and the role of multinational corporations such as corporations, monetary institutions, and global institutions (United Nations, World Health Organization, WTO, etc.) is becoming stronger. As a result, the classical power relations seen as power games between nations have become more complicated. Therefore, development should not only be seen as inter-state development, but also as inter-state and internal state development. Therefore, it can be said that the Roman Empire spent time and money on its subordinate areas, at least.

Development as economical dependency

Dependency can be defined as the external influence of the country, politics, economy, and culture on the country's development policy to explain the country's economic development (Bodenheimer, 1971; Sunkel, 1969). These definitions have three dependencies, which are common to most dependency theorists. First, affiliation describes the characteristics of the international system composed of two groups of countries, described as dominant/subordinate, center/periphery, or metropolis/satellite. The leading countries are advanced industrial countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The dependent countries are states in Latin America, Asia, and Africa that have low per capita GDP and rely heavily on single commodity exports for foreign exchange income (Bodenheimer, 1971). Second, these two definitions jointly assume that external forces are crucial to the economic activities within the dependent countries. These external forces include multinational corporations, international commodity markets, foreign aid, communications, and any other means by which advanced industrialized countries can represent their economic interests abroad (Bodenheimer, 1971).

Third, the definition of subordination shows that the relationship between the master-slave state and the subordinate state is dynamic because the interaction between the two sets of states will not only increase but also exacerbate the pattern of inequality. Besides, dependence is a deeply rooted historical process, which is rooted in the internationalization of capitalism. Dependency is a continuous process (Bodenheimer, 1971). Development is nothing new, although "development" (ie, development practice) has changed over time, the structural relationship between developed and underdeveloped has not changed (Frank, 1969). The relationship between developed and underdeveloped, we tend to think of it as a binary relationship. One person has the right to have a greater influence on another external connection. According to the dependency theory, this is not the case. It believes that this relationship is one of the dependencies that interdependent into a hierarchical structure. And this kind of structure is not unique to modern times but exists throughout history, but its volume has expanded. The structure is composed of the center (metropolis) and the surrounding area; it concentrates political, social, and economic forces, and has the right to extract resources from the surrounding area and exert influence on it. In turn, the center is the periphery of a larger center, which is the periphery of a larger center of a single hierarchy (Frank, 1969). Especially today, when trade barriers are eliminated and the

market becomes more and more open to foreign investment, this is true (Frank, 1969). This shows that development is a wide range of interactions, not limited to development assistance. It is the paradigm of the entire system that affects socio-economic, political, and cultural development. Besides, it shows that development does not occur in incredible evolutionary steps Walt Rostow took a historical approach, arguing that developed countries often have to go through five stages to reach the current level of economic development. These are:

Traditional society: This is an agricultural economy that relies mainly on subsistence agriculture, with almost no trade. The limited scale and low quality of the capital stock leads to extremely low labor productivity, and little surplus output can be used for sales in domestic and foreign markets.

Prerequisites for takeoff: Agriculture has become more mechanized, trading more output. Savings and investment growth, although still only a small part of national income. Some external funding is a needed-for example in the form of overseas assistance, or possibly remittance income from migrant workers living abroad.

Take off: Although the number of industries is still small, manufacturing is still of greater importance. Political and social institutions begin to develop-external financing may still be needed. Savings and investment growth may reach 15% of GDP. Although most people may still work in the agricultural sector, the importance of agriculture is relatively low from an agricultural perspective. There is usually a dual economy. The productivity and wealth of manufacturing and other industries continue to increase, while the productivity and real income of rural agriculture are stubbornly low.

To mature: The industry has become more diverse. As the level of technology improves, growth should spread to different regions of the country-the economy shifts from relying on growth factor inputs to making better use of innovation to bring real per capita income growth.

The era of mass consumption: Increased output levels have increased consumer spending. The activity of the tertiary industry is changing, and the expansion of middle-class consumers continues the growth, but this is natural in the dominant development discourse. A static and objective world, albeit quite biased towards a euro-centric view. Therefore, it is believed that if European powers have experienced a specific development process, it will be equally effective for other countries. therefore, rather than treating developing countries as being in the primitive stages of capitalism, it is better to show that these stages are only specific in a specific time and space (for example, Europe in the 18th century (Frank, 1969). Rostow model is based on the history of the United States and Europe and defines the mass consumption norms of the United States as an integral part of all industrialized social and economic development processes moreover, the model assumes that it is inevitable to adopt a neoliberal trade policy that allows the transfer of manufacturing bases of a given advanced regime to low-wage areas. Rostow's model does not apply to Asian and African countries, because events in these countries are unreasonable at any stage of his model (Seligson et al., 1998; Frank, 1969).

Second, the theory illustrates how this relationship is manifested. The role of the center is to obtain funds from its satellites and then direct them to larger centers again. Therefore, the more countries (or markets) periphery will be more accurate from a market perspective. To a certain extent, it will become more difficult to be penetrated by the center instead of borders.

Development as a way to legitimacy and power

Bornschier (1989) believes that legitimacy may be a determinant of relative economic success, and it should be legitimized through the relative lack of large-scale political protests. From the perspective of rational choice, there are theoretical reasons to accept Bonsky's proposition, and some reasons to doubt it (Weede, 1996). Although he carefully studied the robustness of the lack of empirical links between large-scale political protests and economic growth, Bonskill did not consider the allocation of alliances and their damage to effective resource allocation, which may affect the relationship between legitimacy and economic growth, relationship, and performance. To investigate this possibility, the influence of distribution alliances is called the "Democratic Age". A reanalysis of the post-war economic performance of industrialized democracies shows that Bornschier's (1989) early findings were neither as powerful as he believed, nor did they have a "democratic era" as we claimed based on previous studies the impact is so powerful.

In the introduction of "Improving Will", the author Murray Li borrowed from Foucault's previous work and explained the limitations of using force to rule (or as the author mentioned). In general, she believes that the use of force alone is not enough to maintain effective control over a particular territory and its subjects. She went on to describe that even among complete dictators with absolute power, such as sovereigns If the sovereign rule becomes too authoritarian, they may revolt. This is even more apparent in systems where the government seeks legitimacy for its rule. As Murray Li said: "...the exploitationism of the East India Company in Britain and the Netherlands caused ecological damage and population displacement, the ensuing drought, famine, and rebellion threatened profits and rule", take the lead in systematically thinking about the relationship between "people and things" as a stage for intervention, and mobilize and persuade their employers to do the same" (Li, 2007). The acquisition of the theme becomes one this is a good strategy to gain legitimacy, "buy" public order and create effective rules.

Development as a geopolitical tool

The Sustainable Development Goals adopted in 2015 represent a common vision for cooperation to achieve common international goals. Five years later, this optimistic agenda has repeatedly been shrouded in narrow national interests, which makes development tools serve geopolitical ambitions (Igoe, 2019). For many countries, foreign aid is an important part of foreign policy. Since World War I, the world's wealthiest countries have been using the transfer of goods, services, and funds as a way to interact with other countries. Over time, more and more states provide more and more resources to other states. Aid comes in the form of loans, usually lower interest rates or direct grants. The latter form of assistance has become increasingly important, relatively new to the states, and has been widely used after World War II (Azam and Thelen, 2008). In addition, countries also use aid to achieve a variety of different policy goals: some aid is military aid; some provide humanitarian and disaster relief, and some target economic development and long-term changes. Since aid resources are usually fungible, it is difficult to determine the actual results of aid. However, aid always has a geopolitical impact (Collier, 2007).

The literature reflects these changes in international politics to a certain extent and attempts to assess its importance to the aid system. In addition to aid politics, it is more

than just aid economics. Especially the geopolitics of foreign aid is highlighted. Broadly speaking, geopolitics includes domestic and international politics around aid (Burnside and Dollar, 2004). The global powers rarely use development aid as a lever of international politics. During the Cold War, it is well known that the United States and the Soviet Union spent a lot of money on government development assistance, which was of interest to the government. These governments are usually authoritarian regimes, such as the Augusto Pinochet regime in Chile and the Noriega regime in Panama. These systems have been continuously assisted by the U.S. government (O'Connor et al., 2019; Corrales et al., 2009). One of the most important examples was in 1983, when the U.S. and Saudi Arabia persuaded the overproduction of oil, causing the price per barrel to plummet to \$13 (Baumeister and Kilian, 2016; Tran, 2010). Every barrel of oil, which in turn led to the collapse of the Soviet Union's oil export-based economy, and the Soviet Union, needed a lot of funds to purchase new micro-oil technology.

Neo-liberalism: The dominant ideology

So far in this article, we have only talked about development in a broad sense. By analyzing the relationship between developers and developers from an economic and cultural perspective, we use development as a tool for development and hegemony. Although we mentioned the dominant ideological discourse, we think it is necessary to analyze what the dominant discourse is and understand how it achieves the above description of what development is. After the world economic turmoil in the 1970s, the oil crisis and debt crisis in the early 1980s led to market instability, and a series of new concepts and reforms gradually became the dominant economic policy and development strategy (Desai and Potter, 2013). Announced by the Reagan and Thatcher administrations, and promoted by the Bretton Woods system. Liberalism became the paradigm of development. Liberalism is an institution established by the Bretton Woods Conference, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank (WB). Although the development up to that time was mainly based on some form of classical economic theory (it must be pointed out that there is very little research on the development of the Soviet Union, so most development research is an analysis of Western development), neoliberalism advocates (Desai and Potter, 2013). This means going back to Adam Smith's teaching that the market is regarded as the subject of self-regulation. The author should not believe that the goals pursued by neoliberalism can be generalized among the ten policies of the "Washington Consensus" (Williamson, 1990):

- a. Fiscal policy discipline to avoid huge fiscal deficits relative to GDP;
- b. Shift public expenditures from subsidies (especially "indiscriminate subsidies") to provide the poor with a wide range of key services that are conducive to growth, such as primary education, primary health care and infrastructure investment;
- c. Reform of the tax system, expansion of the tax base and moderate marginal tax rate;
- d. The interest rate determined by the market where the actual interest rate is positive (medium);
- e. Competitive exchange rate;
- f. Trade liberalization: import liberalization, with special emphasis on eliminating quantitative restrictions (licenses, etc.); any trade protection that low tariffs and relatively uniform tariffs will provide;

- g. Opening up foreign direct investment;
- h. Privatization of state-owned enterprises;
- i. Deregulation: Except for reasons of safety, environmental protection, consumer protection and prudential supervision of financial institutions, abolish laws and regulations that hinder market access or restrict competition;
- j. Legal protection of property rights.

Although the above-listed are not strict policies followed by development agencies, the general idea has been widely used. It can be summarized as an attempt to relax market control, reduce government spending, minimize its role and stimulate an export-oriented economy. There are many participants in the development field. Obviously, every participant has the freedom (arguably) to not follow this logic, but considering the two main participants in development, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are still part of the UN system and are still the promoters of the UN. The neoliberal ideas of the main participants are undoubtedly the overall direction of development. These ideas are based (at least in the case of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund) on forcing countries to accept frequent radical and painful reforms (Green, 2012). This reform will fundamentally change the structure, freeze public wages, depreciating currency, privatize and reduce government spending (these reforms are called structural adjustment plans (IMF plans were later adopted by other institutions) (Desai and Potter, 2013), economic recovery plans (ERB).) and later Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF). The reason behind this is that the government is often prone to corruption, trade protectionism, and other forms of trade barriers, which leads to inflation and "suffocates" the market. Unnecessary government spending will be better utilized in the private sector (Desai and Potter, 2013).

Criticism of neo-liberalism

Without wanting to get caught up in widespread and obvious criticisms of the neoliberal capitalist system (though we have not diminished the importance of these criticisms), to measure the achievements of neoliberals in achieving their goals. If we look at the works of Adam Smith and later the neoliberal writer Milton Friedman, we will discover the importance of reasoning. The market is self-regulating. If given a certain amount of time without being affected by the government, it will eliminate problems such as wealth distribution and poverty (Desai and Potter, 2013). The idea is that capital will flow to where the individual's entrepreneurial spirit is most needed, mainly based on greed (Friedman, 1979). So, given that we have experienced nearly 30 years of neoliberal development, have the world's problems improved. So, there are some specific questions to answer this question. First of all, choosing the world puzzle is a problem. If we achieve the SDGs, there is no doubt that some progress has been made, especially in the areas of health and hygiene (U.S. Department of State, 2013).

According to the United Nations, about 700 million people have escaped the poverty line (U.S. Department of State, 2013). In this sense, one might say that the reform has not reached the level set by the Millennium Development Goals, but it is progress. On the other hand, poverty is a related term that is usually defined by the status of other people (for example, as opposed to developed societies); as Branko Milanovic put it: "*As we improve According to the overall global understanding, poverty and inequality in other regions will affect more people than today.*" By using GDI and GDP data to calculate, he concluded that since the 1850s, global inequality has been increasing

(Milanovic, 2012). Despite difficult statistics, inequality is increasing and wealth accumulation is still concentrated in the hands of a few people (Seligson et al., 1998).

Maybe different methods can help us clarify some things. Author Duncan Green summarized a study done by the Structural Adjustment Program Review Program (SAPRI), SAPRI's research is carried out in collaboration with non-governmental organizations, the World Bank, and scholars in multiple countries. Summarizing the Greens summary, the impact of SAP is great, mainly negative besides large companies, and SMEs (according to the report) are seen as the backbone of large jobs. The same is true for agriculture. Many farmers find that they cannot maintain a life of working in agriculture. In addition, despite financial liberalization and reduced workers' rights, reforms are still seen as a cause of increasing inequality. Finally, for companies involved in the production, privatization is considered wise, but privatization of necessary services (such as water and electricity) is considered unhelpful (Green, 2012). So what can be said about the impact of the development of neoliberalism? This is a delicate matter, especially due to measurement issues. Although the goals of the Millennium Development Goals have improved, the overall trend indicates that inequality has increased and wealth has become concentrated in fewer people (evidence against the trick flow effect). Therefore, so far, neoliberalism has generally failed to achieve its promised goals, and in some cases has even worsened the situation. As Green said in his book: "*If structural adjustment is a drug, it would have been banned very early due to its adverse side effects*" (Green, 2012).

Conclusion

In this article, from the above discussion, it could be assumed that development is not an independent process of depoliticizing technology also this is a highly ideological thought, derived from the progressive myth of Eurocentrism. In addition, development, which is a means of recreating existing power relations through a dependent self-service system. Most importantly, development can be used as a tool for direct political influence. The question is what conclusion can be drawn about today's development practice? Allowed development overlaps the above development characteristics. Going back to Adam Smith all subsequent economic liberals, the typical enlightenment theory. This reason stems from the progressive thinking centered on the euro, and the whole society will benefit by establishing a free, effective, export-oriented market. This can be achieved if the states eliminate trade barriers and the market shifts to specialized production and export of commodities with "competitive advantages", all of which are accomplished through the division of labor. Enlightenment theory exists by discovering problems. The economy is seen as a static and objective thing, and only measurable variables are considered. It never considers human happiness, self-realization, values, and aspirations.

Acknowledgement

We hereby acknowledge the input of every member of this team for their tireless efforts during this work.

Conflict of interest

The authors have declared no conflict of interest with any parties involved in this research study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agnew, J.A. (2005): *Hegemony: The new shape of global power*. – Temple University Press 288p.
- [2] Augelli, E., Enrico, A., Murphy, C. (1988): *America's Quest for Supremacy and the Third World a Gramscian Analysis*. – UNKNO 207p.
- [3] Azam, J.P., Thelen, V. (2008): The roles of foreign aid and education in the war on terror. – *Public Choice* 135(3-4): 375-397.
- [4] Adorno, T.W., Horkheimer, M. (1997): *Dialectic of enlightenment*. – Stanford University Press 449p.
- [5] Baumeister, C., Kilian, L. (2016): Forty years of oil price fluctuations: Why the price of oil may still surprise us. – *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30(1): 139-60.
- [6] Bodenheimer, S. (1971): *Readings in US Imperialism. Dependency and Imperialism: The Roots of Latin American Underdevelopment*. – Taylor and Francis 9p.
- [7] Bornschier, V. (1989): Legitimacy and comparative economic success at the core of the world system: an exploratory study. – *European Sociological Review* 5(3): 215-230.
- [8] Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.C. (1990): *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. – Sage Publication 143p.
- [9] Burnside, A.C., Dollar, D. (2004): *Aid, policies, and growth: revisiting the evidence*. – *Policies, and Growth: Revisiting the Evidence* 36p.
- [10] Collier, P. (2007): *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*. New York: Oxford University Press. – *Journal of Peace Research* 45(1): 121-122.
- [11] Connell, R.O. (1989): *Of Arms and Men*. – New York: Oxford University Press 384p.
- [12] Corrales, J., Kimmage, D., Kurlantzick, J., Link, P., Milani, A., Rahman, R. (2009): *Undermining democracy 21st century authoritarians*. – Freedom House 94p.
- [13] Cowen, M.P., Shenton, R.W. (1996): *Doctrines of Development*. – Routledge, New York 554p.
- [14] Desai, V., Potter, R.B. (2013): *The companion to development studies*. – Routledge, London 608p.
- [15] Frank, A.G. (1969): *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*. – Monthly Review Press, New York 436p.
- [16] Friedman, M. (1979): Interview excerpt from an interview with Phil Donahue: Milton Friedman-Greed. – Video Media: Youtube Official Portal. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RWsx1X8PV_A
- [17] Green, D. (2012): *From poverty to power: How active citizens and effective states can change the world*. – Practical Action Publishing 490p.
- [18] Igoe, M. (2019): *How geopolitics shaped global development in 2019*. – Devex Official Portal. Retrieved from: <https://www.devex.com/news/how-geopolitics-shaped-global-development-in-2019-96253>
- [19] Ikenberry, G.J. (2001): American power and the empire of capitalist democracy. – *Review of International Studies* 27(5): 191-212.
- [20] Jones, H. (2009): *Equity in Development: Why it is Important and how to Achieve*. – Overseas Development Institute 57p.
- [21] Kernell, S. (1976): The Truman Doctrine speech: A case study of the dynamics of presidential opinion leadership. – *Social Science History* 1(1): 20-44.

- [22] Kissinger, H. (2002): *Does America Need a Foreign Policy? Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*. – Simon & Schuster 352p.
- [23] Li, T.M. (2007): *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*. – Duke University Press 392p.
- [24] Milanovic, B. (2012). *Global income inequality by the numbers: in history and now-an overview*. – Development Research Group, World Bank 30p.
- [25] Munck, R., O’Hearn, D. (1999): *Critical Development Theory*. – Zed Books Ltd. 10p.
- [26] O’Connor, K., Janenova, S., Knox, C. (2019): *Open government in authoritarian regimes*. – *International Review of Public Policy* 1(1: 1): 65-82.
- [27] Rushton, J.P. (1999): *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. – *Population and Environment* 21(1): 99-107.
- [28] Seligson, M.A., Passé-Smith, J.T., Seligson, M.A. (Eds.). (1998): *Development and underdevelopment: The political economy of global inequality*. – Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers 13p.
- [29] Sunkel, O. (1969): *National development policy and external dependence in Latin America*. – *The Journal of Development Studies* 6(1): 23-48.
- [30] Tran, M. (2010): *Manuel Noriega–From US Friend to Foe*. – The Guardian Official Portal. Retrieved from:
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/apr/27/manuel-noriega-us-friend-foe>
- [31] U.S. Department of State (2013): *U.S. relations with Saudi Arabia*. – U.S. Department of State Official Portal. Retrieved from:
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3584.htm>
- [32] Wallerstein, I. (1974): *1974The Modern World System*. – New York Academic 440p.
- [33] Weede, E. (1996): *Legitimacy, democracy, and comparative economic growth reconsidered*. – *European Sociological Review* 12(3): 217-225.
- [34] Williamson, J. (1990): *What Washington means by policy reformo Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* – Institute for International Economics, Washington 15: 421-423.