

APPROACHES TO POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: SOME CONCEPTUAL CHALLENGES

by

Diana D. Nacer-Cherif

B.A., University of British Columbia, 1979

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Political Science



Diana D. Nacer-Cherif 1991

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

November, 1991

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

A P P R O V A L

NAME: Diana Nacer-Cherif
DEGREE: Master of Arts
TITLE OF THESIS: Approaches to Political Development:
Some Conceptual Challenges

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Chairperson: Professor Alberto Ciria

Dr. A. H. Somjee
Senior Supervisor

Dr. ~~V~~. Dobuzinskis
Second Supervisor

Dr. H. Adam
External Examiner
Sociology & Anthropology
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved: Nov. 22, 1991

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Approaches to Political Development: Some Conceptual
Challenges.

Author:

(signature)

Diana Nacer-Cherif

(name)

November 22, 1991

(date)

ABSTRACT

Most economic, political, and sociological contributions to development theory originated in "the modernization paradigm." Development was seen as an evolutionary unilinear process where underdevelopment was defined in terms of differences between rich and poor countries. Many of the principal contributions to modernization theory came from Sociology. The prescription for modernization thus proved similar to that of Westernization -- underdeveloped countries were to imitate Western institutions. Most scholars within political development also recommended such prescriptions. This thesis seeks to address and explain this reliance upon Western experience with reference to political development. It also seeks to point out that such an exclusive reliance on Western experience has created a problem of conceptual inadequacy in the understanding of the actual complexity of developing societies.

The thesis begins with a critical review of the predominating theoretical approaches to political development, followed by a look at some of the difficulties experienced in formulating a universal definition of the term political development against the background of the Westcentric tendency in existing political development theory. Chapter Two examines the problem of Western bias in studying political development. A

fresh analysis of the concept of ethnocentrism is attempted after reviewing both Anglophone and Francophone sources. Chapter Three considers the views on ethnocentrism and Western bias of several expatriate scholars presently working in the West. The final chapter summarizes the results obtained from the various critical examinations carried out in this study, and looks at their implications for the sub-field of political development.

This thesis concludes that the body of theoretical ideas employed in the political development literature often prevents us from understanding the complexity and diversity of political development processes of non-Western societies. An alternative approach has been proposed which emphasizes a particularistic and incremental approach to political development by considering the culture and history of the society in question. It is suggested that a multi-disciplinary approach incorporating "contextually tailored" regional models employing certain Western conceptual tools (wherever appropriate), would assist in shifting the focus of the orientation of development from an entirely Western perspective to one highlighting the specific country or region under study, thus minimizing ethnocentric or Westcentric biases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express special thanks to my supervisory committee: Dr. A.H. Somjee and Professor L. Dobuzinskis. I am very grateful to Dr. Somjee who has truly been an inspiration to me.

I would also like to thank the staff of the B.C. Research Library for their excellent assistance with literature searches. I am also grateful to Dr. B. Burnside for her very helpful comments and suggestions, and to Ms. S. Boutonné and Ms. H. Matsui for their on-going interest and assistance. Finally, I would like to thank the National Research Council, and particularly the Regional Director of IRAP B.C., Mr. Des Mullan, for giving me the opportunity and support to pursue this degree while working full-time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Organization of the Thesis	4
CHAPTER ONE: POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY: A CRITICAL REVIEW AND ANALYSIS	7
The Historical Approach	11
The Structural-Functional Approach	16
The Normative Approach	22
The Institutional and Interrelationist Approaches	31
A) The Institutional Approach	31
B) The Interrelationist Approach	33
The Contextual Approach	36
Some Recent Writings	38
A) Rethinking Political Development Theory	39
B) Alternative Theoretical Solutions	41
Political Development: The Complexity of Definition	44
Conceptual Inadequacies: The Problem of Knowing about Developing Societies	49
Some General Observations	59

CHAPTER TWO: THE PROBLEM OF WESTERN BIAS IN STUDYING POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT	64
Ethnocentrism: A Brief History and Definition of the Concept	67
Some French Writings on the Concept of Ethnocentrism	75
Ethnocentrism: French and English Nuances	82
Some French Reactions to Various Manifestations of Ethnocentrism	84
Some General Observations	92
CHAPTER THREE: EXPATRIATE CRITIQUES: REACTIONS TO THE WESTCENTRIC BENT OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT LITERATURE	103
Expatriate Scholars	106
A) Literature	106
B) Latin America: The Dependency Theorists	109
C) Other Expatriate Scholars from Latin America and Mexico	114
D) North America	118
E) China	119
F) Japan	122
G) India	125
H) Africa	127
I) The Middle East	129
J) Jewish Scholars: "Exceptional Cases"	133
Some General Observations	135
A) Differences among Expatriate Scholars	137
B) Similarities among Expatriate Scholars	139
CHAPTER FOUR: CRITIQUES AND TRENDS: IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY CONSTRUCTION	144
Summary of Results	145
Concluding Section	157
Works Cited	173

INTRODUCTION

Theodore Wright describes the very existence of the social sciences as being based upon the assumption that members of a society can study not only other societies, but also their own with some degree of detachment so as to create an objective science (93). This, however, is not always the case. To do research free from the "insider-outsider" dilemma (error resulting from preconceived biases and prejudices about others), it is necessary to become familiar with other people's values and cultures. At the same time, it is essential to know just what values researchers themselves bring to bear on the conduct of their own research.

In fact, the scholarly study of other cultures has proved to be an on-going challenge for social scientists of all disciplines. Political science has not escaped this challenge. Quite the contrary, since it has repeatedly been pointed out that many of the basic concepts and theories which guide the discipline, have been deeply rooted in the social and historical experiences of the countries of Western Europe and North America. The discipline of political science has not, by any means, justified its "very existence" to use Wright's expression, since it has continually relied, at the theoretical level, upon

American and Western European experience. This thesis seeks to address, explore and explain this reliance upon Western experience with reference to the sub-field of political development. It also seeks to point out that such an exclusive reliance on Western experience has created a problem of conceptual inadequacy in understanding developing societies. This thesis examines the contention of many Western and non-Western scholars that there are alternative approaches and orientations to the problem of development, and specifically political development, than the conventional approach taken by Western scholars. That is, Western scholars who viewed development in general as an aspect of modernization, and then went on to equate modernization with Westernization. It will also be argued that the body of theoretical ideas used in development studies, and specifically in political development, often prevents us from understanding the complexity and diversity of political development processes of non-Western societies.

The problem of unacknowledged bias is an on-going concern in the social sciences, which must contend with diverse pre-existing notions and prejudices, on the one hand, and the exclusivity of the Western historical and social experience, on the other. In this thesis we shall examine the nature of biases involved in understanding the political development of other societies. The

general issue of multiple bias will not be pursued; our focus will be mainly on Western bias and, more specifically, on ethnocentrism in political development studies.

Ethnocentrism is a phenomenon similar to one under review in recent anthropological literature, which implies that most concepts have been formulated with reference to the perception of social reality as seen by men. Masculine traits are thus used as the criteria of evaluation (androcentrism). Such has been the drift of the writings of Edwin Ardener and Ivan Illich. The major focus in the social sciences with respect to biases has, however, been on eliminating that aspect of ethnocentrism involving unconscious assumptions or notions of superiority over non-Western peoples. The discipline of political science has not yet fully resolved the problem of ethnocentrism. As already mentioned, political science and particularly the sub-field of political development continue to reflect much ethnocentric or Westcentric thinking at the conceptual level. Leacock states that: "Western social science is permeated with ethnocentric and racist formulations that place responsibility for the problems of Third World nations on their own supposed backward 'traditionalism'" (133). Chapter Two of this thesis will take a fresh look at the relatively old concept of ethnocentrism in an effort to contribute to an understanding of the Westcentric bent

of the political development theoretical literature, and to assist in understanding why this old problem continually re-surfaces.

The view that there is a diversity of cultures and that these cultures need to be understood and accepted is not new. Interestingly enough, Rousseau, writing in 1783, foresaw the importance of acknowledging and addressing differences among human beings: "When one wants to study men, one must look around oneself; but to study man, one must first learn to look into the distance; one must first see differences in order to discover characteristics" (qtd. in Lévi-Strauss Structural Anthropology: 35). Rousseau's message, more than two hundred years old, is still valid today -- it can still teach us something.

Organization of the Thesis

The introduction presents the main topic of the thesis, outlines the central points which will be argued, and sets out an organizational plan of the thesis.

Chapter One is devoted to a critical review of the predominating theoretical approaches to the study of political development in an attempt to illustrate the Westcentric bent of political development theory. Some recent works relating to political development theory are also looked at. This will be

followed by a look at some of the difficulties which the sub-field of political development has encountered at the level of definition. Chapter One will conclude by focusing on epistemological issues and, specifically, the sociology of knowledge in order to demonstrate why development theory tends towards Western ways of thinking, and why the construction of a universal definition of the term "political development" proves so difficult.

Chapter Two examines the problem of Western bias in studying political development. As already mentioned, a fresh examination and analysis of the concept of ethnocentrism will be carried out in this chapter. Writings of both Anglophone and Francophone authors on the topic of ethnocentrism are looked at in order to avoid a purely Anglophone interpretation. Both English and French writings on the concept of ethnocentrism are compared and contrasted. A review of some French reactions to various manifestations of ethnocentrism in contemporary French history is then carried out. The chapter concludes with a discussion of different ethnocentric expressions in French and English contemporary history.

Chapter Three takes into account the views on ethnocentrism and Western bias of a group of expatriate scholars largely from the developing countries who are presently working in the West.

A survey of their works is carried out with the objective of ascertaining whether or not there is an identifiable expatriate position, and if so, if this position differs from other political development scholars. Expatriate writings are compared and contrasted, and an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses is attempted.

The last chapter summarizes the results obtained from the various critical examinations carried out in this study, and looks at their implications for the sub-field of political development. Some suggestions on how to minimize ethnocentric biases conclude the discussion.

The discussions presented in this thesis are an attempt to advance and push forward the analytical process by raising questions and points of discussion, and by drawing tentative conclusions. The objective of this thesis is not to provide definitive answers but to provide a focus for further research, analysis, and discussion on the topic.

CHAPTER ONE

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY: A CRITICAL REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

Modern political development theory dates back to the end of World War II. Blomstrom and Hettne note that the earliest modern theory of development was purely economic and based upon simple modes of growth, in which capital formation was a key factor (19). These models were almost entirely based on the economic conditions of industrialized Western societies. The authors note that their application to the problems of the underdeveloped countries revealed an immense gap between fact and theory, and was compounded by the fact that most Third World countries mechanically imitated Western methods of study (20). Most contributions to development theory -- whether economic, political, or sociological -- originated in a basic paradigm, most commonly referred to as "the modernization paradigm." Development was seen in an evolutionary unilinear perspective and the state of underdevelopment defined in terms of observable differences between rich and poor countries (Ibid.). Development meant the closing or bridging of these gaps through an imitative process, where the less developed countries were expected to become more and more like the industrialized nations. The benefits of modernization were, for the most part, taken for

granted.

Sociology played a major role since many of the principal contributions to modernization theory came from that discipline. probably the most central figure was Durkheim, who, like other classical theorists, was chiefly concerned with the transition from "tradition" to "modernity" in Western Europe. Talcott Parsons' position, as stated in his Structure and Process in Modern Societies (1960), has been extremely influential among political scientists. Parsons believed that once capitalist forms were able to establish themselves, they would then lead to political initiatives similar to those in the West. The prescription for modernization thus proved to be very much the same as for Westernization -- underdeveloped countries were to imitate Western institutions.

W.W. Rostow conceived development as consisting of a number of stages which were basically derived from the distinction between "tradition" and "modernity." His was probably the most well-known economic contribution within the tradition of modernization theory. Rostow's doctrine was influential during the late 1950's and early 1960's, and was a typical expression of the Western development paradigm (Ibid. 22).

Other authors focused upon a variety of criteria but most considered political development as an aspect of modernization.

such a characterization also applied to those scholars within the sub-field of political development. Most of the major works representing the predominant scholarly perspectives or approaches to the study of political development were written in the 1960's and 1970's. These approaches can be classified as follows: the historical approach; the structural-functional approach; the normative approach; the institutional and interrelationist approach; and, the contextual approach. A critical review of the literature representing these different approaches to the study of political development will be presented in order to analyze the adequacy and effectiveness of the current theoretical framework. Conceptual tool sharpening is a critical and on-going process. The importance of "tool sharpening" cannot be overstated since analysis is facilitated by and carried out with the aid of effective conceptual tools such as theories and models. Apter captures the importance of theory with respect to modernization: "The theories are important only because the problems are so great" (Politics of Modernization 425). Apter's quote would also apply to development.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: (i) the historical approach; (ii) the structural-functional approach; (iii) the normative approach; (iv) the institutional and interrelationist approaches; (v) the contextual approach; (vi)

some recent writings; (vii) a section on definitional complexities; (viii) a section on the problem of knowing about developing societies; and, (vix) some general observations. In the first sections it shall be argued that contemporary political development theory reflects a strong Westcentric bias, and that developing societies need not and should not necessarily follow all of the political development paths already travelled by the industrialized societies of the West. Some of the difficulties that the sub-discipline of political development has encountered at the definitional level will then be outlined. This will be followed by a section focusing on the sociology of knowledge to assist in understanding why the construction of a universal definition proves so difficult, and why development theory tends towards Western ways of thinking. The chapter will conclude with some general observations.

The Historical Approach

In The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy (1966), Barrington Moore Jr. makes the following statement reflecting his emphasis on history coupled with his belief that all events should be explained with reference to the past: "Whether the ancient Western dream of a free and rational society will always remain a chimera, no one can know for sure. But if the men of the future are ever to break with the chains of the present, they will have to understand the forces that forged them" (508). Moore's historical approach, therefore, concentrates on what happened and why. The topic of his book is vast: the routes by which various countries have come to the modern industrial world. He looks at a number of countries: Britain, France, and the United States which were the products of bourgeois creations; Germany and Japan, which in their forced economic modernization went through an experience of fascism; Russia and China, which adopted the ideology of communism to transform their agricultural societies; and India which built an industrial base for herself with the help of shaky but surviving liberal political institutions. Throughout the book, the author poses various historical questions in an attempt to understand the complex process of social change in each of these countries.

The result of Moore's case studies offers an explanation as to why some societies followed a path to 20th century capitalist democracy while others ended up with fascist and communist systems. The author looks at the political roles played by the landed upper classes and peasantry in the transformation of agrarian societies into modern industrial systems. He identifies three routes to the modern world: bourgeois revolutions culminating in the Western form of democracy; conservative revolutions from above ending in fascism; and, peasant revolutions leading to communism. Moore considers all three routes as historical stages. The book is, therefore, an account of the various types of historical experiences faced by the landed upper classes and the peasants, that is, an attempt to discover the range of historical conditions under which either or both of these rural groups have become important forces behind the emergence of Western parliamentary versions of democracy, and fascist and communist regimes.

In attempting his comparative history of economic modernization, Moore makes a significant contribution in that he provides an explanation as to why some societies ended up as capitalist democracies or as communist systems. He does this by concentrating on the political consequences of the part played by the landed upper classes and the peasantry. Moore concludes that

the process of modernization begins with peasant revolutions that fail and culminates during the 20th century with peasant revolutions that succeed. According to the author, two classes -- the landed gentry and the peasants and the differing nature of the relationship between them -- were responsible for bringing about political change and economic modernization which varied from society to society. Indeed, economic modernization is the defining factor as well as the prime objective of Moore's three stages.

In identifying three historically relevant paths to modernization, Moore deviated somewhat from the modernization paradigm in that he slightly moved away from the traditional unilinear scheme. He did, however, perceive political development largely as a by-product of the push towards economic modernization which was initiated by the landed upper class or peasantry either together or independently. His theory is largely based on developed countries and, not surprisingly, upon a Western framework which concentrates on the historical and social experiences of largely Western societies. Moore writes from the point of view of what has already taken place in those countries which have previously undergone industrialization. His analysis is further weakened by his case study of India in that a single historical answer or explanation cannot account for

India's very different development history. Somjee has pointed out that in India political participation was introduced far in advance of her economic development (Political Capacity 12). This is not compatible with Moore's scheme. To label India an exception hardly works either since, as Somjee further notes, in many of the developing countries new political institutions were established as soon as the alien rule or the feudal order was brought to an end (Ibid. 24). Finally, Moore neither considers nor addresses the problem of pre-class societies -- those developing societies where classes have not yet totally crystallized.

The importance of an historical approach is also reflected in Organski's The Stages of Political Development (1965). Like Moore, the author employs an historical perspective or approach in order to provide a new theoretical framework for the study of comparative politics and growth. He lays out a four stage ladder to illustrate the paths taken to political development by Third World countries: 1) the politics of primitive unification, from dynasty and colonial beginnings; 2) the politics of industrialization, where new government and rulers begin the drive to production and oversee the move to the cities; 3) the politics of national welfare; and, 4) the politics of abundance. He believes that in their development, the politics of various

countries, developed or developing, revolve around these four points which we have outlined.

Organski opens his argument on a note free from Western bias, acknowledging that Third World countries will take a different route to political development than that taken by developed countries. He makes the point that developing countries do not require Christianity, free enterprise, or a two-party system to develop themselves politically. Unfortunately, he falls into the trap of employing Western archetypes to describe his theory. In other words, Organski's four stages of political development were conceived within an American framework and model where one stage follows another creating a linear sequence where, according to the author, politics are sequentially controlled by the degree of national unification, industrialization, welfare and abundance. Organski further implies that for all countries national unification leads to the politics of abundance.

Both Organski's terminology and his overall approach prove to be problematic. It has already been pointed out that, by referring to the four stages, the author projects a linear sequential progression of development where one step or stage follows another. Organski's successive stages model reflects a very Western approach to the problem in that the notion of

thinking, analyzing and evaluating in a sequential manner is typically Western. It is not necessarily the case that the development path taken by Western countries is even applicable to developing countries. This sequential misconception is analogous to what may be termed "the Western fallacy of progress" where it is automatically accepted that good leads to better, and simple leads to complex. We must recognize that political forms do not necessarily follow sequences originating in and tailored to Western societies. Organski makes the mistake of assuming that Western theoretical knowledge can be applied to developing countries in an across the board fashion.

The Structural-Functional Approach

Structural-functionalism is, in general terms, the study of reality as distinct parts (structural components) connected by interrelations or dependent functions (Anderson in Honigmann 207). This approach employs the concept of a system, and is essentially an explanation of society focusing on the social functions of structural parts. The main objective or goal of structural-functionalism is to discover "universal" laws of structural relations.

Structural-functionalists thus attempted to separate analytically the various structures that define society. Gardner

lists the underlying foundations of structuralism: the role of the environment; a belief in the uniqueness of man's cognitive processes; the importance of language; and, the appropriateness of a holistic approach to the understanding of behaviour and society (38). Indeed, the structural-functional approach promotes the treatment of ecology, which generally means "environment," as a distinct component among other institutional components (Anderson in Honigmann 207). Structural-functionalism has been applied to a great variety of approaches that share one common element: an interest in relating one part of a society or social system to another part or some aspect of the whole. The paradigm is the natural organism where functions are carried on and have many consequences for other structures.

The school of structural-functionalism was very influential among American political scientists in the 1960's. Three prominent political development theorists were structural-functionalists: Gabriel Almond, David Apter and Lucian Pye. Indeed, Almond was the intellectual leader and founding father of the sub-field of political development.

The development of structural-functionalism was greatly influenced by Durkheim whose main ideological contribution was the development of a "scientific" state supported system of morals, based on the notion of collective conscience and organic

solidarity (Harris 7). During the 1930's, there were essentially two convergent influences: Radcliffe-Brownian structural-functionalism, and Parsonian sociology. The notion of organic solidarity became the central theme of Radcliffe-Brown's structural-functionalism in the U.K. (Ibid. 8). Durkheim's solidarism was, however, not confined to British social anthropology. What is referred to as "synchronic solidarist-structuralism" was very influential in the U.S. at the same period on a larger scale. Its chief exponent was Talcott Parsons, who Marvin Harris refers to as "the institutionally most influential of all 20th century American sociologists" (8), and, "the paramount epistemologist of the century" (16).

Structural-functionalism has, therefore, greatly influenced American sociology. Kingsley Davis (1959) argues that structural-functional explanation is sociological explanation. The structural-functional analysis or approach adhered to by American sociologists such as Talcott Parsons, Neil Smelser, Marion J. Levy, Robert Merton, and others identified certain structural dimensions which were of great interest to the students of political development. As already mentioned, political scientists have been deeply influenced by the Parsonian school of sociology, which is driven by structural-functional analysis. Parsons' framework for the analysis of all human

action, like that of other structural-functionalists, is conceived of as a system. He considers culture, personality, and social systems as structural dimensions, and regards them as dimensions of social action. An account of how each of these dimensions interacts and how imbalances between them can be corrected becomes the basis for an elaborate functional scheme (Apter and Andrain 293). Parsons thus integrated the theories of social structure, culture and personality.

Since the publication of The Politics of the Developing Areas (edited by Almond and Coleman, 1960), Almond became the founding father of the sub-field of political development. Using his "developmental approach" (Almond and Powell, 1965), political development was seen as an aspect of the wider process of modernization, marked by three criteria: structural differentiation, subsystem autonomy and cultural secularization (Blomstrom and Hettne 23). Almond, employing structural-functional analysis, viewed a political system as a system of interaction directed to the goals of integration, adaptation and building of new capabilities to meet new challenges.

In his essay, "Introduction: A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics," Almond develops a conceptual framework within which different conceptual political systems may be studied. He formulates a common framework for comparing

political systems of different sizes, institutions, and background. In doing so, Almond found it necessary to "experiment with the conceptual vocabulary of political science" (Almond and Coleman The Politics of 3) as he found the existing vocabulary to be inadequate and obsolete. The author observes that the discipline of political science, until recent years, has simply concentrated on modern, complex, primarily Western states. Much of the terminology used within the discipline has naturally followed suit, reflecting a Westcentric bias. But in so doing, the new vocabulary that Almond came up with, hardly made any difference to our understanding of different political systems.

Maintaining that there is no such thing as a society without a political structure, Almond outlines a functional theory of the polity by separating political function from political structure. He specifies functional and structural elements, suggesting that political systems may be compared in terms of the probabilities of performance of the specified functions by the specified structures. The author states that political systems may thus be compared with one another in terms of the frequency and style of the performance of political functions by political structures. The point being, according to Almond, that statements about politics in political science literature are codable into functional-structural statements of probability, and that a step

has therefore been taken in the direction of a probabilistic theory of the polity. That is, a step towards the development of a formal theory of political modernization which, the author asserts, would improve our capacity to predict the trend of political development in modernizing states from selected indicators.

Almond's attempt to construct a new theory of political modernization was very ambitious. Two of his most crucial insights towards a clearer understanding of political development were: that a new vocabulary is needed to explain political development; and, that a new and different conceptual framework taking into account the size, structure, and culture of the political society under question is needed in order to study developing societies. His formulation of a new conceptual vocabulary to compare the political structures of both the developed and developing countries was commendable.

Unfortunately, Almond was not sufficiently sensitized to the differences between developing societies and Western societies, and to the differences among developing countries themselves. That is, to the particularities and diversity of each developing country. He underestimated their capacity to absorb and react to change, assuming that they could implement policies with the same facility as Western countries.

The Normative Approach

The subject of Apter's The Politics of Modernization (1965) is the process of transition through which all modernizing societies pass. It was one of the earliest works to underline the normative approach to political development. A norm may be defined as a social rule and as the average behaviour of a specified group (Reading 140). Parsons employs "normative" as referring to any "level" of culture, the evaluative judgements of which govern or define standards and allocations at the level below (8n). The normative approach to the social sciences thus concentrates on how things are, or how things ought to be. Apter believes that politics begins with models that are primarily normative and secondarily empirical, and that the identification of moral-political problems is all-important. Apter acknowledges that the subject of modernization is "bound to be too complex for any theory to remain suitable for long" (IX), and, like Almond, asserts that a new kind of knowledge is required to "describe connections between events different from those to which we are accustomed" (Ibid.).

Apter, following the structural-functional approach, suggests that development results from the proliferation and integration of functional roles in a community, and that modernization is a particular case of development.

Industrialization is a special aspect of modernization -- the period in a society in which the strategic functional roles are related to manufacturing. Industrialization is a consequence of modernization. Apter thus posits three stages of development: tradition, modernization, and industrialization. He further elaborates: "Development thus refers to differentiation and complexity, modernization to the establishment of rules relevant to industrial societies in hitherto non-industrial settings, and industrialization to the creation of roles organized around manufacturing" (Apter Some Conceptual Approaches 19).

Apter emphasizes the political rather than the economic variable as independent in modernizing societies since political parties or some other political group usually make up a subsystem in a society. For Apter, politics thus becomes the business of coping with role differentiation while integrating organizational structures. Apter considers the concept of choice as the focal point of the social sciences, uniting normative, structural, and behavioural theory. Choice is, therefore, one very important characteristic of modernity. Normative factors, the author asserts, determine legitimacy and set the conditions that governments try to meet.

In Choice and the Politics of Allocation, Apter stresses the need for a "wider and more capable theory able to capture

normative truths" (2). The author proposes a structural theory designed to suggest alternative ways of understanding and solving a central problem of contemporary politics, the relationship between development and order. The point of departure for Apter's structural theory is the concept of choice.

Apter defines choice as the range of role options in a system at any given time (Choice and the Politics 10). He points out that norms, structures, and behaviour are the three main components of choice. According to Apter, choice is related to development and order in that development is the set of system changes corresponding and leading to the expansion of choice. Development and order are interrelated, and development may generate disorder. The author states that these "seemingly paradoxical conditions" concern us because they arise from the emphasis on choice as a basic characteristic of human action.

Apter defines development as "the expansion of choice opportunities, alternative modes of action available to a given population in any society" (Ibid. 10). One of the most important questions that he addresses is, how can order be maintained while choice expands? Indeed, the purpose of his structural model is to provide a framework for comparative research where case studies could be used to illustrate how people confront freedom, where freedom is defined in terms of the expansion of choice. In

his words: "Expanding choice quickly and effectively is the modernizing problem; what to do with the potentialities of choice is the long-term moral issue" (Ibid. 38).

Apter summarizes his arguments: the greater the degree of development, the wider the range of choice; the wider the range of choice in a system, the greater the degree of normative and structural imbalance. This imbalance may alter the legitimate authority of government and weaken the flow of information creating a greater need to apply coercion, thus resulting in greater uncertainty. This "greater uncertainty" is important since the author is chiefly concerned with the way in which a political system responds to uncertainty.

Apter, although sensitive to the deficiencies of the Western model, believed that modernization represented a linear continuum because the concept of development itself is a recognition of change in a particular direction. His general orientation included the perception of "integrative" ways of thinking and the acceptance of "ideal types" reflecting ethnocentric implications, and the endorsing of static types. For Apter, political modernization became a value-loaded term, since he equated modernization with the capacity enabling a citizen to freely exercise his or her choice.

As we have seen, choice is central to Apter's analysis, acting as the point of departure for his structural theory. Apter cannot be faulted for stressing the importance of choice which is, without dispute, "a basic characteristic of human action." Unfortunately, his primary and central positioning of the concept of choice in order to understand the relationship between development and order, while relevant to Western societies, may not be totally appropriate for developing societies. In making his concept of choice primary, Apter expresses an ethnocentric or Western bias in terms of both temporal sequence, and with respect to the specific priorities of developing societies. Apter has, therefore, conceived choice mainly in terms of Western societies, gearing it to what these societies value and can afford. In doing so, the author ignores some of the basic requirements of developing societies.

Lucian Pye, greatly influenced by Almond and developing his work around Almond, was another American political scientist who adhered to the school of structural-functionalism in order to communicate his views on the normative aspects of political development. Pye was, in fact, instrumental in recognizing certain normative issues underlying political development. In Aspects of Political Development (1966), Pye lists ten different interpretations frequently associated with the expression

"political development," and, as a result, describes what he calls "a situation of semantic confusion which can't help but impede the development of theory and becloud the purposes of public policy" (33). Pye points out that the concept of political development was first defined by Western statesmen and policy makers and not by scholars, thus explaining both the state of the current knowledge and the terminology used to describe the problem of development. He maintains that scholars were unprepared for the demands of postwar history, that is, of dealing with the problems of conceptualizing the processes of political and social development.

Pye extracts the following common characteristics or themes from his list of definitions of political development: an attitude toward equality; the capacity of a political system; and, the differentiation and specialization of structures. The author argues that the drive towards equality and participation coupled with the capacity of a political system to accommodate them, should be the criterion for evaluating political development everywhere. He thus considers that equality, capacity and differentiation lie at the heart of the development process. Pye perceptively observes that development is not unilinear nor is it governed by distinct stages, but by a range of problems that may arise separately or concurrently. The

author advocates "fuller theories of nation-building," and warns of the danger that can arise from faulty conceptualization. Pye stresses a need for realism in the search for understanding the processes of political change.

Although all of the values emphasized by Pye have universal significance, he, nonetheless, did not look beyond the normative structure underlying the American constitutional framework. That is, he did not look beyond the American political development experience, using it as his central point of reference.

Pye employed the theory of structural-functionalism to communicate his ideas on the normative aspects of political development. As already mentioned, the discipline of political science has been greatly influenced by the Parsonian school of sociology or, more specifically, structural-functionalism. It has already been pointed out that Almond is a structural-functionalist as are Apter and Pye. It is not surprising that their approaches were very Western-oriented since the method that they employed was born of a theory originating in American sociology, which has itself been the target of substantial criticism. An awareness and consideration of this criticism is crucial since structural-functionalism provided the method from which three influential development scholars based their theory and approaches. If the base method is weak or inappropriate, the

resulting theory would naturally reflect these deficiencies.

Structural-functionalism has been attacked as illogical, value-laden, and incapable of explaining anything. Jarvie maintains that structural-functionalism was developed to solve a specific sociological problem and that it is a static model of social structure lacking explanatory power (216). In Jarvie's view, both science and history attempt to explain things and the aim of science is the solving of problems, not the collection and synthesizing of facts. Structural-functionalism can provide answers to functional problems. However, it cannot handle other problems, especially those posed by the social sciences. Many important social science problems pose questions that cannot be answered by functional analysis alone since, at the level of explanation, it answers but one question: "how does the system work?"

Structural-functionalism can solve logical problems, but it has difficulty solving comparative problems. In addition, structural-functionalism is unable to handle social change. J.M. Beattie writes: "...the functional approach has had effects both beneficial and inimical to the study of social change and the contact of cultures. Inimical because the functional, 'organic' notion of societies as functioning wholes,...does not and in itself cannot provide an adequate model for analysing and

understanding social change" (5). James Anderson agrees with both Jarvie and Beattie. He points out that: "Structural-functionalism excludes the possibility of the perspective necessary to a view of the constant interaction of the components in complex human systems" (207).

Jarvie states that the heart of the problem lies in the following question: Can all human societies be rationally reconstructed in terms of orderly conjectures (216)? Indeed, an additional question to be posed regarding a theory of political development would be: how can a static model explain and allow for the particular cultural differences, both past and present, of developing countries? Structural-functional analysis does not allow for historical particularism, and, as already mentioned, displays little interest in change. In addition, it makes assumptions of equilibrium, and takes what can be referred to as an "order" or "consensus" perspective. Bryan Wilson reminds us that the philosophical problems involved in translating the meanings and the reason of one culture into the language of another, and of explaining empirically-oriented beliefs in scientific terms, were not solved by functionalism; they were evaded (viii). We must not lose sight of the fact that the fundamental aim of the social scientist should be for explanation, keeping in mind that his or her theories should be

testable. Structural-functionalism does not always adequately explain "why."

The foregoing criticism of structural-functionalism is not intended to negate the necessity of formal analytical methods. It is aimed at: 1) the misuse of the method -- particularly regarding a general application of the method -- where form is emphasized at the expense of content; and, 2) calling attention to the weaknesses of a base method used by political scientists which was ab origine (from the outset) geared towards explaining American society, and was originally constructed to answer particular functional questions relating to that society.

The Institutional and Interrelationist Approaches

A. The Institutional Approach

In Political Order in Changing Societies (1968), Huntington takes what may be termed an institutional approach to the problem of political development. The author rejects the old liberal model of development in which all positive results of economic growth, equality, participation, and stability went together, because of its inadequacy. His main thesis is that political disorder and decay (violence and instability) are in large part due to rapid social change and the rapid mobilization of new groups into politics, together with the slow development of

political institutions. The primary problem in politics, according to the author, is the lag in the development of political institutions behind social and economic change.

The concept of "political community" is key to Huntington's analysis. For Huntington, "political community" is produced by political action and maintained by political institutions. Political community thus depends upon the strength of the political organizations and procedures in a society which in turn depends upon the scope and support for the organizations and procedures, and their level of institutionalization. In short, the degree of community depends on the strength and scope of its political institutions. Huntington regards the concept of "political community" as the most central in the path towards political development, where the community is adequately prepared to deal with the new challenges surrounding development. A breakdown tends to occur at the institutional level where institutions cannot cope with the entry of new forces into the society. Consequently, the result is not political development but political disorder and decay. Huntington thus carries out a two-dimensional analysis of participation and institutionalization concluding that institutions develop strength over time through careful nurturing, if the challenges to which they are exposed do not exceed the capacities they have

acquired at any given stage.

Huntington, focusing on the importance of institutions, argues that the more institutions a country has, the more politically developed it is. His analysis of institutionalization within the American context is by itself very complete. Unfortunately, Huntington's mono-causal explanation ignores other important factors that should be taken into account and included at some level of his analysis: social, religious and historical factors.

B. The Interrelationist Approach

No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries (1976) by Huntington and Nelson is a study focusing on the determinants and patterns of political participation in developing nations and on the interaction between political participation and aspects of modernization. The work reflects Huntington's above-mentioned ideas on development but covers a much wider scope in that it takes into account the general literature in the field.

Huntington and Nelson suggest that there is only one way to expand participation: through economic development. This is in tune with what Binder calls "the fundamental law of political participation" which holds that political participation varies

directly with socioeconomic status (751). The basic purpose of this study is to analyze the effects of social and economic modernization on political participation. The author's emphasis is thus put on political participation as the dependent variable, rather than a causal factor influencing other trends. The authors adopt what can be referred to as an interrelationist approach in formulating their conclusions with respect to political participation in developing countries.

Huntington and Nelson define the concept of participation as "activity by private citizens designed to influence governmental decision-making" (No Easy Choice 4). After pointing out that political participation is not a single homogeneous variable, the authors introduce a theory of modernization, participation, and developmental strategies and find, as Huntington previously had, the traditional liberal model of development to be insufficient and inadequate. The authors introduce a typology of developing systems: bourgeois, autocratic, populist, and technocratic. They argue that the three basic goals of development -- increased political participation, rapid economic growth, and expanded socio-economic equality -- are often at odds, causing political leaders of developing nations to choose among them. Huntington and Nelson thus postulate that the goals of political participation and socio-economic equality come into conflict

during the initial stages of modernization, while during the latter phase the conflict occurs between goals of economic growth and political participation. Political elites are, therefore, left to choose among the various goals and means.

The authors further state that the development hypothesis that posits a straightforward linear relationship between levels of political participation needs to be modified in two ways. They point out that, in general, development and participation do go hand-in-hand, but in some cases participation can occur without development, and in others some development can occur without participation (Ibid. 53).

Huntington and Nelson come the closest of all the scholars discussed to offer a broad social explanation of development. Their interrelationist approach concentrates on the importance of economic development, political participation, and socio-economic equality as the three basic criteria of development. They do, however, point out that in some cases participation can occur without development, and in other cases development can occur without participation. The attention given to dynamics operating at different levels, that is, the authors' efforts to join micro and macro levels, contributes to a development theory that does not fall back on a mono-causal explanation, and rejects the traditional development hypothesis (economic development

preceding the formation of liberal political institutions).

The Contextual Approach

In the political development literature, the problem of Western bias attained its climax with the contextual theory of S.M. Lipset and D. Lerner. Both of these authors interpreted political development largely as a function of previous social and economic development. Similarly, both Lipset and Lerner considered political participation as a function of social and economic modernization.

Lerner in The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing in the Middle East (1958) employs an overtly lineal, Western model as the base line for his typology of modernizing man. He states that the Western model of modernization (increasing urbanization leading to wider economic participation and political participation) exhibits certain components and sequences whose relevance is global. Lerner, therefore, maintains that modernization leads to increased participation. Democratic political participation, according to the author, becomes a function of urbanization.

Lipset's analysis is based upon the concept of democracy which takes centre stage in his argument. In The Political Man (1959) he defines democracy as: "a political system which

supplies regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials, and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office" (45). Lipset refers to democracy as "the good society itself in operation."

Lipset's central thesis is that democracy is related to the state of economic development. In testing his hypothesis, he found that in each case tested, the average wealth, degree of industrialization, urbanization, and the level of education is much higher for the more democratic countries. Lipset thus correlates stable democracies with various aspects of social and economic development.

Lipset and Lerner concentrate uniquely on the economic aspect of development, interpreting political development largely as a function of previous economic development. Lerner, for example, assumes that the Western experience of urbanization precedes democratic development.

Political Development: Some Recent Writings

The preceding sections outline the predominating and, at the same time, "classic" or longstanding theoretical positions within the sub-discipline of political development. An important question to be asked is, has there been any theoretical shift or significant repositioning in recent years? This section addresses some of the more recent writings related to political development theory.

Recent writings (the last ten years) on the topic of political development theory reveal that, although there is much discussion and debate focusing on the pros and cons of the received models, they have not been upstaged or replaced by other models. Many scholars wholeheartedly agree that a theoretical rethinking is necessary, yet very few offer alternative solutions. In addition, there are those who advocate the maintenance of the status quo. Recent works on the topic of political development theory can, therefore, be categorized as follows: i) those scholars who advocate a rethinking of political development theory but do not propose any alternative solution; (ii) those scholars who do propose an alternative theory or paradigm; and, (iii) those scholars who uphold the status quo -- they do not identify any problems or difficulties within the sub-discipline of political development. A selection of the writings

of groups (i) and (ii) will be discussed in this section. Some recent ideas of the founding father of the sub-discipline of political development which essentially promote the maintenance of the status quo will be looked at in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

A. Rethinking Political Development Theory

Among more recent scholars, there are those who recognize the deficiencies of the received models and advocate a rethinking at the theoretical level. While these scholars call attention to the fact that the status quo is unsatisfactory, they do not propose any other alternatives. Their work alerts us that something is wrong. It does not replace the present theory.

Stephen Chilton in Defining Political Development (1988), states clearly in the beginning of his book that his "work does not present a theory of political development" (3). He makes several very valid observations and poses some very good questions. In dismissing the identification of political development with Westernization, economic growth, industrialization, and modernization, Chilton concludes that development is an extremely complex process. He notes, for example, that political development is unilinear in structure but multilinear in specific content, and that social crises can have

more than one developmental solution (94). Similarly, Bernard Logan in his article, "Towards a Redefinition of African Development: A paradigmatic Re-appraisal" (1987), states that the objective of his paper is not to propose an alternative theory (139). The objective is to "initiate the process of paradigm change by drawing attention to critical instances of disjuncture between development theory and the reality of economic production in the broader African economy" (Ibid.). The author calls for the establishment of a culturally-sensitive paradigm within development theory.

P.W. Preston in Rethinking Development: Essays on Development and Southeast Asia (1987), agrees that the whole area of political development theory should be rethought. He does not, however, support the idea that the sub-discipline is in a state of crisis or any sort of difficulty. He focuses largely upon the socio-historical-economic-political circumstances of developing countries. Although the author does not agree that "expert intervention" is the key to development theorizing, he does not offer any alternative. Denis Goulet in "Participation in Development: New Avenues" (1989), argues that new forms of popular participation are needed in the transition to equitable development. He concludes that it is the nature and quality of participation which largely determine the quality of a nation's

development pattern. The author suggests that future alternative development strategies should include the active role of non-elite participation.

Irene Gendzier does an excellent review of the political development literature in Managing Political Change -- Social Scientists and the Third World (1985). While the author states that: "The deconstruction of Development doctrine suggests other paths of explanation" (197), she does not propose another explanation or model. Gendzier's conclusion reflects the present state of political development theory: "...those who have relied on the paradigms of Development studies to understand the nature of Third World societies will have learned something of their own political tradition instead" (Ibid.).

B. Alternative Theoretical Solutions

An examination of recent works relating to political development theory indicates that alternative solutions are few and far between. Of the authors examined, those who do suggest alternative models either promote the merging of existing models, or they advocate theories that still reflect the Western conception of development.

Rethinking Development: Modernization, Dependency, and Postmodern Politics (1987) by David Apter, is a collection of

writings (all chapters except for chapter one have appeared in Apter's earlier works) on the politics of development over the past two decades. Apter states that it is good time to rethink development: "What is required is a strategy that, integrating system and process, will prevent the subject from becoming excessively fragmented and divided into hostile points of view" (15). He proposes a renovated version of modernization theory taking selected ingredients from both dependency theory and modernization theory. He maintains that taken together, "they enable us to see how integrative tendencies and a moving equilibrium can go together with polarization, and each as a function of growth" (29). Apter refers to his present theory as a more "curvilinear" one, combining both dependency and modernization.

Although Apter does propose an alternative theory, it is still an "upgraded" version of modernization. The underlying theme of his book, like that of his previous works, is that development will generate democracy. For Apter, development is still equivalent to expanding choice.

Harry Eckstein in "The Idea of Political Development: From Dignity to Efficiency" (1982), does sketch out a revised theory of political development but is guided by his belief that "the essential task of developing a theory of political stages --

linking in degree and kind -- remains unfulfilled" (466).

According to this author, it is a critical task of development theory to construct a comprehensive theory of history.

Eckstein's proposed theory, however, still offers a view based on steps or stages since he stresses that distinct stages should be identified that link traditional to modern society.

While the previously discussed scholars all concede from the outset that the received models are unsatisfactory, they do not tend to zero in and dwell on just what could account for this. Namely, the conceptual inadequacy of the present body of theoretical knowledge resulting from Westcentric assumptions, which is the focus of this thesis. None of these authors offer a viable alternative theory.

Political Development: The Complexity of Definition

This section addresses some of the problems associated with defining the term "political development."

It has often been pointed out that after one defines the words, half of the discussion is over. Unfortunately, the task is not so clear-cut with respect to the sub-field of political development since there are many variations of the definition of the term "political development." Indeed, this has posed an additional problem for the student of political development. Within this sub-field, the framework of analysis remains somewhat loose because the problem of determining a specific definition of the term "political development" has not been adequately addressed. This is due in part to the problems associated with attempting to formulate a single definition of the term. There is, however, no shortage of definitions of the term "political development."

As previously pointed out, most scholars working in this field agree that political development is a complex concept and has in it an element of modernization. Rostow perceived development as a number of stages derived from the distinction between "tradition" and "modernity." Moore believed that two classes, the landed gentry and the peasants, brought about the economic modernization of society. Similarly, Organski maintains

that political development occurs in order to bring about the politics of abundance. He defines political development: "...as increasing governmental efficiency in utilizing the human and material resources of the nation for national goals" (7). Almond saw political development as an aspect of the wider process of modernization. Apter asserts that development results from the proliferation and integration of functional roles in a community and that it is equivalent to expanding choice, while Huntington states that his concept of "political community" is the most central goal in the path towards political development, where the community adequately prepares and attains a moral sensitivity to deal with the new challenges surrounding development. Huntington associates political development with "institutionalization and political organizations and procedures" (Political Order 386). Both Lipset and Lerner interpreted political development largely as a function of previous social and economic development. Pye attempts to "elaborate some of the confusing meanings frequently associated with the expression 'political development'" (33). He offers ten meanings associated with the term political development. For example, political development as: the prerequisite of economic development; the politics typical of industrial societies; political modernization; mass mobilization and participation; mobilization and power, etc. As opposed to

political scientists, economists are placed in an enviable position when they define economic growth as high mass consumption.

The highest level of intellectual endeavour and probably the most difficult task a scholar confronts is the clear defining of his or her terms. Conceptually speaking, a definition of a concept should be precise, unambiguous, and universally valid. It is the last condition which presents the most difficulties in that a universally acceptable cross-cultural definition per se is impossible to construct because of the fact of cultural variation. The problem of cultural relativism surfaces. Gellner points out that what we suppose to be objective reality or "truth" is but the product of the cognitive apparatus of the individual, community, or age (84).

The concept of cultural relativism has profoundly affected American Anthropology. Melville Herskovits is its most articulate spokesman. The notion of ethnocentrism is often contrasted with cultural relativism -- the perception that the norms and values of each culture have their own validity and cannot be used as a standard for evaluating other cultures. Or, the position that each way of life can be evaluated only according to its own standards of right and wrong. Cultural relativists thus hold that human populations vary widely in their

cultural values, in their conceptions of what is good, true, and beautiful, and that the understanding of a culture different from one's own requires seeing it from the indigenous point of view (LeVine 52). The observer of another culture thus attempts to be on guard against his or her own ethnocentric bias, and at least tries to transcend or eliminate it for the period of his or her observation. In practice, however, an observer cannot completely eradicate his or her cultural conditioning. The most important aspect of the position of the cultural relativist is that it implies a more empathetic understanding of foreign cultures and institutions. That is, an understanding of other societies in terms of their own cultural traditions and history.

A universal definition may not even be desirable or useful. Just because it is assumed that a universal or all-embracing definition is a good thing does not necessarily mean that such a definition would be helpful or beneficial. The point, however, is moot in that truly universal definitions are impossible to construct because, as already mentioned, of the fact of cultural variation. One can, nevertheless, resort to lesser forms of definition in order to facilitate the task: stipulated definitions where a relational definition is attempted; a description of the attributes of the problem in question (for development: economic growth, public participation, disparity of

income, that is, what "development" should consist of); or, finally, a classification where existing meanings, interpretations, and definitions are presented--in this case, the works of development scholars (Somjee lecture, 90/07/30).

A classification presenting existing meanings, interpretations, and definitions of the concept of "political development" was attempted at the beginning of this chapter. Nine development scholars were examined. Each of these scholars presented his own varying definitions of the term "political development." A stipulated or relational definition of the term "political development" is possible but a qualifier must be joined at the end of the definition: For example, "development" means: economic development; the politics similar to industrial countries; political modernization; the creation of a nation-state; public participation; democracy; political and social stability; and, continuing social dynamics to take care of problems as they arise. As mentioned, a cross-cultural universally accepted definition of the term "political development" proves very difficult. The preceding classification illustrates the difficulties associated with adopting a single universal concept or definition relating to the process of political development for all developing societies. As already mentioned, it is the criteria of universality which presents the

most difficulties. The following section attempts to shed some light on this topic.

Conceptual Inadequacies: The Problem of Knowing about
Developing Societies

It is quite comprehensible that the major approaches to the study of political development exhibit strong tendencies toward a Western orientation, and that the various definitions of the term "political development" reflect the cultural background of each scholar's intellectual experience and knowledge. Not all aspects of our social or political knowledge can be universal. This is because our social and historical experiences also become components of the knowledge that we produce. Conversely, not knowing enough about the social and historical experiences of others can give rise to inadequate knowledge. Despite vast ignorance, stereotyping and prejudice, we are beginning to know more about developing countries. They do, however, continue to present us with a formidable challenge since they are, for the most part, little known entities to the West.

Such questions which deal with the study of the nature of knowledge fall under the branch of philosophy called epistemology. Epistemology may be defined as the study of

questions concerning the nature, possibility, limits, and sources of knowledge or of certain kinds of knowledge (Reading 77).

Epistemology is therefore concerned with reliable knowledge and continuous rational criticism for attaining it. Thus Webster's Dictionary defines epistemology as "the branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of knowledge, its origin, foundations, limits and validity" (318). In our contexts, the terms "limits and validity" become significant. Jane Flex notes that epistemology can be conceptualized as the study of the life-situation of consciousness, an inquiry which is ultimately political and historical (1016). It is a vast subject with an ancient history. Philosophers have grappled with what constitutes truth and knowledge from Plato onwards. Related to epistemology but a separate field of knowledge is the sociology of knowledge. The sociology of knowledge is the study of the relationships between systems of thought, sciences and ideologies, and their socio-economic context (Forbes Nationalism, Ethnocentrism 23).

In his article, "Epistemology and Sociology of Knowledge: An Hegelian Undertaking," Joachim Israel points out that the sociology of knowledge and epistemology represent different and separate fields of knowledge (113). The reason, according to Israel, is that sociology originated in philosophy and as it

found its own identity, two different relations evolved between it and philosophy. The first was characterized by sociology's attempt to develop as an independent and positivist science away from philosophy. The second attempted to transform philosophy into a field of sociological inquiry concentrating on the social roots of knowledge and upon the "sociologization" of the philosophy of science, aiming at replacing epistemology with the sociology of knowledge (Ibid. 111).

The insights from the sociology of knowledge are of particular interest to this discussion in that the sociology of knowledge supports the notion that knowledge is formed within the contexts of particular historical and social situations, and is therefore shaped by such historical and social contexts.

The sociology of knowledge has chiefly German origins, growing from the works of writers such as Marx, Nietzsche and Max Scheler, and in France from the work of Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss (Oldroyd 342). Karl Mannheim has also made a significant contribution. It thus emerged from European sociology which posited that the social characteristics of a category of thinkers determine their intellectual products as much or more than the intrinsic merit of their ideas themselves (Maquet qtd. in Wright:89). Mannheim, who thought through the problems associated with the sociology of knowledge, asserted that social

relationships influence the very form of thought. He thus maintained that knowledge was socially and historically determined except for mathematics and the natural sciences. Epistemology, according to Mannheim, is the product of social formations, and varies accordingly from one epoch to the next (cited in Oldroyd:343). What counts as knowledge is determined by the society within which that knowledge is generated. Social and cultural factors thus play an important role. Oldroyd maintains that the work of sociologists of knowledge is important for our understanding of science, and more broadly for a satisfactory epistemology since "what we regard as knowledge, is always a product or combination of both 'objective' and 'subjective' elements" (365).

Parsons would agree with Mannheim in that the former believes that every social theory is relative to the society in which it belongs. The problems of what Parsons calls the sociology of ideology cannot be clearly stated except in the context of an explicitly cultural reference. Parsons thus states that only through an analysis of both social and cultural systems, and of their interpretation and interdependence, can an adequate sociology of knowledge be worked out (165).

Stephen Toulmin points out that, in science as much as in ethics, the historical and cultural diversity of our concepts

gives rise to intractable problems (478). Our concepts, standards of judgement, and interpretation of experience all depend on where one is born and where one happens to live. They are all, therefore, historical and cultural variables. In light of this, Toulmin advocates "the reappraising of our strategies in the light of fresh experience" (503).

The position of the sociologist of knowledge is, nonetheless, highly relativistic. If we accept that all knowledge is socially conditioned, then the problem posed by relativism becomes paramount, since to say that all knowledge reflects the social relations of its creators is to say that all knowledge is relative. What is important, however, is to abstract the significant points that all social scientists should be aware of:

- social and political knowledge is determined by the society within which it is generated. That is, what concepts one employs, what standards of rational judgement one acknowledges, and how one organizes one's life and interprets one's experience, depend largely upon when one was born and where one lived (Ibid. 50).
- the problem of the culture-boundedness of meaning is ever-present. The weight of our culture is always behind us.
- what appears to be irrational may be interpreted as rational when fully understood in its cultural context. Within the appropriate frame of reference, "savage ignorance" is as rational as "civilized knowledge."

The authors cited in the following paragraph share an important common characteristic. They all stress the contingent character of all social science concepts and descriptions.

Lawrence Godtfredsen reminds us that all our theories and paradigms, our thinking about an objective or actual world, arise from our perceptions, formed in part by our own personal, ethnic, cultural, and religious presuppositions (66). He states that "...our ways of encountering the world are inherently and necessarily value-laden and purpose-oriented" (Ibid.). Indeed, Edwin Ardener observes that the human universal lies in the capacity of both sides to gain that particular experience (184). That is, in order to achieve a "total understanding," each party would have to experience the event or issue in question. Ardener states that "understanding appears to be about disequation rather than equation" (Ibid.). For this author, the translation of culture occurs at the level of the interpretation of events and is, therefore, subject to whoever is doing the interpreting. Similarly, Joseph Needham likens forms of experience to different languages -- all of them representing "valid" reactions of man to the universe, but none of them having over-riding authority (270).

Hermeneutics is concerned with the art of understanding linguistically communicable meaning. The German hermeneutic

philosopher, Hans-Georg Gadamer has done considerable work in this area. Some of his ideas, relevant to our present discussion, can be summarized as follows:

Gadamer endorses the traditional conception of understanding an unfamiliar text or way of life as a holistic process, operating within a hermeneutic circle in which we move back and forth between specific parts of the "text" and our conception of it as a totality (Outhwaite 23). Indeed, the movement of understanding always runs from whole to part and back to whole in hermeneutics. Gadamer stresses that understanding is not a matter of forgetting our own horizon of meanings and putting ourselves within that of the alien texts or the alien society; it means merging or fusing our own horizons with theirs. Our intellectual positions are not, therefore, an obstacle to knowledge so much as a condition of knowledge, since they make up the fundamental structure of our relationship with our historical tradition (Ibid. 26).

Employing the basic metaphor of the fusion of horizons ("ours" with "theirs"), Gadamer calls attention to the classic but frequently forgotten rule of interpretation: that one must understand a text (or way of life) in its own terms. The author asserts that a hermeneutically trained mind must from the start be open to the "otherness" of the text. He further states: "One

has to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text presents itself in its otherness and in this manner has the chance to play off its truth in the matter at hand against the interpreter's pre-opinion" (68).

Hermeneutics is not the focus of this thesis. It has been referred to only to illustrate that our efforts to know about other societies and their development processes present us with a large range of cognitive problems, over and above problems presented by individual intellectual positions.

Before we conclude this section we should also take into account the position of anti-relativists. Karl Popper is a staunch critic of relativism.

Popper criticized the ideas of Scheler and Mannheim for their extraordinary emphasis on the social and historical conditioning of social science knowledge. His attack was not, however, a frontal attack on these two scholars, especially the latter. Popper argued that one does not arrive at truth by socioanalysing oneself. "Truth" is arrived at by means of rational criticism and discussion among fellow scholars which ensures the "public" character of knowledge (Popper The Open Society 212-223).

Such a position, however, did not fully refute that of the sociologists of knowledge who focused on the sources and

influences of social science knowledge. It merely reiterated the position that "truth" is either universal or non-existent, and that it can be approximated through continuous rational criticism. In development studies, however, where scholars insulated themselves from critics (at least in the earlier period), an unwarranted assumption was made that their theories and paradigms were of universal applicability and value. When this was challenged, there was no discourse or dialogue in a Popperian sense, only the stating of and holding on to respective positions. What we thus have in development studies is the near absence of rational discourse and criticism which assist us in defining the body of our theoretical ideas.

The foregoing discussion also has bearings on what we mean by "political development." Scholars from developed countries look to a more universally acceptable definition of the concept, whereas scholars from developing countries maintain that we shall have to get by without an acceptable definition. After all, scholars, legislators, judges, and the general population did not wait for the construction of a universally accepted definition of "freedom" or "justice." Similarly, we may have to make do with a set of characteristics of political development which are identified from time to time, and which may differ from one society to another. Then there is the problem of what developing

countries may lack as a result of their own interrupted development. (See in this connection Somjee's "public minimum" which makes a plea for the acceptance of certain conditions which make civilized political life possible, while countries struggle with the problems of their political development.)

Some General Observations

One cannot dispute the fact that the scholars outlined in the previous section have made significant and influential contributions to the field of political development theory. If one can speak of a paradigm in development theory, the modernization perspective does provide one. It has a long tradition in Western social thought. The modernization paradigm has, however, generated much criticism. It would be correct to say that in its more simplistic form, the modernization paradigm served as a development ideology, simply rationalizing cultural colonialism. Wiarda points out that such concepts as "development" or "modernization" must simply be recognized for what they are: metaphors, poetic devices, shorthand tools, abstractions that have some importance in defining, outlining, or describing reality but should not be mistaken for reality itself (165).

In this chapter it has been argued that there is a notable theoretical inadequacy in the political development theoretical literature with respect to the non-Western world. The predominant scholarly perspectives to the study of political development examined proved unsatisfactory and inappropriate with reference to developing countries. Their application to developing countries has been seriously questioned due to the

following reasons:

- political development was generally perceived of as a by-product of the push towards economic and social modernization;
- the theories were largely based on developed countries;
- Western archetypes were identified and sought to be replicated;
- the theories were not sufficiently sensitized to the differences between developing societies and Western societies, and to the differences between developing societies themselves;
- linear models of development were used;
- the normative structure underlying the American political development experience was too concentrated upon;
- the structural-functional method employed by three leading political development theorists is questionable in terms of its appropriateness for measuring and monitoring political development, and has been the target of widespread criticism;
- mono-causal explanations were concentrated upon;
- all approaches explain Western historical and political reality much more effectively and accurately than non-Western historical and political reality;
- the approaches examined thus neglect an understanding of the actualities of developing countries' history, culture, experience of recent development, and perception of how elites and scholars of developing regions view their own social and political reality. And,
- only one approach alluded to a broad social explanation of development (the interrelationist approach of Huntington and Nelson).

The most critical assumption common to the various approaches examined in this chapter is that developing societies will, at one point or another, follow the political development path already travelled by the industrialized societies of the West, in spite of the fact that developing societies possess basically different cultures and histories.

It has thus been argued that the theoretical inadequacy of the political development literature is in part due to the influence which American sociology, and specifically structural-functionalism, has had on the discipline of political science which has contributed to both the normative structural-functional and Westcentric bent of political development theory. Three leading political development theorists employed structural-functionalism which was born of a theory originating in American sociology. It was suggested that structural-functionalism may not have been entirely appropriate due to its lack of explanatory powers and Western orientation. In addition, it has been argued that the theoretical inadequacy of the political development literature is partially due to the failure of development theory to account for the individual particularities and diversity of developing countries.

Some recent writings relating to political development theory were looked at. All of the scholars agreed that a

rethinking of the sub-discipline was necessary, yet none specifically focused on how we arrived at the present state of conceptual inadequacy. None of these scholars offered acceptable alternative solutions.

It was pointed out that there exists a variety of definitions of the term "political development." It was suggested that a stipulated or relational definition of the term "political development" could be constructed but that adequate qualifications would have to be added. In addition, it was suggested that a universally acceptable cross-cultural definition of "political development" is impossible to construct because of cultural variation. It was argued that the criteria of universality presents the most difficulties in terms of establishing a single definition of "political development."

In order to shed some light on the problems associated with constructing a universal definition, and to assist in explaining why Western scholars tend towards Westcentric theories and models, the sociology of knowledge was looked at. The sociology of knowledge supports the notion that knowledge is formed within the contexts of particular historical and social experiences of a society. Although the position of the sociologist of knowledge is highly relativist, it was pointed out that social science knowledge is, nonetheless, determined by the society within which

it is generated and is, therefore, culturally determined. As already mentioned, the development scholars mentioned in the beginning of this chapter were all, of necessity, describing their own experiences with respect to the development process which they expressed through various Western oriented theories.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PROBLEM OF WESTERN BIAS IN STUDYING POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The discipline of political science, and specifically the sub-field of political development, has much ground to cover in terms of eliminating Western bias or ethnocentrism from its literature. Some progress has been made, however, since some political scientists, including some scholars from the Third World, have acknowledged that the vast bulk of our social science findings, models, and literature which purport to be universal are in fact biased, Eurocentric, and not universal at all. They tend to be based on the narrow and particular experiences of Western Europe and the United States and, as a result, have different degrees of relevance to the rest of the world. Abdo Baaklini maintains that the growing volume of literature on developing countries by Western scholars has been marred by the persistence of ethnocentric interpretation, and that this inadequacy of current analysis has generated not only faulty knowledge, but has also proved an obstacle to development itself (558).

Thus, it is increasingly being recognized in political science that the currently used theory and concepts are, in fact, biased by a value-laden, Western perspective. Walter Neale

asserts that because of their origin, the sciences of man, including the technical sciences, are heavily tainted by Eurocentrism. This is because the very concepts and vocabulary used, as well as most of the theories, have been evolved in the light of European experience (Neale 129). Among more progressive political scientists, there are those who boldly challenge the received wisdom by advocating a fundamental reexamination of most of the "truths" social scientists, especially North American social scientists, hold to be self-evident. They are seriously questioning the appropriateness and adequacy of the terms, concepts, and theories currently used to explain the social and political reality of the non-Western world. Wiarda goes even further, advocating a complete reeducation, in nonethnocentric understandings, of at least two generations of social scientists, policymakers, and the informed public ("Ethnocentrism" 197).

In order to understand the problem of Western bias in the political development literature, an analysis of the concept of ethnocentrism is required. Ethnocentrism has been the object of study in social science literature, particularly among anthropologists, since the 19th century. It is, therefore, a relatively old and recurring theme. Insights from anthropology did, in fact, first identify ethnocentrism as a significant problem. Cultural anthropology has contributed, directly or

indirectly, the most profoundly to the problem of ethnocentrism and to the need to evaluate non-Western societies on their own terms and in their own contexts, rather than through the supposedly universalist perspective derived from Western European and American experience.

A selected review and interpretation of the literature on the concept of ethnocentrism will, therefore, be presented in this chapter. A fresh look at the concept of ethnocentrism will be undertaken in this chapter to assist in explaining just why the problem of ethnocentrism continues to re-surface. Both Anglophone and Francophone writers will be examined in order to avoid a purely Anglophone interpretation. This chapter is divided into the following sections: (i) a brief history and definition of the notion of ethnocentrism focusing on Anglophone writers; (ii) some French writings on the concept of ethnocentrism; (iii) French and English nuances on the definition of ethnocentrism; (iv) some French reactions to various manifestations of ethnocentrism in contemporary French history; and, (v) some general observations.

Ethnocentrism: A Brief History and Definition of the Concept

The concept of ethnocentrism is, as previously noted, a relatively old one and was by no means unknown among 19th century anthropologists. The effects of ethnocentric attitudes plagued man's relations to his fellows long before Sumner gave an academic explanation of the phenomenon in 1906. Ethnocentrism was a major theme in both biological and cultural theories of primitive war causation. Tylor (1871) viewed ethnocentrism as a contributing factor to primitive concepts of law and justice (van der Dennen in Reynolds et al. 2).

William Graham Sumner, born in 1840 and one of the pioneers of American sociology, coined the term "ethnocentrism," directly associating it to the evolution of warfare. Hatred of the enemy is a consequence of war, and love of one's own people compliments this sentiment. Sumner gave the term "ethnocentrism" to this phenomenon more than 80 years ago. In Folkways, published in 1906 and the author's only major sociological study, Sumner emphasized the "superiority-delusional" aspect of ethnocentrism in describing and defining it as: "the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it" (13). He observed that every group thinks its own folkways (customs and traditions) are the true and right ones and that

other groups' folkways are wrong. Sumner maintained that the "syndrome of ethnocentrism" is universal and thus applicable to all mankind: "the ethnocentrism of attitude, ideology, and action were inextricably linked together, mutually reinforcing, universal, and necessary for survival" (qtd. in Levine and Campbell:2). Sumner also contributed and coined the widely used concepts of "in-group" (ourselves) and "out-group" (everybody else) which, along with the concept of ethnocentrism, continue to inform much contemporary sociological thought.

LeVine and Campbell note that the ethnocentric syndrome as formulated by Sumner can be seen in retrospect as an intellectual application of nationalist ideology to "tribal" societies (103). They further note that recent anthropological and sociological studies have produced a number of cases that are not consistent with the assumption that the ethnocentric syndrome, as Sumner described, is universal (67). Merton points out that in adopting a descriptive, rather than an analytical outlook on the facts of the case, Sumner inevitably blurred and obscured the otherwise conspicuous fact that, under certain conditions, the out-group becomes a basis of positive and not merely hostile reference (277). Nonetheless, Sumner's concept of ethnocentrism has been repeatedly presented as a descriptive one, and has been widely noted by a variety of social scientists. While noted by social

scientists, his work does not, however, appear to have adequately influenced a great many scholars who remain insensitive to the phenomenon of ethnocentrism. Sumner's main contribution is that he first identified and labelled the concept of ethnocentrism. One should not lose sight of the fact that most ethnographies available for Sumner to read reflected unconscious ethnocentrism.

By 1950 the term "ethnocentrism" had come to stand for the ordinary person's as well as the scholar's unsophisticated reaction to cultural differences -- unthinking defense of familiar ways as absolutely right, and unqualified rejection of alien ways as simply wrong (Forbes 22). The ethnocentrist was thus someone who judged foreign groups by domestic standards.

There is agreement among contemporary social scientists that the tendency to ethnocentrism is universal in that all humans are born and raised in a culture which is usually the only one accessible to them. Because they are not exposed to other cultural perspectives, they inevitably tend to take their own as normative. The Encyclopedia of Anthropology thus defines ethnocentrism as the tendency to use the norms and values of one's own culture or subculture as the basis for judging others (Hunter and Whitten 147). Similarly, in the International Dictionary of Regional European Ethnology and Folklore, ethnocentrism is defined as the tendency to exalt the in-group

and its values and to depreciate other groups and their values (Hultkrantz 108). Adams, writing in 1951, maintains that ethnocentrism arises from the combined factors of the process of socialization and enculturation, and the resulting perpetual reintegration of a culture pattern between and within individuals (Ibid. 109).

Ethnocentrism is still a major explanation in contemporary theories of primitive warfare. The founding father of sociobiology, E.O. Wilson (1978) states: "The force behind most warlike policies is ethnocentrism, the irrationally exaggerated allegiance of individuals to their kin and fellow tribesmen" (van der Dennen in Reynolds et al. 6). Similarly, Ignacy Sachs views ethnocentrism or more specifically what he calls "Eurocentrism," as a contemporary source of conflict and as an obstacle to peace (130).

In fact, the consequences of ethnocentrism cover a wide spectrum. One cannot speak of ethnocentrism as a simple, homogeneous phenomenon. It encompasses a wide variety of attitudes, both at the individual and at the societal level. Vittorio Lanternari states that those attitudes which we call ethnocentric express themselves at various levels, i.e., emotional, psychological, behavioural, moral and intellectual (52). Hester and Killian point out that ethnocentric attitudes

and behaviour form a continuum which exhibits, both individually and socially, many varieties from the feelings of oneness and satisfaction with one's own lifestyles to negative dispositions such as religious bigotry and racism (311). The heart of ethnocentrism with reference to moral norms is thus the belief that the moral precepts indigenous to one's own group are to be preferred to all others (Ibid.). The different kinds of ethnocentrisms may therefore be referred to and described as value-assessing presuppositions or forms of prejudice.

Several theories have been proposed to explain the phenomenon of ethnocentrism. Levine and Campbell, previously cited, list the following in their classic work on the subject:

- 1) Realistic Group Conflict Theory: This theory assumes that group conflicts are rational in the sense that groups do have incompatible goals and are in competition for scarce resources. "Real threat causes in-group solidarity" is the most recurrent proposition of this theory.
- 2) Evolutionary Theories: Purports that realistic group conflict can be viewed as one of many adaptive mechanisms that promote group survival.
- 3) Sociopsychological Theories: Under this heading are placed the bulk of theories that explain prejudice through psychological factors operating in a social context. Many of these theories are of Freudian inspiration.
- 4) Cognitive Congruity Theories: Under this title are grouped a variety of theories that deal with congruence and disparity among beliefs. For example, "if we are good, kind and fair and they are our enemy, then psychologic dictates that they must be bad, cruel and unfair." This leads to a contrast of perception of those groups that are associated with the in-group (positive) and those that are dissociated (negative).

- 5) Transfer and Reinforcement Theory: The central notion is that the ethnocentric dispositions of adults constitute repetitions on the wider group level of behaviour patterns acquired through prior interpersonal experience in primary groups. (van der Dennen in Reynolds et al. 10-16)

LeVine and Campbell define ethnocentrism as an attitude or outlook in which values derived from one's own cultural background are applied to other cultural contexts where different values are operative (1). The authors also conclude that there is a universal tendency to rate one's own group positively in relation to most other groups which is, as previously noted, the classical ethnocentric view of others, first described by Sumner. In terms of ethnocentrism theory, the expectation is that in-groups and positive reference groups will thus be rated positively and out-groups will be rated negatively. Berry and Kalin hold that ethnocentrism theory may be borne out by high own-group ratings and by the pattern of positive evaluations of those groups which serve as positive reference groups, and negative evaluations of those serving as out-groups (109). LeVine and Campbell suggest that a trend toward greater ethnocentrism as human society has developed over the last ten thousand years is observable based on increased populations creating increased conflicts of interest over resources (223).

Forbes (1985) highlights Levinson's explanation of ethnocentrism who states that the term has the general meaning of

provincialism or cultural narrowness; it means a tendency in the individual to be "ethnically centered," to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally "alike" and in his rejection of the "unlike" (22). Forbes notes that this is essentially the meaning that the term has today. Hester and Killian state simply that the phenomenon of ethnocentrism is an unavoidable socio-cultural fact (310).

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the discipline of anthropology has developed a sophisticated understanding of ethnocentrism. This is to be expected since anthropology may be defined as the systematic study of the nature of human beings (Hunter and Whitten 12). Long gone are the days when anthropologists referred to Western cultures as "advanced" and non-Western cultures as "inferior." Modern anthropologists are well aware of the dangers of cultural bias in their work. They recognize that the investigator must be constantly on guard against the intrusion of unconscious ethnocentrism into his or her research.

Two fundamental theoretical distinctions in anthropology, the emic and the etic perspective, illustrate this point. Emics refers to a variety of theoretical field approaches in anthropology concerned with "getting inside" the native (folk) worldview (Ibid. 142). The main idea is that the subjects

studied have their own folk categories, assumptions about these categories, taxonomies and part-whole systems in terms of which they logically relate these categories to each other, as well as values concerning items classified according to these categories. Emic descriptions thus provide an internal view, with criteria chosen from within the system. To understand the behaviour of subjects, it is crucial that the field researcher identify the cognitive properties of these emic categories; otherwise interpretations of behaviour cannot claim to reflect units of behaviour which are meaningful to the people studied (Ibid.).

Etics, on the other hand, is a label for a variety of theoretical approaches in anthropology concerned with the outsider's view of the culture. Etics involves the careful specification of the categories, the logical relations between categories, and assumptions underlying the uses of these categories by social scientists (Ibid. 152). One can, therefore, never assume that the researcher's etic categories (kinship, for example) reflect a perceived reality for an informant, who has his or her own emic categories. One must be on guard against treating one's own etic categories as "the real thing," and assuming they are the emic categories of the people's one is studying.

Some French Writings on the Concept of Ethnocentrism

This section is devoted to the writings of a selected group of contemporary French anthropologists, political scientists, and historians on the topic of ethnocentrism. Part one of this chapter provided an essentially Anglophone view and definition of the concept of ethnocentrism; this section will complement it by providing a Francophone viewpoint on the same subject.

Interestingly enough, writings on French reactions to manifestations of ethnocentrism were much more prevalent than French writings on the concept of ethnocentrism itself. Section IV of this chapter will, therefore, include some French reactions to various manifestations of ethnocentrism in contemporary French history.

Claude Lévi-Strauss, born in 1908, is the most well known and influential French anthropologist. He was a structural anthropologist greatly influenced by Rousseau whom he considers the prophetic founder of cultural anthropology (Scholte in Honigmann 639). Structuralism in contemporary anthropology denotes an analytical approach based on the assumption that observed phenomena are specific instances of an underlying generalized principle of relationship or structure (Hunter and Whitten 373). The objective of structuralism is to gain a general understanding of how the human mind works, through the

analysis of different cultures. Lévi-Strauss' view of anthropology is typically French in that he was inclined to stress system and to relate phenomena in the context of integrative total social facts (Voget in Honigmann 27). Lévi-Strauss also stressed the importance of history, maintaining that history and anthropology are inseparable. History, according to Lévi-Strauss, concentrates on the conscious expression of social life while anthropologists examine the "unconscious foundations" (Hudson in Honigmann 120).

Lévi-Strauss defines a culture as consisting of a multiplicity of traits, some of which it shares, in varying degrees, with nearby or distant cultures, and some of which distinguish it more or less sharply from the others (The View 17). On the subject of ethnocentricity, Lévi-Strauss has much to offer. He observes that the diversity of cultures has rarely appeared to men for what it is, that is, a natural phenomenon resulting from the direct or indirect relationships between societies (Structural Anthropology 328). Instead, men tend to see in diversity a sort of monstrosity or scandal, or an inferior state of social existence. The most ancient attitude, according to Lévi-Strauss, consists in the pure and simple repudiation of cultural forms (moral, religious, social, and aesthetic) if they are at variance with our own. This repudiation is manifested in

ethnocentric reactions when man is faced with ways of living, believing, and thinking alien to his own. Lévi-Strauss asserts that by refusing to see as human those members of humanity who appear as the most "savage" or "barbaric," one only borrows from them one of their characteristic attitudes. It is at this point that he makes the following statement, frequently quoted in both French and English: "Le barbare, c'est d'abord l'homme qui croit à la barbarie" ("The barbarian is first of all the man who believes in barbarism") (Ibid. 329).

Lévi-Strauss observes that racial prejudices are not declining, that everything points to their resurfacing with greater intensity. He stresses the fact that the diversity of human cultures is behind us, around us, and ahead of us. In Structural Anthropology (Vol.II) he concludes his discussion of ethnocentrism on a wishful note: "The only demand we may make upon human diversity is that it realize itself in forms such that each is a contribution to the greater generosity of the others" (362).

In his article, "The Distracted Look: Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia or Racism?", Michel Giraud, an anthropologist at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris, criticizes what he refers to as Lévi-Strauss' "banal" use of the term ethnocentrism. Giraud reports that Lévi-Strauss states that

ethnocentrism is universal and that such attitudes are inevitable and legitimate. Giraud objects to the fact that recently the extreme Right in France (the National Front), with reference to the issue of immigrant presence in France, took up some of Lévi-Strauss' arguments as a justification for their racist position: that such attitudes are universal, inevitable, and legitimate. Lévi-Strauss, needless to say, is not affiliated with the National Front. He does, however, view ethnocentric attitudes as "consubstantial with our species...always inevitable, often fruitful, and even dangerous when exacerbated" (View From Afar XV). These sorts of attitudes are fruitful, according to Lévi-Strauss, only in terms of the need to preserve the diversity of cultures, a theme the author stresses throughout his work.

Giraud, however, does not agree with Lévi-Strauss and offers an additional viewpoint. He regards ethnocentrism as: "the fruit of particular systems of sociocultural relations based on relations of force and hostility, of domination and exploitation, and that it itself helps to reproduce these relations. In other words, it is a socially determined and historically-defined phenomenon and consequently has no intrinsic necessity and no inevitable characteristics" (414). Giraud thus views ethnocentrism at a very specific level resulting from negative activity. Lévi-Strauss, on the other hand, sees it in more

general terms, focusing on the preservation of cultural diversity, thus reflecting his tendency towards viewing a system in its entirety.

Raymond Aron takes up the same theme in his article "Le Paradoxe du Même et de L'autre" ("The Paradox of Ourselves and Others"), where he observes that "humanity" stops at tribal frontiers where it is perceived that other tribes, groups, or villages are made up of those who are "bad" and "mean" as compared to ourselves. He challenges the accuracy of Lévi-Strauss' assertion that "the barbarian is first of all the man who believes in barbarism" and offers an interesting interpretation. Aron suggests that Lévi-Strauss' phrase contains an internal contradiction. He notes that the anthropologist, by trade, is sympathetic to and understands "savages" (meaning "others"). He states that the "savage" has, in fact, taught the anthropologist to see another society as one among many, and to see other societies, in Aron's terminology, through the others' or savages' own eyes. Aron suggests that the anthropologist adheres to cultural relativism, again by the nature of his trade, yet the "savage" ignores it. This, Aron states, may work against the "savage" in terms of the anthropologist's view of the "savage" since cultural relativism takes precedence with the anthropologist. Aron makes two related points. The first point

is that cultural relativism may paradoxically become another form of ethnocentrism in that much depends on who is defining "barbarism." The anthropologist's definition of "barbarism" would differ from that of the "barbarian" himself (Aron's term). The anthropologist thus falls victim to his own cultural relativism. The second point is that Western civilization is not necessarily equal to, as many maintain, the pinnacle of progress. Many "savages," to use Aron's term again, have revealed a very high level of development in their religious ideas and complex social rules. To regard and accept such people simply as "savages" does them a severe discredit.

In his article, "La science politique africaniste ou les culs-de-sac des modèles d'analyse ethnocentriques" ("Africanist Political Science or Blind Alleys of Models of Ethnocentric Analysis"), Ilunga Kabongo, a Third World Francophone scholar, observes that American literature has dominated African political science. American intellectual domination, he maintains, has greatly influenced questions, theories, methods, and concepts in Africanist political science (167). He advocates eliminating colonialist vocabulary from theories of political modernization. Similarly, he states that the terms "modernization" and "Westernization" should not be used as synonyms. Like other Third World scholars, Kabongo stresses that Westerners must stop

thinking along the lines that the present state of development achieved by Europe and North America is the ultimate objective of the Third World and, at the same time, equal to the end of world history.

If ethnocentrism is to be overcome, education of both the Western countries and the Third World is of paramount importance. Maurice Mauviel in "Vers une solution éducative à l'ethnocentrisme: la communication interculturelle" ("Towards an Educational Solution to Ethnocentrism: Intercultural Communication"), suggests that education plays a decisive role in reducing the Western ethnocentric vision of the Third World, and increasing intercultural communication. He asserts that when we speak of a new international economic order we should also be speaking of a new educational order (49). The author refers to a "multi-cultural man" who is socially and psychologically a product of the interaction between cultures of the 20th century. This "new" type of man, a product of a new educational order, would believe in the unity of men, and accept and appreciate the fundamental differences that exist between different cultures.

Ethnocentrism: French and English Nuances

There appears to be general agreement among both Anglophone and Francophone scholars that ethnocentrism is a universal and negative force to be reckoned with. Giraud is a partial exception to this trend in that he does not view ethnocentrism as a universal force. He does, however, view ethnocentrism as a negative force at a very specific level resulting from repressive practices, discrimination, and segregation.

One finds a firmly established definition of the concept of ethnocentrism among the Anglophone scholars. They offer a number of similar descriptions of the phenomenon, for example: "...this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything...."; "...unqualified rejection of alien ways as simply wrong."; "...the tendency to use the norms and values of one's own culture or subculture as the basis for judging others."; "...the irrationally exaggerated allegiance of individuals to their kin and fellow tribesmen."; and, "...an attitude in which values derived from one's own cultural background are applied to other cultural contexts where different values are operative." In tracing the history of the concept of ethnocentrism, and in uncovering a clear, common definition such as: "...a tendency in the individual to be 'ethnically centered', to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally 'alike' and in

his rejection of the 'unlike' " (Forbes Nationalism 22), it is somewhat easier to understand why so many development theory scholars fell and continue to fall into the ethnocentric trap. How can one escape, without the proper training, a "universal" and, therefore, "unavoidable socio-cultural fact?"

Interestingly enough, a general pattern emerged in that the French scholars examined seemed to take the concept of ethnocentrism as a "given," and were more inclined than the Anglophones to offer solutions and prescriptions to the problem. This is most likely due to the fact that the French writings looked at were more recent than those of the Anglophone writers, but more importantly, the Third World Francophone scholar (Kabongo) had experienced ethnocentrism first-hand. His writing was thus a reaction to the experience of ethnocentrism as opposed to simply describing it. Lévi-Strauss offers a typically French view of the subject, concentrating on the system as a whole. His concentration on the positive aspects of cultural diversity is commendable yet his solution is somewhat incomplete and facile -- that cultural diversity "realize itself in forms such that each is a contribution to the greater generosity of the others." Mauviel goes much farther in that he advocates a prescription which includes the need for a mass re-education through a new educational order.

In addition, the Francophone writers tended towards an "external" focus because their concentration was primarily on the diversity of cultures, that is, on other tribes and groups (Lévi-Strauss, Aron, Mauviel). In contrast, the Anglophone authors' focus was more "internal." In constructing a descriptive definition, they repeatedly zeroed in on the notion of "self" by continually using expressions such as "one's own culture."

In summary, the Anglophone and Francophone authors examined complemented each other in that the Anglophones first described the phenomenon of ethnocentrism, and the Francophones generally took a more pro-active position by providing constructive commentary or solutions. This theme will be re-visited in the last section of this chapter.

Some French Reactions to Various Manifestations of Ethnocentrism

It is easy to cite examples of different manifestations of ethnocentrism during certain periods of French history: the works of Maurice Barrès (one of the first modern anti-semites); L'affaire Dreyfus (anti-semitism); French colonization and the process of decolonization in both Black Africa, North Africa and Indochina; and, the relatively recent extreme right position of Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front Party (xenophobia). One such

manifestation of ethnocentrism, that of racism, took root in France partially due to the influence of writers such as Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau (1816-1882). Gobineau, often referred to as the "father of racism" in France, was a diplomat, Orientalist and author of Essai sur l'Inégalité des Races Humaines (Essay on the Inequality of the Human Race). He promoted the theory that even though "pure races" disappeared long ago, the on-going process of racial mixture "dooms mankind to an inescapable degradation" (qtd. in Lévi-Strauss View From Afar:4). Gobineau's followers developed and advanced the theory of the racial superiority of the blond Aryan.

An examination of French literature reveals what could be referred to as a certain degree of "ethnocentric guilt" about these events in French history. Specifically, colonization and the process of decolonization appear to have evoked the most reaction from a variety of Francophone writers. Indeed, Raoul Girardet states that: "L'idée coloniale a tenu trop de place et pendant trop longtemps dans l'esprit des Français pour que son histoire les laisse aujourd'hui indifférents" (499). He further elaborates: "Dans l'histoire morale de la France contemporaine, l'idée coloniale semble s'être chargée de plus en plus de signification, d'un poids de plus en plus lourd de références, de souvenirs, de fidélité ou d'hostilité" (405).

Sartre has made a substantial contribution to the subject of decolonization. He states that Africa is, for many of us, a great hole in the map of the world which lets us keep our conscience clean (cited in Contat and Rybalka 187). He asserts that "to be a man is to be an accomplice of colonialism, since all of us without exception have profited by colonial exploitation" (Sartre in Fanon Wretched 21). Sartre advocates the reading of Frantz Fanon who, he claims, is the spokesman for those promoting the unity of the African continent.

Fanon maintains that the feeling of inferiority of the colonized is the correlative to the European's feeling of superiority. He points out that not only must the black man be black, but he must be black in relation to the white man. The author's solution presents a great challenge to men of all colours: "the liberation of the man of colour from himself" (Black Skin 10). Fanon poignantly sums up the status of the black man and captures the ethnocentrism embedded in his plight: "Was my freedom not given to me then in order to build the world of the you?" (Ibid. 232).

Elbaki Hermassi observes that all Maghrebi societies have been subjected to colonial domination and that none of their political traditions and institutions have been spared the tumult, assault, distortion, and ultimate redefinition

(Leadership and National 56). Jacques Berque in "Towards a Better Transfer of Knowledge and Values," contends that the world as a whole is only just emerging from a period of overt imperialism and is facing almost everywhere, the consequences of unequal exchange (330). He lists some of the negative effects of colonization, and specifically the teaching of French history to North African schoolchildren in Algeria: the fallacious nature of a transfer of knowledge tending to depersonalize the recipient; the consequent need to "decolonize" not only its background and methods, but also its language and content; and ambiguity as regards those parts of the content which, since they involve values held to be universal, would be freely adopted by the recipient (329). True integration, Berque concludes, postulates active participation.

A similar theme emerges in La Décolonisation de l'Afrique -- Vue par des Africains (The Decolonization of Africa seen through African Eyes), a collection of essays by several African Francophone scholars and political leaders. Abamby Nationy Zentho describes the situation in Africa in 1939: "Toute l'Afrique était sous domination coloniale, ou sous protectorat, ou sous mandat, ou sous occupation de L'Europe. Ce qui voulait dire que tout le pouvoir économique et politique était entre les mains de non-Africains..." (78). Colonization and the resulting

process of decolonization have produced a situation characterized by a very clear reaction against the French or imperialist way of doing things. The future trend in the literature points toward indigenous solutions to indigenous problems. Throughout the book, the following themes reoccur with respect to the topic of decolonization: the need for the preservation and promotion of African cultural heritage (language and history) as well as the economic independence of the African continent; and, the solving of problems indigenously, that is, by Africans themselves.

Similarly, Fanon's solution to the colonial problem is through the achievement of revolutionary socialism everywhere or, he warns, "one by one we will be defeated by our former masters" (Wretched 10). An economic program for the countries of Africa is, therefore, of prime importance to the author as well as a doctrine or policy concerning the division of wealth and social relations. Last but not least, the preservation and encouragement of national culture should be included.

Léopold Sedar Senghor, the father of Négritude (the promotion and preservation of Negro African cultural values) and Africanité (the symbiosis of the values of Arabism and the values of Négritude) has written extensively on decolonization or more precisely, "transcending the colonial fact" (Nationhood 17). His position is surprisingly moderate and very realistic in that

he advocates the building of a Negro-African nation freely associated with France in a confederation. He promotes a development plan which would be essentially economic and social "based on European, Socialist contributions, and also on the best of Negro African civilization" (Ibid. 66).

Senghor's "African way of Socialism" depends largely upon the cultural convergence of Africa as a whole. Indeed, Négritude is one example of Francophone tendencies to think of culture in national and continental terms, rather than at the micro or tribal level. Senghor stresses that cultural independence is the necessary prerequisite of political, economic, and social independence. At the same time, Senghor urges Arabs to remain Arabs and that Sub-Saharans should remain Negroes. According to this author, the colonial fact or the imposition of Western values and ways of doing things, can only be transcended through the unity of the African continent coupled with the preservation of African cultural identity.

Similarly, E. Wamba-Dia-Wamba addresses the problem of ethnocentric imperialism in Africa, pointing out that African development has been fuelled by two opposing factors: ethnocentric imperialism and the forces of African national liberation (225). The author notes that these two factors have significantly slowed down development in Africa.

René Dumont, a contemporary French agronomist and historian, has written approximately thirty books which share a common theme: the under-development of the Third World and what the author refers to as the "egoism" of the developed nations. In Stranglehold on Africa, Dumont's central thesis is that "development"--the implantation of the Western economic system through colonization--has brought about the worst destruction in the history of the world. The author reminds us that when the capitalist countries gave up their domination of the colonies on the political front, their economic system was deeply rooted in these countries. It was suggested that the Third World should "catch-up" or "develop" by following the Western model of development. Dumont points out that the following three crucial questions were not asked:

- 1) Is the consumer society a desirable goal;
- 2) can it be set-up anywhere; and,
- 3) is it suitable for Africa? (15)

Dumont stresses the fact that the Western world has persuaded most of the African leaders that the Western model of progress is the only desirable model for them, but the Western World has never asked the most important of the interested parties, the peasants, what they think. Of equal importance, most Western scholars, until recently, have never studied the economic, historical, sociological, political and psychological

context of the particular country into which the Western model has been introduced. Dumont advocates establishing a dialogue between developed and under-developed nations using language untainted by self-interest and ideology, that is, a dialogue free from Westcentric bias.

Fernand Braudel, a Frenchman often referred to as the most influential historian of the post-war era, picked up on the same theme fifteen years earlier than Dumont. That is, a recognition of the importance and significance of the indigenous population (the peasants or masses). In Capitalism & Material Life, Braudel describes a history of material civilization from 1400-1800. The approach taken by the author is to "put the masses themselves in the foreground, although they lie outside the lively, garrulous chronicles of history" (XV). Men and things make up material life, Braudel reminds us, thus the common or half-forgotten man is the starting point of his book, and not the "victors" -- those who have most benefitted from capitalism. We will return to Braudel in the next section.

Some General Observations

As previously illustrated, the Anglo-Saxon writings on ethnocentrism have focused on an in-depth description of the concept resulting in a common definition among Anglophone scholars: "...a tendency in the individual to be 'ethically centered', to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally 'alike' and in his rejection of the 'unalike'" (Forbes Nationalism 22). This definition has greatly contributed to the understanding of the notion of ethnocentrism. Francophone writings on ethnocentrism tend to be reactive rather than descriptive, advocating solutions or prescriptions to the problem.

Interestingly enough, this same pattern emerges when comparing the Anglo-Saxon world-view on developing countries reflected in and represented by the political development theoretical literature of the 1960's presented in Chapter One, and the work of a group of French writers and scholars of the same time period (the 1960's). The French writings were essentially a reaction to one of the most significant manifestations of ethnocentrism in contemporary French history, namely, the effects of colonization and the process of decolonization. Those who are directly involved in the event tend to advocate indigenous solutions, whereas those who just

simply describe the event from afar tend to advocate the implementation of solutions reflecting their own experiences or ways of doing things. This trend clearly emerges with the political development scholars examined in Chapter One who generally tend to advocate Western solutions to non-Western problems, and the French authors surveyed who were reacting to manifestations of ethnocentrism. That is, the French authors were reacting to their own first-hand experiences of colonization and decolonization where an indigenous solution or a variation of it was unanimously called for.

Two different approaches thus emerge: what will be referred to as the Anglo "experience-remote" description of a phenomenon or event as compared to the French "experience-proximate" reaction to phenomenon or events. For the purposes of this thesis, "experience-remote" refers to a removed description of a phenomenon or event that has not been directly experienced. The term "experience-proximate" as used in this thesis, refers to a phenomenon or event that has been experienced first-hand resulting in a reaction that often takes the form of a solution or prescription to the particular problem. These two approaches, the Anglo "experience-remote" description of the phenomenon versus the French "experience-proximate" reaction to the actual event, underscore the importance of the following: involvement in

the event by those directly implicated or what could be called self-involvement for self-development; and, an understanding and consideration of the specific historical and contemporary context, that is, a consideration and an understanding of both the past and the present of the country or region under study. Ethnocentrism or Western bias can only be overcome with a clear understanding of the context-specific, time-specific, and place-specific attributes of the particular event under study.

Other contemporary French authors such as Fernand Braudel and Michel Foucault have written on the importance of this last point.

Braudel is, in his vision of history, a "vitalist" since he views history as the history of organic societies propelled by a will to live but conditioned by a series of external forces -- the environment, climate, resources, and political and economic organization. In Capitalism and Material Life he does not simply advocate a mono-causal explanation of historical progress or development but takes into account, in great detail, a variety of factors: social, religious and historical, for example. The objective of his book is to uncover an explanation for the dramatic disparity between East and West. That is, why is there continually a situation of super-abundance and penury between East and West? To do this, Braudel concentrates on the

importance of specific context (the general environment) and what could be called "layers of intermingled activity." According to Braudel, civilization is the ancient settlement of a certain segment of mankind in a certain place. Time and place thus become all-important. In offering a broad social explanation of historical development, the author underscores the importance of the plurality and diversity of experience.

Time and place also play a significant role in the writings of Michel Foucault who many refer to as one of the most influential thinkers of modern time, as well as the central figure of French philosophy since Sartre. Foucault's literary, philosophical style combines outstanding literary merit with a theorizing free of analytic discipline similar to Bergson, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty. This is in opposition to the work of Anglophone philosophers which is generally academic in style and analytic in method. Considered as a "post-structuralist," Foucault is famous for his reorientation of historical inquiry where cultural context plays an important role.

Foucault's first influential book Folie et déraison: histoire de la folie à l'âge classique, (Madness and Civilization), concerns the investigation of the cultural assumptions underlying the different historical ways of handling madness or insanity. It is, however, Les mots et les choses (The

Order of Things), which is Foucault's masterpiece. This "archaeology of the human sciences" deals with such questions as: what are the borders of our own way of thinking? and, how do Westerners order phenomena? The author concentrates on what he calls "epistemes" -- conceptual strata underpinning various fields of knowledge and corresponding to different time periods in Western thought. According to Foucault, "epistemes" follow one another in the course of history, and the oldest "episteme" is the Renaissance paradigm. The author's aim in writing this book was to provide an in-depth historical account of the emergence of the human sciences. It is, therefore, a quest for the "fundamental codes" of our culture, or a search for conceptual archetypes, mainly tied to language. Foucault often said that his aim was to write "the history of the present," that is, to find the conceptual underpinnings of some key practices in modern culture, placing them in historical perspective (cited in Merquior 15).

Braudel and Foucault express many of the same themes and ideas as the French authors surveyed in this chapter with respect to mankind's development, his relationship to others, and his perception of his relationship to others. There is substantial common ground in both of these authors' approaches and attitudes. Interestingly enough, together these two authors may be said to

represent and crystallize the predominant attitudes, opinions, approaches, and reactions of the French authors surveyed in this chapter on both the problem of ethnocentrism and manifestations of ethnocentrism by:

- recognizing the importance of the indigenous population (Braudel);
- realizing that historical progress or development must take into account a variety of factors (Braudel);
- concentrating on specific context (Braudel and Foucault);
- underlining the importance of plurality, diversity of experience, and cultural diversity (Braudel and Foucault);
- focusing on a generalist philosophy and history, and discouraging a nationally or sectionally focused history (Braudel);
- concentrating on the cultural context (Foucault); and,
- recognizing the value of historical analysis (Foucault).

On a similar note, Ali Mazrui and Michael Tidy outline differences in the way in which France and Britain colonized Africa. In Nationalism and New States in Africa, they stress the importance of cultural identity and local participation with respect to the former British and French colonies in Africa. Mazrui and Tidy cite several major factors and social forces which, in their opinion, contribute to making former French colonies more nationally integrated than former British colonies.

The authors offer an explanation as to why Francophone colonies in Africa were generally more integrated than former African British colonies, and, in doing so, underscore the importance of indigenous or local participation.

Mazrui and Tidy look at the implications of the policies of both Britain and France with respect to nation-building in Africa: British indirect rule in Africa compared to French policies of assimilation and integration. They conclude that although Britain had a policy of indirect rule (rule the colonies as far as possible through "native" authorities and institutions), British approaches to colonial rule did not help nation building. The authors state that: "Classical cases of indirect rule were, in fact, few and far between. Britain did not always find appropriate 'native' institutions to use in her own imperial order" (375). They further state: "...sometimes artificial or synthetic chiefdoms were created with no real indigenous roots" (Ibid.).

The authors outline several factors explaining the apparent success in nation-building among the Francophone colonies as opposed to the Anglophone colonies: Francophone countries were generally smaller than the Anglophone colonies; former French colonies in Africa were more ethnically homogeneous than former British colonies; there was more regional awareness among

Francophone countries; there was a high degree of educational centralization in the French colonies; and, Islam acted as an important force of national integration and played an integrative role in the French colonies (377). They stress that the strength of Islam as a civilization has contributed greatly to national integration in the French colonies, particularly in West Africa.

Mazrui and Tidy suggest that British indirect rule did not promote native participation and, as a result, did not work as an integrative force. They observe that Francophone colonies were, among other factors, more cohesive due to the strong influence of Islam. The two authors thus imply that preserving religious and cultural identity, as well as participating at the local or indigenous level, are important ingredients for successful "nation-building."

What might account for the differences in approach among Anglophone and Francophone scholars on the topic of ethnocentrism? That is, the Anglo "experience-remote" description of the phenomenon of ethnocentrism, and the French "experience-proximate" reaction to the actual event. The fact that Francophone writings on the topic of ethnocentrism tend to be reactive rather than descriptive does not simply imply that Francophones are less ethnocentric than Anglophones. It does, however, suggest that of the authors surveyed, more Francophones

had "first-hand" encounters with various forms or manifestations of ethnocentrism. Indeed, as previously noted, France has historically been faced with many incidences of manifestations of ethnocentrism (e.g. anti-semitism, the process of colonization and decolonization, and xenophobia). This has produced a body of writers and scholars whose work has essentially been a reaction to these events in contemporary French history. A sample of some of these French writers has been surveyed in this chapter. One could refer to this reaction as a certain "ethnocentric guilt" on the part of these French writers about such negative events. This "guilt" is more pronounced in the French writings since these writings tend to deal with actual "first-hand" events (in most cases, colonization and decolonization).

The answer to the question -- what is it about France historically that has contributed to an approach to the problem of ethnocentrism which focuses on pro-active solutions and prescriptions -- is two-fold. The significant area to concentrate on appears to be the particular social context in question, and not on differences per se between the French and the English. National differences, as they relate to this discussion, may well contribute but are of secondary importance.

The first reason contributing to differences in the French

approach relates to the way in which the French structured the colonial context at the outset. That is, policies of assimilation and integration, as opposed to British indirect rule. Although the French colonial policies were far from perfect, they did allow for some degree of local or native participation. As pointed out by Mazrui and Tidy, France's colonial history has been somewhat more conducive to the needs of the native population. French policies included the involvement -- albeit somewhat superficial -- of African politicians in the workings of French government. Secondly, the French approach to the problem of ethnocentrism is very context-dependent in that many of the French authors were reacting to situations that they themselves have been personally involved with. Two factors then, a mind-set geared toward strategies of native assimilation and integration, coupled with the fact that many of the French authors were intimately involved with the events that they were writing about has produced a French approach or perspective that differs significantly from that of the Anglophones. Indeed, the French attitude and approach to the problem of ethnocentrism is driven by the fact that many of the writers had experienced the event first-hand and thus responded in a reactive mode as opposed to simply describing the concept.

As previously pointed out, there is a parallel between the development scholars surveyed in Chapter One and the results of the survey carried out in this chapter: those who are directly involved in the event tend to advocate indigenous solutions whereas those who describe and analyze the event from a distance advocate the implementation of solutions reflecting their own experiences or ways of doing things. Mazrui's and Tidy's explanation as to why former French colonies were generally more integrated than former British colonies supports this idea for the following reasons: British indirect rule did not promote native participation; and Francophones, in addition to having smaller more ethnically homogeneous and centralized colonies, were able to preserve their religious and cultural identity (Islam) which acted as a strong integrative agent.

CHAPTER THREE

EXPATRIATE CRITIQUES: REACTIONS TO THE WESTCENTRIC BENT OF
POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT LITERATURE

Let us now take into account the views on ethnocentrism and Western bias of a group of expatriate scholars largely from the developing countries who are presently working in Europe, North American, and at some of the international institutions. This is a mixed group of writers and academics all of whom share one common characteristic: the experience of having emigrated from the East to the West, thus having lived, sequentially, and then simultaneously, in two separate worlds.

Within the discipline of political science one finds diverse examples of such expatriate scholars presently working in the West, but who originally came from a variety of non-Western countries: Latin America, China, Japan, India, Africa, and the Middle East. Different and distinct positions, approaches and world-views can be identified in their work resulting from and reflecting the co-habitation of two separate worlds.

Expatriating is no easy task. The process of adopting a new culture is complex: learning a new language and mentality; picking up new and different cultural rules; discovering the existence of different "barriers" both visible and invisible, learning new cultural-specific definitions; balancing the old

culture with the new culture and thus having to deal with colliding world-views and expectations; and finally, realizing just how thinly spread the acquisition of a new culture is and just how fast the process of unlearning it could become. Changing cultures thus has far-reaching repercussions and implications, especially with respect to the works of those writers and scholars who have emigrated from the East to the West. Their approaches and positions differ from those of both Western and indigenous scholars providing valuable insights and alternative ways of looking at and solving problems.

This chapter will offer a selective review and analysis of the works of several scholars who have expatriated, and in doing so have adopted what could be referred to as an identifiable expatriate position. A selective survey and overview of the works of these scholars will be carried out with a view to ascertaining:

- 1) the degree of influence expatriating has had on their work;
- 2) if there exists any internal differences among the work of expatriate scholars; and,
- 3) if any new dimensions can be identified in their work that differ from the work of other development scholars.

This chapter is divided into two parts: i) a survey and discussion of the works of a selection of expatriate scholars; and, ii) some general observations incorporating a discussion of

points 1-3 above.

Expatriate Scholars

A. Literature

Expatriate scholars are, needless to say, found in all academic disciplines. Before examining the works of expatriate scholars from the social sciences, we will briefly turn to literature in order to call attention to the radical cultural and historical differences between East and West. Both Bharati Mukherjee and Salman Rushdie provide the reader with a first-hand description of what it is like to make the transition from East to West.

Mukherjee was born in Calcutta, lived in Canada, and is presently living in the U.S. She is the author of two novels and a travel memoir. A common theme runs throughout her work: the exploration and examination of the complex tensions of the immigrant experience. Her stories of Indians recreating their lives in North America provide important insights into the transition from East to West. She describes the easy process of returning to India and the difficult feat of living abroad: "I knew the rules in India...In Canada I was helpless and self-absorbed..." (Days and Nights 169). Mukherjee's struggle to find a "balanced voice" for her writing proves a challenging and stimulating task because of expatriating: "...the problem of voice is the most exciting one. Born in Calcutta and educated

initially in Bangali, I now live in Canada and write in English about Indians living in India or in the U.S." (Ibid. 286).

Indeed, Mukherjee's writings are dedicated to the exploration and examination of the "complex tensions of the immigrant experience." Her stories provide critical insights into the difficult transition from East to West. Her impression of the United States puts life in India in proper context: "America is sheer luxury, being touched more by the presentation of tragedy than by tragedy itself..." (Ibid. 168). Mukherjee uses terms such as "discreet," "secretive" and "pliable" to describe herself after having experienced the transition from East to West. Her work provides a platform from which to view the great differences between East and West -- differences which must be taken into account when considering the problems of developing countries.

Rushdie's expatriation is strongly reflected in his work. Born in Bombay and presently living in London, Rushdie continually makes reference to the two worlds that he inhabits. The Satanic Verses (1988) recounts the adventures of two central characters that begin as the two are on their way from India to England. Their plane blows apart but the two miraculously survive, "chosen in the match between Good and Evil." The book essentially describes their journey "toward the evil and the

good." Rushdie does not let his readers lose sight of the great differences between East and West: "Five and a half hours of time zones; turn your watch upside down in Bombay and you see the time in London...How far did they fly? Five and a half thousand as the crow. Or: from Indianness to Englishness, an immeasurable distance" (41). The author captures the too often made assumption of Western superiority as he describes one of his Indian characters: "He was a neat man in a buttoned suit heading for London and an ordered, contented life. He was a member of the real world" (74).

Like Mukherjee, Rushdie provides a "two-world" and a "divided self" context as he describes the adventures of his two main characters in London, and at the same time, constantly alludes to images of rural India and post-Biblical Arabia in the background.

On a similar note, V.S. Naipaul and Nirad Chaudhury have, in various ways, also sought to criticize the country of their origin in order to gain acceptance in their host country. In addition, they have attempted to point out the human damage which has occurred due to the negative effects of colonialism on both the Imperial power and the colony. These writers go beyond ethnocentrism to mutual benefit and mutual damage for all parties concerned. Nirad Chaudhury, for example, thought British rule

brought out the best in Indians, while Naipaul thought it distorted the perceptions of elites in both countries. Together these two authors thus converge the complexity of the phenomenon of ethnocentrism which the expatriate writers focus on.

The point to be made here is that these two expatriates vividly bring to our attention the continuing cultural differences in scholars who were trained abroad, write in a foreign language, and who live like voluntary exiles with their "divided selves." Far from becoming "bridges," as was expected, they became poignant reminders of the unassimilated worlds.

B. Latin America: The Dependency Theorists

The modernization paradigm underwent strong criticism from social scientists in the Third World, particularly in Latin America. It became outdated in the early 1970's. The popular explanation of the causes of underdevelopment came under serious attack from a coalition of "dependency" theorists, of whom the most well known spokesman in North America is André Gunder Frank (Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America, 1967). This coalition of "dependency" theorists formed a dependency school which came into existence in the mid-1960's.

The dependency school in Latin America has evolved, on the one hand, from the structuralist tradition of Raul Prebisch,

Celso Furtado, and the ECLA (The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America), and, on the other, from Marxist and neo-Marxist thinkers on imperialism (Lall 800). The influence of the dependency school has been widespread and has come to incorporate a number of different lines of argument. Probably the most popular has been associated with Frank's search for a theory of underdevelopment. Forbes summarizes Frank's argument: The world is dominated by a single economy such that all peoples are integrated into the sphere of capitalist production. They are linked by a series of metropolis-satellite chains which draw towards the centre the surplus which is produced at each stage of production. The result is that the periphery -- the satellites-- is impoverished, while the centres accumulate and grow (67). The strong point differentiating dependency critics from their predecessors was that they had both a coherent and cogent alternative explanation. In addition, it was an explanation that shifted a large part of the responsibility for underdevelopment from the Third World back to the former colonial and new industrial powers.

The arguments of Frank and his dependency theory contemporaries were well received because they were presented at a time of increasing dissatisfaction with the traditional theories of development, and offered a credible explanation as to

why the great majority of poor newly independent nations were not sharing in economic development. Some of the dependency theorists expatriated to the United States or other Western countries and continued their work at Western universities. Among expatriate scholars, their work is the most abundant in theory. A.G. Frank and Celso Furtado are probably the two most important proponents of the dependency perspective outside of Latin America. Frank is an American (formerly an economist in Chicago) who spent some time in Latin America. Furtado is originally from Brazil and expatriated to France after the '64 coup. It is to his work that we now turn.

Celso Furtado is probably the best known economist from Latin America. He presently works at the University of Paris (professeur associé at the Faculté de Droit et des Sciences Economiques - Paris IV).

In Obstacles to Development in Latin America (1970), Furtado examines the conditions of underdevelopment in Latin America. His main thesis is that development and underdevelopment are both parts of the same process: the unprecedented spread of modern technology. In his preface the author states that his book is destined for readers outside of Latin America. He thus emphasizes external factors which tend to aggravate and perpetuate underdevelopment.

Furtado takes a structural approach to the problems of Latin America. He describes the phenomenon of underdevelopment within the framework of current history, stressing that it is a complex process. He contends that as a consequence of the rapid spread of new production methods from a small number of centres radiating technological innovations, there has come into existence a process tending to create a world-wide economic system. Underdevelopment, according to Furtado, is thus considered a "creature of development" or as a consequence of the impact of the technical processes and the international division of labour commanded by the small number of societies that espoused the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century (XVI). The author asserts that the resulting relations between these societies and the underdeveloped areas involve forms of dependence that can hardly be overcome.

Furtado concludes that development and underdevelopment should be considered as two aspects of the same historical process involving the creation and the spread of modern technology. With respect to the vast quantity of political problems in underdeveloped countries, the author stresses that such problems reflect historical situations different from those through which the currently advanced countries have passed in the early phases of their development. These different conditions

are, as the author states, "beyond the ideological rationales derived from the experience of classical capitalism" (XXV).

Furtado insists that if these political problems are to be solved, effective solutions must be developed in the underdeveloped countries themselves.

Furtado echoes similar thoughts in Economic Development of Latin America (1970), where he describes a pattern in the underdeveloped countries where assimilation of technology is very slow, and the benefits of increased productivity are very poorly distributed.

As already mentioned, the dependency theorists' arguments were well received in the 1960's because they were presented at a time of increasing dissatisfaction with the traditional theories of development. Concentrating primarily on the theoretical aspect, the dependency theorists advocated a counter theory of underdevelopment where the peripheral or satellite (underdeveloped) states remain impoverished, while the centres or developed countries continue to grow. Among expatriate scholars, their work is the richest in theory.

Furtado describes the phenomenon of underdevelopment within the framework of current history, stressing that the problems of the underdeveloped countries reflect historical situations that are different from those through which the currently developed

countries have passed in the early phases of their development. According to the author, these different conditions are all-important and underscore the importance of establishing effective solutions to underdevelopment in the developing countries themselves.

Dependency theorists have made a significant contribution to development literature in that they provided a plausible alternative to traditional theories of development.

C. Other Expatriate Scholars from Latin America and Mexico

Guillermo O'Donnell was born in Argentina but left in 1979. He is presently working at Princeton. The central theme of his article, "Corporatism and the Question of the State," is that the role of the state differs according to a country's particular historical experience.

O'Donnell calls those structures "corporatist" through which functional, nonterritorially based organizations officially represent private interests before the state. They are subject for their existence as well as their right of representation to authorization or acceptance by the state; such a right is reserved to the formal leaders of those organizations, forbidding and excluding other legitimate channels of access to the state for the rest of its members (49). His central thesis is,

therefore, that "corporatism" should be understood as a set of structures which link society with the state. "Corporatism" is not a static phenomenon in that it changes from country to country. In Latin America it is a relatively recent phenomenon and, according to O'Donnell, displays crucial differences from the "corporatism" observed by some authors in the developed countries.

The author asserts that the principal currents of Anglo-Saxon academic literature have been influenced by factors that causes them to ignore or deny the existence of problems typical of underdeveloped countries. O'Donnell lists a number of these factors: the tendency to ignore historical experiences where the role of the state differs from that of developed countries; the tendency to see social change as a movement along a traditional-modern continuum; and, the tendency of many scholars to view their own countries as the epitome of "development" (51).

O'Donnell brings out two important points. He maintains that the role of the state differs according to a country's particular historical experience. Secondly, Anglo-Saxon academic literature has denied or ignored the existence of problems typical of underdeveloped countries simply because these problems never manifested themselves within the Western experience.

Susan Kaufmann Purcell is considered an authority on Mexico, and has written and lectured extensively on the relations between Mexico and the United States. She is presently Senior Fellow and Director of the Latin American Project at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. Kaufmann Purcell is American.

Part of Kaufmann Purcell's work has included the editing of two volumes containing essays by Mexicans, Americans and Mexicans who have expatriated to the United States. Kaufmann Purcell is committed to strengthening mutual understanding between the U.S. and Mexico, and to encouraging cooperation between the people and governments of both Mexico and the U.S. She observes that Americans speak of the "interdependence" of Mexico and the U.S. "Interdependence" does, however, take on a pejorative sense for many Mexicans who question whether a relationship that is as asymmetrical as that between Mexico and the United States can be mutually beneficial.

Kaufmann Purcell's Mexico in Transition -- Implications for U.S. Policy (1988) contains, as its subtitle suggests, "Essays from both sides of the borders." Among the contributors is Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, a Mexican political scientist who is currently a Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, D.C.

In his essay, "Mexico and the United States: The Lost Path," Zinser contends that the bilateral relationship between Mexico and the United States has recently become more conflictual. The U.S., he states, wants Mexico to help find solutions to problems that only serve U.S. interests. Zinser suggests that active disapproval on the part of the U.S. towards Mexico seems to be inspired by three basic assumptions: 1) a perception that the "Mexican way" of doing things is increasingly wrong; 2) because of this, Americans no longer consider the Mexican government a reliable partner; and, 3) there is a view that Mexican leadership has lost its power to resist pressure and its ability to stop direct American involvement in Mexican affairs (122).

The author concludes that Mexico is trapped and U.S./Mexican relations are at an impasse, because there is no political incentive in Washington to work out a cooperative solution with Mexico outside the existing system. Zinser stresses what, in his opinion, dominates U.S./Mexican relations: the U.S.'s desire for Mexico to be a willing partner by finding solutions that best serve U.S. interests.

Zinser calls attention to the false notion entertained by many Americans that the "Mexican Way" of doing things is wrong. Furthermore, he states clearly that U.S./Mexican relations cannot simply be determined on the basis that the U.S. wants Mexico to

help find solutions to problems that only serve U.S. interests.

D. North America

Although not originally from Latin America, H.J. Wiarda identifies with the expatriate scholars. He has, with many of his works published during the mid-1970's and early 1980's, been instrumental in calling attention to the fact that many of our notions regarding Latin America have been of an extremely ethnocentric nature. This is the topic of his book, Politics and Social Change in Latin America (1974), and his article entitled, "The Ethnocentrism of the Social Science Implications for Research and Policy" (1981).

Wiarda's main thesis is that the Latin American experience is subject to special imperatives of analysis and interpretation that the general literature on development and social change has thus far failed to provide (Politics and Social Change Preface). He argues that there is a distinctive Southern European and Latin American intellectual and socio-political tradition which does not conform to the development paradigms formulated by Marx, Weber and others. In his 1981 article, he cites new literature from Latin America and Southern Europe which provide alternative routes to development. This new literature focuses on such themes as: corporatism (Spain/Portugal), dependency, patron-

client relations, and centre-periphery relations. Wiarda maintains that this literature has helped form the basis for a new Latin American social science. The author notes that these alternative ways of viewing the development process have, for the first time, considered the developing countries on their own terms. Policies and tactics which have been based on inappropriate development models can have serious ramifications. Wiarda's solution, already cited in Chapter Two, is radical: a complete reeducation, in nonethnocentric understandings, of at least two generations of social scientists, policymakers, and the informed public ("Ethnocentrism" 197).

E. China

China in Crisis -- China's Heritage and the Communist Political System and China's Policies in Asia and America's Alternatives (1968) is a two-volume set edited by Ping-ti Ho and Tang Tsou, two native Chinese who are both presently professors at the University of Chicago. The two volumes survey a vast span of Chinese history from the point of view of geography, demography, political ideology and institutions, social and educational thought, and economics.

In Ping-ti Ho's article, "Salient Aspects of China's Heritage," Ho gives a detailed account of the structural patterns

of historical development in China. He puts much emphasis on ideology, stressing that in order to understand the true character of the traditional Chinese state, one must first study the ideology on which the traditional Chinese state was based. According to the author, the fundamental character of the traditional Chinese state cannot be fully understood without an analysis of the components of Confucianism, the predominating ideology.

Ho concentrates on the period of time called the Western Han (B.C. 206-8 A.D.) which is when, according to the author, the fundamental character of the traditional Chinese state was determined. He devotes a considerable section to examining the different schools of thought that were interwoven into Western Han statecraft and ideology which were usually regarded as Confucian. Ho concludes that Confucianism was always a tool, never the master, of the traditional Chinese state, which during the entire imperial age remained highly authoritarian. Authoritarianism was, therefore, always strong in traditional China, and it has, according to Ho, progressively increased during the last several dynasties. The author points out that there exists significant continuities between the past and the present in China, and that one cannot hope to understand China today without a knowledge of imperial China. The author's

emphasis and concentration on Chinese history and ideology is a common theme among all contributors in the two volumes.

Metzger and Myers' article, "Sinological Shadows: The State of Modern China Studies in the U.S.," reflects a similar theme in that the authors contend that a good understanding of China's current policies and political trends depends on an adequate understanding of both China's history and Chinese society in modern times. According to the authors, the investment of \$41 million (from 1958-1970) to Western institutions of higher education in support of Chinese studies, has not paid off in that it has not produced quality scholarship and a corps of reliable China experts.

Metzger and Myers observe that many study the politics or doctrine of the Communists with little grasp of China's intellectual and political tradition. They stress the importance of examining China as a complex historical civilization. The authors point out that both the "modernization" and the "revolution" paradigm exaggerate the backwardness of China. They conclude that much work still remains with respect to Chinese studies. Chinese history should be systematically put into the context of the evolution of China's society and culture during the last few centuries. In order to analyze this context, a new kind of interdisciplinary methodology should be devised that

effectively combines the study of the key structural patterns with that of leading personalities and situational configurations (47).

Like Ping-ti Ho, Metzger and Myer stress that China's current policies and political trends cannot be understood without an adequate understanding of both China's history and Chinese society in modern times. They point out the importance of examining China as a complex historical civilization.

F. Japan

Chie Nakane is a Japanese anthropologist who resided for a short time abroad (California) and then returned to her native Japan. In Japanese Society (1970) Nakane attempts to construct a structural image of Japanese society, synthesizing the major distinguishing features of Japanese life in order to provide a better understanding of Japanese society. The aim of the study is to view Japanese social structure in the light of a cross-cultural comparison of social structures, and, most importantly, to look for what the author refers to as the "persistent factors" underlying the various changes to Japanese society.

Nakane admits that she had an advantage in pursuing her objective of a more complete understanding of the structural core of Japanese society in that she is Japanese. She compares her

illustration of Japan to an artist using his colours: "I had a distinct advantage in handling these colours, for they are colours in which I was born and among which I grew up; I know their delicate shades and effects" (VIII).

The author points out that most of the sociological studies of contemporary Japan have been concerned primarily with its changing aspects. Nakane, however, concentrates on "basic components and their potentiality in the society" -- that is, social persistence. Her approach is through a structural analysis. She does not resort to cultural or historical explanations, although she does consider them to be important elements.

The working of what Nakane calls the "vertical principle" in Japanese society is the main theme of her book. She asserts that the most characteristic feature of Japanese social organization arises from a single bond in social relationships: an individual or a group always has one single distinctive relation to the other (X). The author concludes that this structural tendency, which has developed during the course of Japanese history, has become one of the prominent characteristics of Japanese culture. She further states that during the course of modernization Japan imported many Western cultural elements, which were, however, always partial and segmentary, and were never in the form of an

operating system. Nakane cites this as an example of industrialization combined with the importation of Western culture that did not effect the basic Japanese cultural structure.

In looking for the "persistent factors" in Japanese society, Nakane concentrates on basic unchanging components which form an operating system in Japanese society, and continue to dominate or override imported Western cultural elements. It is interesting to note that Japan is a fully developed society without being totally Westernized. The Japanese have succeeded in "out-Westernizing" the Westerners "à la Japanese."

In Why has Japan "Succeeded"? (1982), Michio Morishisma focuses on Japan's distinct history and culture in presenting the theme of his book: to clarify those respects in which Japan has been both successful and unsuccessful, and to explain why this has been the case.

Morishisma sets out the problem under study in a Weberian manner, employing Weber's grand conception or modus operandi. He does not, therefore, view Japan within the narrow vision of "Japanese studies," but within the following framework: Japan has had its own culture from ancient times, and the ethos of the Japanese people has been formed over many years within this cultural environment. Because of this, Japanese capitalism has

deviated from the typical free enterprise system. The central question the author poses in the book is as follows: why have the possessors of this kind of non-Western attitude come to gain such control over the industrial techniques produced by the West? Morishisma asserts that the answer to this question lies in the fact that Japan, like other countries, has a specific history and a specific cultural ethos that has determined and guided its course of development. The author thus considers historical considerations and cultural characteristics to be all-important. Any analysis that omits these two crucial elements is, according to Morishisma, incomplete and even dangerous.

G. India

A.H. Somjee, originally from India and presently working in Canada, has made a significant contribution to the sub-discipline of political development. Armed with an impressive field research experience spanning three decades, Somjee boldly challenges the received wisdom through several volumes and articles focusing on the importance of the particular development experiences of developing societies.

In his critical review of the various theoretical approaches to the study of political development, Somjee argues that most of the concepts, theories and models used are of limited value in

explaining political development in developing countries. In breaking with traditional political development theory, Somjee suggests that the terms, concepts, and theories currently used to explain the social and political reality of the non-Western world should be seriously questioned as to their appropriateness and adequacy. He advocates an ethnopolitical approach to the study of political development, emphasizing the human dimension -- the particular social, cultural and historical forces of the countries under study. Thus, the individual and peculiar development experiences of those countries under examination need to be concentrated upon. Somjee urges that there is much to be learned from the past development experiences of developing societies themselves. His approach has a strong anthropological flavour.

Somjee accordingly argues that what is presently needed in development studies is a "fresh round of cognitive effort" which can be focused on the perceiving, knowing and conceptualising of the actual complexity of the development process in emerging societies (Development Theory Preface). As already mentioned, the concept of ethnodevelopment plays a key role where the people themselves need to be involved in their own development process. The construction of a reverse theory should, therefore, be the order of the day.

H. Africa

In 1969 Ali Mazrui went to Northwestern University as a scholar in residence. He did, however, return to East Africa after his stay in the United States, but is presently back in the States. The main theme of Mazrui's Cultural Engineering and Nation-Building in East Africa (1972), is reflected in the following statement made by a professor at Oxford in 1963 and quoted by Mazrui:

Perhaps, in the future, there will be some African history...But at present there is none; There is only the history of the Europeans in Africa. The rest is darkness,...and darkness is not a subject of history. (7)

The author contends that the central myth surrounding Africa is that of the denial that the Africans are a historical people. Africa, it is said, entered history only as a result of European contact. Furthermore, the understanding of Africa and its past has been greatly distorted by reports written by Europeans passing through Africa.

Mazrui, concentrating on African history and institutions, points out that the African oral tradition of history should not be discarded in that it is just as valid, if not more so, as African history written by Europeans. The author's solution is dependent upon four guiding principles used in the planning of

what Mazrui refers to as social engineering: 1) indigenizing what is foreign; 2) idealizing what is indigenous; 3) nationalizing what is sectional; and, 4) emphasizing what is African. According to the author, this particular social engineering is necessary to carry out the much needed nation-building or construction process in East Africa.

Similarly, in Nationalism and New States in Africa, Mazrui and Tidy focus on the "...cultural tyranny of a Eurocentric world culture that was imposed on Africa during the colonial period..." They point out that political development for Africa was envisaged in terms of building institutions comparable to those of Western systems. Their prescription for African countries concentrates on cultural emancipation: the adoption of a language policy of relevance to African culture; transforming the educational system; developing African literature and arts; and, most importantly, the pursuance of an ideology which puts a premium on African autonomy. The authors also advocate the building of a political system which gives weight to "the culturally more authentic peasants."

In Africa in World Affairs, edited by A. Mazrui, Dharam Ghai in his article entitled, "Africa, the Third World and the Strategy for International Development," reflects much of Mazrui's thinking.

Ghai maintains that the only solution for the Third World is that based on the recognition of the diversity and heterogeneity of the developing world, and the formulation of an international development strategy sensitive to such diversity and differentiation (237). Special measures are needed for the special problems of the majority of African countries. As a starting point, Ghai advocates a survey of each developing country describing the main features of their economic and social systems, and assessing the main obstacles to rapid development. The formulation of a comprehensive development program should follow.

I. The Middle East

Edward Said is a Palestinian Arab who expatriated to the United States and is now at Columbia University. Orientalism (1979) is the most general of his works. Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient is an Orientalist. Orientalism, according to the author, is the academic study of the Orient by Westerners and the assumptions and stereotypes that underlie this supposedly objective research. Said points out that a very large group of Orientalist writers have accepted the basic distinction between East and West as the starting point for their theories, novels, and political accounts of the Orient.

The author's starting point has thus been the British, French, and American experience of the Orient. It is, therefore, a style of thought based upon a distinction between the Occident and the Orient, expressed in the work of Western scholars from all disciplines. Said reminds us that from the beginning of the 19th Century to the end of World War II, France and Britain have dominated the Orient and Orientalism. Since World War II, the United States has dominated the Orient. Out of this domination comes the large body of texts Said calls Orientalist. The book traces the development of Orientalism from its influence on British and French colonial policy to the way its values can be seen in current attitudes towards Vietnam and the Middle East. To speak of Orientalism, Said maintains, is to speak mainly of a British and French cultural enterprise. In short, Europe has articulated the Orient.

Said's main thesis is that the Orientalists formed their views, not by direct observation, but by analysis of existing Western texts. As a result, Western Orientalism is ethnocentric and imperialist since it denies the reality of both the Orient and its people. It is, as the author points out, a Western way of dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. For Said, Orientalism is synonymous to cultural domination. He maintains that Orientalism represents a sign of

European-Atlantic power over the Orient as opposed to a discourse about the Orient. This puts the Westerner in a relationship with the Orient where the West is always in a position of superiority. Brombert writes that Orientalism for Said is, therefore, a political doctrine, and Orientalist scholars are explicitly or implicitly guilty of racism and ethnocentrism (Orientalism 532). The underlying theme of the book is thus the relationship of knowledge and power, since the relationship between the Occident and the Orient is one of power and domination.

Said calls attention to the difficulties of truly representing another culture. For Said, Europe has articulated the Orient. Orientalism is thus a British and French cultural enterprise since Orientalists formed their views not by direct observation but by analysis of existing Western texts. For the author, Orientalism quite simple means cultural domination. Said's description of Orientalism as an analysis of existing Western texts on the East, thus contributes to a better understanding of the way in which cultural domination has operated.

Said raises a variety of thought-provoking questions: What other sorts of intellectual energies went into the making of an imperialist tradition like the Orientalist one? The author does, indeed, challenge the reader with a very basic and important

question that is raised repeatedly throughout the book: Can there be true representation of anything, specifically of another culture?

Elbaki Hermassi, in The Third World Reassessed, agrees with Said. He maintains that Orientalism essentially focused on the traditions of the elites of the countries under study at the expense of local communities. In addition, it detached Third World cultures from their colonial context and its traumatic effects. The author concludes that Orientalism's methods, assumptions, and preoccupations are rooted in the European experience of Islam prior to the advent of colonization (7).

Similarly, in "American Intellectuals and Middle East Politics: An Interview with Edward W. Said," Said specifically calls attention to the silence, disinformation, and apathy concerning the Middle East on the part of the United States Left. He refers to the "sophisticated Orientalist interpretation" of events in Israel employed by American reporters, which, Said states, "uniformly comes out to be scandalously tendentious" (38). Throughout the interview, Said emphasizes the need for an honest international standard for discourse about the Middle East.

J. Jewish Scholars: "Exceptional Cases"

It is interesting to note that Jewish scholars may be considered as exceptions to the general trend of scholars surveyed in this Chapter, in that they have succeeded in becoming part of the Western learning tradition. They have, therefore, succeeded in broadening the "Western category" to include a non-Western group. This may be due to a number of factors.

George Marek argues that because the Jews were persecuted for several centuries and confronted with a continuous intolerance, they had no choice but to cultivate their minds since they were in large part prevented from doing anything else. He states: "The Jews, 'forced' to think, developed remarkable thinkers in many fields." (40).

Theodore Wright, in his article, "The Sociology of Knowledge: Jewish and Muslim Impact on American Social Sciences," argues that Jewish scholars have had a powerful impact on the social sciences. He states that Jews have largely shaped the paradigms and conceptual apparatus with which most Westerners approach, perceive, and analyze society in general (89). Wright cites such scholars as Morgenthau and Almond, and points out that Lipset observed some 30 years ago that sociology, anthropology, and psychology have had a disproportionate number of Jews among their leading practitioners (cited in Wright 90). The author

lists some reasons why this has occurred: the expulsion of Jewish scholars from Germany after 1933; second generation Jewish scholars were able to rise to the top once discriminatory university admission quotas were dismantled; and, there is a strong emphasis on learning and study in the Jewish culture (91).

Similarly, Gavin Langmuir, in responding to Jeremy Cohen's article, "Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom," points out that largely due to the revulsion caused by the "Final Solution," the attitudes of most non-Jews in the West toward Jews have undergone a radical change. Non-Jewish scholars, he maintains, have recognized that they need more knowledge of Jewish history, and, as a result, they have paid greater attention to the work of histories of the Jews.

Some General Observations

The birth of the dependency theorists in the mid-1960's reinforced the very important notion that growth and modernization theories were inadequate with their excessive concentration on physical capital, their equating of development and Westernization, and the somewhat simplistic nature of their explanations. There was, therefore, a marked shift in notions of the meaning of development (Forbes The Geography 58). Economic growth was no longer the primary standard of judging. As a result, development was gradually redefined as a more complex entity (Ibid.).

This shift in the meaning of development is strongly reflected in all of the works surveyed in this chapter. It is not surprising that a common theme is readily discernable in all of the writings. Time and time again the authors examined refer to the importance of taking what can be referred to as a particularistic and historical approach or perspective when describing the development process. The authors all insist, in one way or another, that the emphasis must be put on the particular society and culture under study, coupled with an in-depth examination and understanding of the particular country's historical experience. In addition, the development process must be carried out in the country that is undergoing development and,

most importantly, the false idea that the indigenous way of doing things is wrong must be corrected. The problems of developing countries need to be understood as a relational and on-going process. These common themes, easily detectable in all of the writings surveyed in this chapter, result in an alternative orientation and approach to the problem of development, and specifically, to political development. The results of the expatriate scholar literature review thus suggest that this orientation and approach, different from traditional approaches to political development, is in large part due to the fact that all scholars surveyed came from the non-Western world (with one exception), and that all of these scholars expatriated to the Western world. These two important factors appear to have reinforced and sensitized the scholars to this particularistic and historical approach. Expatriating has, therefore, had much influence on a good part of their work.

Different strands are identifiable in the expatriate scholars' arguments which, more often than not, reflect striking parallels. These common and diverse strands will be discussed in the following sections.

A. Differences among Expatriate Scholars

As previously mentioned, the most distinguishing trait found in the work of the dependency theorists is the abundance of theory. They advocated a counter theory of underdevelopment. This counter theory was strengthened by the fact that it was presented in a very timely fashion when dissatisfaction with traditional theories of development was on the increase.

O'Donnell differs from other expatriate scholars in that he zeroes in on the significance of historical experience with reference to the role of the state. Although his conclusions are similar to those of the other scholars surveyed, his point of departure differs in that his argument revolves around the role of the state which continually takes centre stage.

Ping-ti Ho focuses primarily on the ideology on which the traditional Chinese state was based. His ideological point of departure, Confucianism, differentiates this scholar from the others. Interestingly enough, his conclusions parallel those of the other scholars.

Metzger and Myers stress two factors which they consider of equal importance when considering Chinese political trends: an adequate understanding of both China's history as well as Chinese society in modern times.

Nakane's approach differs from the other scholars in that she is the only scholar to carry out a purely structural analysis. In order to determine how Japan has remained "Japanese," she concentrates on social relationships which have remained unchanged in Japanese society. She thus focuses on the basic components of society which have remained static. Unlike the other scholars, Nakane considers cultural or historical explanations to be of secondary importance. Her modus operandi reflects a very non-Western way of looking at development: the concentration on what is static and not on change or "progress."

Somjee's work reflects a strong anthropological flavour unlike other expatriates. His terms "ethnodevelopment" and "ethnopolitical" capture and appropriately label many of the ideas and themes expressed by the majority of the expatriate scholars: an emphasis on the social, cultural, and historical forces of the countries under study.

Mazrui differs from the others in that he takes an institutional approach. His focus is on African institutions and history. He presents a sound case for the validity of African oral history, and strongly asserts that an understanding of Africa and its past has been greatly distorted by Western scholars.

Said, like Mazrui, concentrates on the Western domination of the Orient, or, more specifically, the way in which the West has distorted the Orient through Western interpretations and analyses. He maintains that Europe has articulated the Orient and that this non-Oriental articulation of the Orient is equal to cultural domination.

B. Similarities among Expatriate Scholars

The expatriate scholars' work surveyed in this chapter reflects a number of similarities. These similarities far outweigh the differences described in the last section.

Furtado, O'Donnell, Ping-ti Ho, Metzger and Myers, Morishisma, Somjee, Mazrui, and Said all stress the importance of historical factors and differences of the various countries under study. This is a very important similarity in that the majority of approaches of the scholars surveyed is based on historical particularism. That is, a particular country's history must be understood in order to understand and deal with the present problems of that country.

All scholars, with the exception of Nakane, stress the importance of both past and present cultural factors. Or, as Morishisma states, "the ethos of the people" under study.

The dependency theorists, Morishisma, Somjee, Mazrui, and Said all stated directly that the solutions to the problems of the developing countries should come from the developing countries themselves. O'Donnell, Zinser, Ghai, and Said alluded to this in that they all pointed out that developing countries have quite different problems than developed countries, and that special measures should be taken to deal with these special problems. These two points are very important as most scholars advocated solutions to the problems of developing countries at the indigenous level, or what can be called a reflexive sub-discipline of political development. Similarly, Wiarda, Metzger and Myers, Somjee, and Said asserted that a new methodology should be devised to deal with developing countries, as well as special imperatives of analysis that the general literature on development has failed to provide.

All authors without exception stressed the diversity and heterogeneity of the developing world.

As illustrated in the previous sections, the expatriate scholars all emphasized different aspects and considerations reflecting their own diverse backgrounds. As we have seen, there exists some internal differences among expatriate scholars in that each focuses on different elements: theory; structural

patterns of historical development; anthropology; the indigenous way; ideology; cultural ethos; and institutions. These internal differences are of interest, but only at a secondary or "mechanical level" in that they assist the scholar in arriving at his or her conclusions which are of primary importance. These internal differences are thus dominated by several common themes which together contribute to an identifiable expatriate position: a position that emphasizes the particular historical experience of the country under study; one that recognizes the importance of regional factors; and, finally, one that recognizes the importance of carrying out the development process at the indigenous or local level.

This position differs dramatically from that of conventional development scholars who viewed development as an aspect of modernization where modernization meant Westernization. The expatriate scholars surveyed in this chapter thus differ from conventional scholars in that they are guided by what can be called a reflexive political science or sub-discipline of political development where those directly implicated by the development process are involved. In addition, they have adopted a particularistic and historical perspective. This approach not only differs considerably from the conventional path taken by most Western scholars but provides an alternative dimension from

which to view the development process.

An evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the expatriate scholars' arguments results in some important observations. These observations may be made at two different levels. At the first and most important level, the major strength of the scholars' collective arguments is that an identifiable and very valid expatriate position does emerge. As already mentioned, this position provides an alternative way in which to view the development process. At a secondary and less important level, some cautionary comments need to be made with reference to the content of this expatriate position. The emphasis on the particular historical experience of the country under study is extremely important, yet care should be taken to avoid unnecessary quantities of historical research or description. This, naturally, would be a judgement call on the part of the scholar. Secondly, self-development should not necessarily forbid the importation of all foreign or Western elements. What needs to be changed is the focus of the orientation of development from an all-Western perspective to a perspective oriented to and in the area or areas undergoing development. Some method of selective screening of foreign elements may prove useful in this case.

The expatriate scholars surveyed in this chapter, despite their internal differences, have made an important contribution to the sub-field of political development in that they have repeatedly focused on three crucial concepts: 1) the importance of a country's particular history; 2) the systemic nature of a culture where the interjection of foreign (Western) ill-fitting elements simply disrupts the system; and, 3) the reflexive nature of the sub-discipline of political development where those directly involved in the development process must participate. These scholars have recognized the on-going challenge faced within the sub-discipline of political development that Western experience must be transcended with respect to the development process of non-Western countries.

Jewish scholars were briefly mentioned so as not to exclude an important group. As previously pointed out, Jewish scholars appear more as an exception to the rule in that they differ from the other expatriate scholars, with their strong footing in the Western learning tradition. A number of reasons were given for this.

CHAPTER FOUR

CRITIQUES AND TRENDS: IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY CONSTRUCTION

This thesis has sought to refute the notion that, for the developing countries, there is only one destiny: Euro-American Westernization. A multi-disciplinary approach has been employed in an attempt to illustrate that there are alternative approaches and orientations to the problem of development, and specifically to political development, than the conventional approach taken by Western scholars. Even liberal legal and political institutions borrowed by the developing countries from Western countries can be adapted to fit both the cultural and economic backgrounds of developing countries. The future of developing countries need not, therefore, be repeatedly "determined" by the Westcentric or biased theory of Western scholars. In order to emphasize this point, sources have been examined from the following disciplines: Political science, anthropology, sociology, economics, history, philosophy, as well as English and French literature. This cross-disciplinary approach has, contrary to expectations, produced some very consistent results. This chapter will present a summary and discussion of these results and their implications with respect to the sub-discipline of political development.

Summary of Results

Through a survey and critique of the political development literature and the various theoretical positions implicit in it, Chapter One of this thesis has attempted to demonstrate the Westcentric bent and orientation of political development theory. It was argued that the theoretical perspectives which were constructed much in advance of an understanding of the peculiarities of developing societies, proved to be unsatisfactory. Equally unsatisfactory was the "blanket extension" of the body of theoretical knowledge to developing countries without the necessary refinement and reformation. A number of reasons were given for this theoretical inadequacy, among the most important: political development was generally perceived of as a by-product of the push towards economic and social modernization; the theories were largely based on developed countries; the theories were not sufficiently sensitized to the historical and cultural differences between developing societies and Western societies; the structural-functional method employed by three leading political development theorists is questionable in terms of its appropriateness for measuring political development; and, only one approach alluded to a broad social explanation of development. One critical assumption was repeatedly made by the majority of political

development scholars surveyed: that developing societies will, at some point, follow the political development path already travelled by the industrialized societies of the West in spite of the fact that developing societies possess basically different cultures and histories.

In Chapter One it was also stressed, among other factors, that American sociology, with its particular set of biases, has had a strong influence on the discipline of political science. With reference to the developing countries, sociologists have been mainly concerned with the transition from "tradition" to "modernity" where, they assumed, underdeveloped countries would imitate those institutions that were characteristic of Western countries. Three leading political development theorists employed structural-functionalism which originated in American sociology. It was suggested that structural-functionalism may not have been entirely appropriate due to the fact that it does not make any provision for change, has a distinctly Western orientation, and lacks explanatory powers.

It has thus been argued that the theoretical inadequacies within the sub-field of political development are largely due to the following: the influence that American sociology has had on the discipline of political science which has contributed to both the normative structural-functional tendency and Westcentric bent

of political development theory; and, of equal importance, to the failure of development theory to sufficiently account for the individual particularities and diversity of developing countries themselves. This latter deficiency has also contributed to the Westcentric theoretical tendency.

The major theoretical approaches to the study of political development have, therefore, originated from, or have relied too heavily upon the Western model of development and modernization. For political development theorists, a large gap still exists between theoretical structures and the real world. These scholars have repeatedly ignored the fundamental anthropological principle that the function of a culture component is to be judged and determined by reference to its context. With reference to political development theory, it must be stressed that what is conceptually functional in one political setting may not be functional or appropriate in another. Any conceptual or concrete tool, in order to be effective, must be adapted to or fashioned after the particular setting or context in which it will be used.

Some recent writings related to political development theory were also looked at in Chapter One. Of the works examined, all of the scholars agree that the received models are unsatisfactory and that the problems and core issues within political

development should be thought through with reference to the peculiarities of various societies. These scholars were not specifically concerned with why a situation of conceptual inadequacy exists. In addition, none of these scholars offered a refinement of the present theory which takes into account the actual problems of specific societies.

As illustrated in Chapter One, the sub-discipline of political development has been plagued with difficulties at the level of definition. There is no single agreed-upon definition of the term "political development." This comes as little surprise since the process of political development crosses many cultural boundaries, touching a great many societies. When formulating a definition, it is the criteria of universality which proves the most problematic since one single definition of "political development" would seem impossible to construct due to the fact of cultural variation.

Yet some scholars have suggested that "universals" could be established with respect to a definition of "political development." This opens the door to an interesting and difficult debate where the problem of differing cultural values and differences in societies' development processes plays a central role. The position taken in this thesis is that it would be much more productive to define the process of political

development according to the specific context, that is, according to the particular country or region one is addressing. It must, after all, be kept in mind that a universal definition would have to await the formulation of a number of region and country based theories which would then need to be pieced together into a larger whole. In a situation of diversity where our knowledge is bound to be incremental, great leaps into grand universal theory or theories may not be the intellectually sound course to follow.

The discussion focusing on the complexities of defining the term "political development" has, however, shown that a stipulated or relational definition of the term "political development" can be constructed. Some allowance or provision must, however, be made for dealing with continuing social dynamics to take care of particular problems as they arise. Development means different things in different countries, and development means different things to different people. As already suggested, one single definition of "political development" proves futile and unproductive due to the variation in the cultural components of each society. One could, however, suggest a variety of definitions of "political development" which could apply in certain cases depending on the particular area or country under study, for example: the establishment and development of institutions; social and economic development;

mobilization and participation. These are but a few examples. The list goes on; its length reflects the diversity of each developing country.

In order to shed light on the conceptual inadequacies of political development theory -- that is, to assist in understanding why development theory is inclined towards Western ways of thinking, and why the construction of a universal definition of the term "political development" proves so difficult -- we have turned to epistemological issues, and specifically to the sociology of knowledge. We have acknowledged that, although we in the West are beginning to know more about the developing countries, they still present us with a formidable challenge because of our own lack of knowledge. The sociology of knowledge has assisted us in highlighting the fact that social science knowledge is formed within the contexts of particular historical and social situations. It is, therefore, influenced by the society within which it is generated. Thus, in constructing their theories, the development scholars surveyed in Chapter One were simply reflecting their own body of society and culture-specific knowledge. These scholars were simply describing their own experiences as they related to the development process through various Western oriented theories.

At the same time, we have looked to Karl Popper and his

method of the critical scrutiny of ideas as a way out of the extreme relativism inherent in the sociology of knowledge position; that is, critical inquiry, continuous dialogue, and the willingness to subject our intellectual positions to the scrutiny of others. While Popper expects universalistic positions to emerge out of this process, we have not yet reached this position in either development studies or development theory . We have yet to learn more about non-Western societies before we can construct universalistic theories of the development process.

Chapter Two attempts to further clarify, explain, and understand the issue of Western bias in the political development literature by carrying out a fresh review and interpretation of the literature on the relatively old concept of ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism continually re-surfaces in the social sciences. Indeed, Godtfredsen quotes Gunnell who brings this point home:

The rather simple ethnocentrism and bias apparent and inherent in most of the conceptual frameworks of political science and their failure to describe non-Western societies as well as to capture significant aspects of domestic politics, has been notorious and almost monotonously criticized for a number of years....(67)

Some Francophone authors' writings on the concept of ethnocentrism were then looked at in order to avoid a purely Anglophone interpretation of the concept. A sample of French

reactions to various manifestations of ethnocentrism in contemporary French history was also examined. The concluding part of Chapter Two focused on different ethnocentric expressions in French and English contemporary history.

As we have seen, Chapter Two reflects general agreement among both Anglophone and Francophone scholars that ethnocentrism is a universal force to be reckoned with. One finds a firmly established definition of the concept among Anglophone scholars: "...a tendency in the individual to be 'ethnically centered', to be rigid in his acceptance of the culturally 'alike' and in his rejection of the 'unlike'" (Forbes Nationalism 22). This definition contributes to an understanding as to why the development scholars surveyed in Chapter One continuously focused on a development path fashioned after Western experience.

The second part of Chapter Two, focusing on the Francophone view of ethnocentrism, produced some interesting results. Those French writers surveyed who had experienced ethnocentrism first-hand showed a tendency to react to the phenomenon by providing solutions to the problem, as opposed to simply describing it as was the case with the Anglophone writers. In addition, the Francophone writers tended towards what could be referred to as an "external" focus. Their concentration was primarily focused on the diversity of cultures (on "others"), as opposed to

Anglophone descriptions which repeatedly employed the term "self."

It was suggested that both the Anglophone and Francophone scholars surveyed complemented each other since the first group defined the concept of ethnocentrism, while the latter group reacted to the phenomenon by providing solutions. This trend was particularly evident in the concluding part of Chapter Two where some French reactions to different manifestations of ethnocentrism in French history were surveyed.

Different solutions to the problem of ethnocentrism surfaced forcefully in the latter part of Chapter Two which focused on one flagrant manifestation of ethnocentrism during contemporary French history, namely, colonization and the process of decolonization. It was suggested that negative events such as colonization and the process of decolonization have produced what may be termed a considerable "ethnocentric guilt" among certain French writers. Many French scholars have written on the topic of colonization and decolonization. A number of these authors were surveyed in this section. It was pointed out that together both Fernand Braudel and Michel Foucault may be said to represent the predominating attitudes, opinions, approaches, and reactions of the French authors surveyed on the problem of ethnocentrism and manifestations of ethnocentrism. Braudel and Foucault

summarize the French authors surveyed since they repeatedly focus on a number of the same themes as the French authors, for example: the importance of the indigenous population; the importance of cultural context and cultural diversity; the value of historical analysis; and, the recognition that development must take into account a variety of factors.

It was argued that a French mind-set geared towards strategies of native assimilation and integration (the French structuring of the colonial context), combined with the fact that many of the French authors were directly involved with the events that they were writing about, has produced a French approach or perspective that differs significantly from that of the Anglophones.

This same pattern -- the Anglo "experience-remote" description of the phenomenon of ethnocentrism, and the French "experience-proximate" reaction to the actual event -- emerged when comparing the Anglo-Saxon world-view on developing countries represented by the works of political development theorists, and the work of a group of French writers and scholars of the same time period whose work was essentially a reaction to the effects of colonization and the process of decolonization (a significant manifestation of ethnocentrism in France). Those who are directly involved in the event tend to advocate indigenous

solutions, whereas those who describe the event from a distance promote solutions mirroring their own experiences and ways of doing things.

These two approaches, the "experience-remote" description of the phenomenon, which in this study was represented by a group of Anglophone scholars, and the "experience-proximate" reaction to the actual event, in this case represented by a group of Francophone writers, call attention to the following: that unlike a body of theoretical ideas in the natural sciences, the theories of the social sciences are, by and large, rooted in the historical and social experience of scholars and the societies to which they belong.

Chapter Three takes into account the views on ethnocentrism and Western bias of a group of expatriate scholars largely from the developing countries who are presently working in Europe, North America, and at some of the international institutions.

First we turned to literature in order to understand and call attention to the large cultural differences between East and West. Mukherjee and Rushdie accurately describe the problems associated with making the transition from East to West, and in dealing with a double cultural identity. V.S. Naipaul and Nirad Chaudhury were cited as examples of writers who have gone beyond ethnocentrism. Their work is characterized by the following

theme: the mutual benefit and mutual damage of the effects of ethnocentrism on all parties concerned.

A survey and examination of the works of a number of expatriate scholars was undertaken. The results of this survey were most interesting in that all authors took a particularistic and historical approach or perspective when describing the development process. All of the authors surveyed agree that emphasis must be put on the particular society and culture under study, combined with an in-depth examination and understanding of the particular country's historical experience. In addition, the development process must be carried out in the country that is undergoing development where the indigenous way is stressed and adhered to. A firm expatriate position was thus identified: a position that emphasizes the particular historical experience of the country under study; one that recognizes the importance of regional factors; and, one that recognizes the importance of carrying out the development process at the indigenous or local level.

Through an evaluation of the strength and weaknesses of the expatriate scholars' arguments, some important observations surfaced: 1) the major strength of the scholars' collective arguments is that an identifiable expatriate position does emerge (as described in the previous paragraph) which provides an

alternative way in which to view the development process; 2) Self-development does not necessarily forbid the importation of all foreign or Western elements. What needs to be changed is the focus of the orientation of development from an all-Western perspective to a perspective oriented to and in the areas undergoing development. Some method of selective screening was recommended for this; and, 3) the major weakness found in the expatriate scholars' work is a tendency towards historical research, cultural analysis, theoretical critique, and deconstruction. What is now eagerly awaited is a bolder and more conclusive theoretical approach at the hands of these scholars which has significance beyond their own regions.

Concluding Section

The diverse literature surveyed in this thesis repeatedly reflect the same pattern where those not directly involved with the actual event proposed solutions typical of and reflecting their own experiences, while those directly involved in the event advocated solutions at a local or indigenous level. The political development theorists presented in Chapter One promoted their own Western style solutions to the problems of distant, far-removed and much less understood countries. Similarly, the

majority of the Anglophone writers simply described the phenomenon of ethnocentrism. In contrast, those involved in the actual event -- the majority of the French authors surveyed, and the expatriate scholars surveyed -- took a much more pro-active position with respect to development. They continually upheld Berque's position on development that "true integration postulates active participation" (340) where indigenous problems should be resolved at the indigenous level, and where a particular country's history and culture must be taken into consideration.

As pointed out in Chapter Two, anthropologists have contributed the most profoundly, directly or indirectly, to the problem of ethnocentrism and to the need to evaluate non-Western societies on their own terms and in their own contexts. One may well ask why the discipline of anthropology has not had more of an impact on political science, and particularly on the sub-field of political development; specifically with reference to the issue of ethnocentrism, and more generally with respect to the problem of cultural differences. Such an influence would have been welcome because political development scholars, like the majority of anthropologists, were engaged in studying societies other than their own. The answer may be found in part by the fact that the field of political development lacks, by and large,

a definite conceptual direction (Somjee Political Capacity 98). Furthermore, Somjee notes that there is not only a lack of scholarly criticism in the field, but also a lack of communication among political development scholars (Ibid. 5). It is unfortunate that a sub-discipline concerned with human (political) development that is plagued by confusion and little firm theoretical direction, has not sought guidance from the discipline of anthropology.

Some progress has, however, been made in the field of political development since an awareness of the dangers of ethnocentric analysis is slowly increasing within the discipline of political science. The expatriate scholars are a case in point, as are some of the scholars cited in Chapter One who recognize that a rethinking of political development is necessary. As Paul Streeten observes: "There is something if not illegitimate, at any rate distasteful, in people from safe and comfortable positions recommending revolutions, or painful reforms, or, for that matter, the maintenance of the status quo, to others" (qtd. in Hermassi Third World Reassessed: 8). An increasing number of scholars would agree with Streeten, particularly those who come from the Third World. Some additional Third World scholars who share Streeten's views are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Like Edward Said's notion of Orientalism, Syed H. Alatas, in referring to the developing countries, writes of a "demonstration effect" defined as the assimilation and acceptance of the utility and superiority of social science knowledge from the West by developing countries ("Captive Mind" 10). In his 1974 article, Alatas refers to this syndrome as a "captive mind" dominated by Western thought acquired through books by way of an imitative and uncritical manner. Alatas states that this intellectual "demonstration effect" must be eliminated or restricted. He thus advocates an autonomous social science tradition in Asia and other developing countries where alternative models, methodologies and concepts to modify those already available are constructed. Alatas' answer to the problems of developing societies is not to avoid the Western world of learning, but to assimilate it in a selective and constructive manner. This responsibility, he stresses, lies within the developing countries themselves to carry out.

Elbaki Hermassi in Leadership and National Development in North Africa states simply that modernization theory is a failure which cannot explain backwardness, and offers no practical remedy for underdevelopment (216). This author sees no alternative to historical analysis. He asserts that the historical tradition of a given national unit should be studied along with its impact

upon actual or potential national development (5). Hermassi stresses that future studies of the Third World should be both time-oriented and context-sensitive, and suggests a new paradigm focusing on the construction of region-specific models.

In his article, "The Call for Indigenization," Yogesh Atal promotes indigenization as a solution for the developing countries but, at the same time, warns of the associated difficulties. The author reminds us that the question of indigenization has been discussed since the early 1970's, and has come to mean different things to different people. Atal lists what he perceives indigenization to mean at the local level: general localization, language shift, paradigm replacement, a return to native categories of thought, glorification of tradition, and condemnation of foreign academic colonialism (192). Like Said and Alatas, he believes that academic colonization is part and parcel of the modernization package in that there is considerable distortion of facts and misrepresentation of reality in the writings of outsiders (Westerners) on development.

Atal points out that at the non-local level, the call for indigenization appears almost like a revolt against the dominance of Western concepts, theories, and methodologies because the demand for indigenization is an invitation to re-examine the very

structure of the social sciences. Indigenization thus emphasizes the "inside view" or the emic perspective, drawing attention to historical and cultural specificities. Atal warns of two dangers linked to indigenization: the difficult dilemma of the universality of science versus the specificities of cultures; and, that it must be kept in mind that the developing countries are, themselves, at different stages of social science development.

Wolfgang Sachs, a professor at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Essen, West Germany, believes that the concept of "development" which is now almost five decades old, is passé. He states that the ideology of development is obsolete in that it no longer makes any sense for the South to catch-up to the North. He adds that one single path to development simply no longer exists. Sachs advocates a new conceptual framework incorporating his solution to the problems surrounding development: "the politics of manifold experimentation" which is, according to this scholar, a culturally directed social project focusing on manifold diversity. In carrying out this "global experimenting," Sachs stresses that we will be able to broaden our present possibilities and, in doing so, to enrich the forms of life we presently have.

Alatas, Hermassi, Atal, and Sachs all promote recipes for development which reflect and agree with the results obtained from this study: a concentration on alternative social science models and on indigenization.

Then there are those scholars who, for the most part, promote the maintenance of the status quo. These scholars were referred to in Chapter One. Let us, therefore, take into account some recent ideas of the founding father of the sub-discipline of political development, namely, Gabriel Almond.

In his article, "The Development of Political Development" (1990), Almond presents a defense of the evolution of the predominant theoretical approaches in the sub-disciplines of political development and comparative politics. The article is significant in that it reflects the present thinking of one of the most prominent political development theorists. In the following paragraphs, we shall look closely at Almond's ideas as expressed in his article and offer some critical comments.

Almond points out that between 1945 and 1965, comparative politics and development studies sought to make sense out of the reconstruction of both governments and economies in post-war Europe, the increase of nations, and the search for modernization in the Third World. Development studies thus made the reputations of a generation of political scientists, economists,

sociologists, anthropologists, and other social scientists (Apter, Binder, Coleman, Pye, Weiner, amongst others), including those scholars who took a quantitative approach (Lerner, Lipset, and Deutsch to name a few). Almond stresses that Talcott Parsons was influential in the conceptual efforts of development theorists. At the same time, economic historians and economists concerned with Third World problems and prospects produced a substantial literature. This literature did not lend itself easily to simple characterization because it was so methodologically diverse.

Almond reports that in the mid-60's an attack on development research began that equated mainstream social science and comparative politics to American imperialism and neocolonialism. According to Almond, this characterization of the development literature as ethnocentric, projective, unilinear, and as the intellectual handmaiden of capitalism and imperialism, stemmed from the work of Marxist theorists who were mostly from Latin America. The author counterattacks this criticism of development research, stating that: "The claim that the primarily American literature presented a monolithic and unilinear model of political development and projected Anglo-American and capitalist values on the outside World cannot survive an even casual reading" (227). He further asserts that: "...the attribution of

the view to mainstream comparative politics that the modernization of the Third World implied a capitalist and democratic outcome simply cannot be sustained by evidence" (229).

Almond concedes that full scholarly objectivity is an impossibility, but maintains that: "...the constant search for ways of minimizing ideological and cultural bias, of bringing them under control, is very much alive" (231). He then critiques dependency theory, focusing on the weaknesses involved in treating the world political economy as divisible into four class formations (the capitalist centre, the periphery of the centre, the centre of the periphery, and the periphery of the periphery). Almond, does, however acknowledge that dependency theory stressed variables that development theory in its earlier stages neglected. Nonetheless, he believes it incorrect to say that the "dependency" emphasis on political economy and on international variables had significant impact on mainstream development studies. The author concludes this section by pointing out that while Third World research continues on a substantial scale, it no longer is the "growth industry" it was in the 1950's and 1960's. The relationship between politics and economic development, Almond acknowledges, turns out to be more complex than expected.

Almond then refers to the accomplishments made in area studies during the last decade, saying that these studies have not been fully appreciated. Similarly, he affirms that the application of models and concepts from comparative politics and political sociology has illuminated communist politics in important ways. Almond argues that during the last several years, "creative model fitting has been the essence of the game" -- whether it be the patron-client model, the bureaucratic politics model or other conceptual models taken from American political studies that have, according to the author: "...proven so useful in bringing out the similarities and differences among First, Second, and Third World countries" (246). The author concludes that the characterization of the literature of comparative politics as an ideological defense of imperialism and capitalism simply is not borne out by evidence. He states that: "Mainstream comparative studies, rather than being in crisis, are richly and variedly productive. If there is no single paradigm today, it may be said that there never was one. In the four decades since World War II, the level of rigor has been significantly increased with quantitative analytical, and historical-sociological work. It has not escaped cultural and ideological bias, but it aspires to and attains an even greater honesty and detachment" (253).

Almond's article is a detailed account of the evolution of the sub-discipline of political development. Unfortunately, the conclusions drawn more than uphold the status quo since they reflect the same type of thinking demonstrated by Almond and his associates in the 1960's. There does not appear to be any significant change in approach or attitude.

Almond's assertion that the characterization of development literature as ethnocentric, projective, unilinear etc. stemmed from the work of Marxist theorists mostly from Latin America is correct in as far as it goes. What he neglects to mention is that the ideas of the dependency theorists were generally well received largely because they were presented at a time of increasing dissatisfaction with traditional theories of development. It was not only the Marxist theorists who were dissatisfied with Western political development theory. Almond does a harsh critique of dependency theory saying that the dependency theorists proposed "a simpleminded interpretation" of Third World development. Although he does acknowledge that dependency theory stressed variables that development theory tended to neglect, he only briefly mentions international variables. He does not, for example, mention the importance that the dependency theorists attributed to historical and cultural factors, indigenization, or the general diversity of the

developing world. As this thesis has attempted to illustrate, these factors are difficult to ignore. Last but not least, Almond does not call attention to the important theoretical contribution made by the dependency theorists -- that because of their work, development was subsequently defined as a more complex entity.

Almond states that there is no evidence supporting the idea that the modernization of the Third World implies or is equal to a capitalist and democratic outcome. In short, he denies the Westcentric tendency of political development theory. Instead, he argues that "creative model fitting" has been the essence of the game for the last several years. With respect to the use of models in both the sub-disciplines of political development and comparative politics, Almond primarily focuses on the application of Western models to Third World countries, and refers to trying different models on "for fit." The crucial question of the appropriateness of applying these American models to Third World countries is not adequately addressed.

Almond's conclusion is the most surprising since it only relates to a portion of his topic. He suggests that there may never have been a single paradigm for mainstream comparative politics studies. While this may be true, the author avoids addressing this same issue with respect to political development,

the major topic of his article. As illustrated in Chapter One of this thesis, it would be difficult to build a case stating that political development theory has not at least been influenced by the modernization paradigm. Almond, however, appears to draw his conclusion simply to prove the point that: "Mainstream comparative studies, rather than being in crisis, are richly and variedly productive" (Ibid.). After all, it must not be forgotten that Almond is defending his sub-discipline and life's work; a sub-discipline that he was so instrumental in creating. ✓

Nevertheless, Almond took nearly a quarter of a century to take the critics of his theory seriously. In doing so, he did not go beyond the dependency theorists. He had practically no answer for his critics from Asian and African countries who maintained that the cultural backgrounds of emerging societies constitute a very vital factor in their development process.

This study has shown that the solution to the problem of development theory is as complex and multi-faceted as the problem itself. In this thesis we have attempted to illustrate that the present body of theoretical ideas employed in the sub-field of political development, often prevents us from understanding the complexity and diversity of political development processes of non-Western societies. Needless to say, no single solution can

solve the many challenges posed by developing countries.

Certainly no single Western solution can solve the development problems of Third World countries.

The discussions in this thesis have raised many questions. Among the most challenging is, how can ethnocentric biases be decreased or minimized? It is the opinion of this writer that a solution to minimizing ethnocentric or Western biases should focus on eliminating the problem at hand, as opposed to simply concentrating on the symptoms of the problem. In the case of political development, the problem is as follows: how to achieve a dramatic reorientation of thinking away from a primarily all-Western focus and orientation. The symptoms of the problem manifest themselves in models reflecting Westcentric characteristics and perspectives. The results of this study underline the importance of a particularistic and incremental approach to the sub-discipline of political development, stressing the role of indigenization, or what has been referred to in Chapter Three as a reflexive sub-discipline of political development. A concentration on alternative social science models was repeatedly called for. In order to change the focus of the orientation of development and to thus minimize ethnocentric biases, this writer advocates a multi-disciplinary approach incorporating "contextually tailored" regional models

which may or may not incorporate certain Western conceptual tools. Once the predominating focus of the orientation of development is shifted from an entirely Western perspective to one highlighting the specific country or region under study, ethnocentric biases are bound to be dramatically reduced.

Our Western mind-set must be re-programmed to think along the lines of regional models complemented by selective and constructive Western elements, as opposed to the traditional blanket imposition of Western models on developing countries. That is, Western models which, more often than not, do not account for the particular needs of developing societies. After all, theories and models are simply intellectual tools which represent what we believe happens in the world. They are not absolutely true or false; they are only more or less useful. If they reflect certain biases or exclude important elements they are of no use at all. Inadequate and inappropriate theories and models may hinder the task at hand, or worse still, as Baaklini has suggested, they have: "...proved an obstacle to development itself" (558).

Western political development scholars must first educate themselves (once again if necessary) with respect to the dangers of ethnocentrism and, secondly but not less importantly, they must re-educate themselves about the specific people they wish to

"help" in order to obtain a thorough understanding of the particularities and specific contexts of those who are the object of their research. Otherwise they will remain insensitive to the reality and actual needs of the other and the present trend will continue.

Works Cited

- Alatas, S.H. "The Captive Mind and Creative Development." International Social Science Journal XXVI.4 (1974): 691-700.
- . "The Captive Mind in Development Studies." International Social Science Journal XXIV.1 (1972): 9-25.
- Almond, G.A. "A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics." The Politics of the Developing Areas. Eds. G. Almond and J. Coleman. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960. 3-64.
- . "The Development of Political Development." A Discipline Divided. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990. 219-262.
- Anderson, J.N. "Ecological Anthropology and Anthropological Ecology." Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Ed. J. Honigsmann. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. 179-239.
- Apter, David E. Choice and the Politics of Allocation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- . Rethinking Development. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987.
- . Some Conceptual Approaches to the Study of Modernization. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- . The Politics of Modernization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Apter, David E., and Charles F. Andrain, eds. Contemporary Analytical Theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Ardener, E. "Comprehending Others." Edwin Ardener - The Voice of Prophecy and other essays. Ed. M. Chapman. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc., 1989. 159-185.

- Aron, Raymond. "Le Paradoxe du Même et de L'autre." Échanges et Communications. Eds. Jean Pouillon and Pierre Maranda. Paris: Mouton, 1970. 943-952.
- Atal, Yogesh. "The Call for Indigenization." International Social Science Journal XXXIII.1 (1981): 189-197.
- Baaklini, Abdo I. "Legislatures in New Nations: Towards a New Perspective." Polity VIII.4 (1976): 558-580.
- Barnes, Barry, and David Bloor. "Relativism, Rationalism and the Sociology of Knowledge." Rationality and Relativism. Eds. Martin Hollis and Steven Lukes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982. 21-47.
- Beattie, J.M. "Contemporary Trends in British Social Anthropology." Sociologus 5 (1955): 2-14.
- Berque, Jacques. "Towards a Better Transfer of Knowledge and Values." Prospects VI.3 (1976): 328-348.
- Berry, J.W., and Rudolf Kalin. "Reciprocity of Inter-Ethnic Attitudes in a Multicultural Society." International Journal of Intercultural Relations 3.1 (1979): 99-112.
- Biddiss, Michael D. Father of Racist Ideology--The Social and Political Thought of Count Gobineau. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.
- Binder, Leonard. "Review Essay: Political Participation and Political Development." American Journal of Sociology 83.3 (1977): 751-760.
- Blomstrom, Magnus, and Bjorn Hettne. Development Theory in Transition. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1984.
- Bozeman, Adda B. "American Policy and the Illusion of Congruent Values." Strategic Review Winter 1987: 11-23.
- Braudel, Fernand. Capitalism and Material Life 1400-1800. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Brombert, Victor. "Orientalism and the Scandals of Scholarship." The American Scholar Autumn 1979: 532-542.
- Brynes, Asher. "When We Learned to Look Forward." The Nation February 1974: 216-219.

- Cayley, David. "Redefining Development." CBC Ideas Transcripts (1990): 11-20,21-31,32-40.
- Cancian, Francesca. "Functional Analysis of Change." American Sociological Review 25 (1960): 818-827.
- Centre Culturel Africain. La Décolonisation de L'Afrique--Vue par des Africains. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1987.
- Chilton, Stephen. Defining Political Development. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988.
- Cohen, Jeremy. "Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom." The American Historical Review 91.3 (1986): 592-624.
- Connolly, William. "Taylor, Foucault, and Otherness." Political Theory 13.3 (1985): 365-375.
- Contat, Michel, and Michel Rybalka. The Writings of Jean-Paul Sartre. Volume 2, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.
- Driedger, L., and R. Clifton. "Ethnic Stereotypes: Images of Ethnocentrism, Reciprocity or Dissimilarity?" Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 21.3 (1984): 287-301.
- Dumont, René, and Marie-France Mottin. Stranglehold on Africa. Worcester: Ebenezer Baylis and Son Ltd., 1983.
- Eckstein, Harry. "The Idea of Political Development: From Dignity to Efficiency." World Politics XXXIV.4 (1982): 451-486.
- Fairchild, Henry Pratt, ed. Dictionary of Sociology. New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co., 1965.
- Fanon, Frantz. Black Skin White Masks. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1967.
- . The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1963.
- Flax, Jane. "Why Epistemology Matters: A Reply to Kress." The Journal of Politics 43.4 (1981): 1006-1024.

- Forbes, D.K. The Geography of Underdevelopment. London: Croom Helm, 1984.
- Forbes, H.D. Nationalism, Ethnocentrism, and Personality. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Foster-Carter, A. "From Rostow to Gunder Frank: Conflicting Paradigms in the Analysis of Underdevelopment." World Development 4.3 (1976): 167-177.
- Foucault, Michel. Madness and Civilization. New York: Pantheon Books, 1965.
- . The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. New York: Pantheon Books, 1971.
- Frank, A.G. Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- . "Dependence is Dead, Long Live Dependence and the Class Struggle: An Answer to Critics." World Development 5.4 (1977): 355-367.
- Furtado, C. Economic Development of Latin America. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- . Obstacles To Development in Latin America. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.
- Gadamer, H.G. "On the Circle of Understanding." Hermeneutics Versus Science? Eds. J.M. Connolly and T. Keutner. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988. 68-78.
- Gardner, Howard. The Quest for Mind. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Geilhufe, Nancy. "Response to Saral Teilhet-Waldorf's 'Anthropological Orthodoxy: A Case of Reverse Ethnocentrism'." Human Organization 38.4 (1979): 422-424.
- Gellner, Ernest. Relativism and the Social Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Gendzier, Irene. Managing Political Change: Social Scientists and the Third World. Boulder: Westview Press, Inc., 1985.

- Ghai, Dharam. "Africa, The Third World and The Strategy for International Development." Africa in World Affairs. Eds. A. Mazrui and H. Patel. New York: Joseph Okpaku Publishing Company Inc., 1973. 235-251.
- Girardet, Raoul. L'idée coloniale en France de 1871 à 1962. Paris: Hachette, 1972.
- Giraud, Michel. "The Distracted Look: Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia or Racism?" Dialectical Anthropology 12 (1988): 413-419.
- Godtfredsen, Lawrence R. "The Phenomenological Persuasion in Political Science: To the Students Themselves." Teaching Political Science 15.2 (1988): 65-72.
- Goulet, Denis. "Participation in Development: New Avenues." World Development 17.2 (1989): 165-178.
- Gover, Yerach. "Were You There, Or Was It a Dream?: Ideological Impositions on Israeli Literature." Journal of Palestine Studies XVI.1 (1986): 56-78.
- Harris, Marvin. "The history and Ideological Significance of the Separation of Social and Cultural Anthropology." Columbia University, Unpub. manuscript. n.d.
- Hermassi, Elbaki. Leadership and National Development in North Africa. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- . The Third World Reassessed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Hester, J.P., and D.R. Killian. "The So-Called Ethnocentric Fallacy." Southern Journal of Philosophy XIII.3 (1975): 309-317.
- Hudson, Charles. "The Historical Approach in Anthropology." Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Ed. J. Honigmann. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. 111-141.
- Hultkrantz, A., ed. International Dictionary of Regional European Ethnology and Folklore. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1960.
- Hunter, D.E. and P. Whitten, eds. Encyclopedia of Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1976.

- Huntington, Samuel P. Political Order in Changing Societies.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Huntington, Samuel P., and Joan M. Nelson. No Easy Choice:
Political Participation in Developing Countries.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Israel, Joachim. "Epistemology and Sociology of Knowledge:
An Hegelian Undertaking." Sociological Perspectives
33.1 (1990): 111-127.
- Jarvie, I.C. The Revolution in Anthropology. London:
Routledge & Kregan Paul, 1964.
- Kabongo, Ilunga. "La science politique africaniste ou les
culs-de-sac des modèles d'analyse ethnocentriques."
Canadian Journal of African Studies 13.1-2 (1979):
163-178.
- Kaufman Purcell, S., ed. Mexico in Transition--Implications
for U.S. Policy. New York: Council of Foreign
Relations, Inc., 1988.
- . Mexico-United States Relations. New York: Praeger
Publishers, 1981.
- Kublin, Hyman. "Moore, Barrington, Jr. Social Origins of
Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the
Making of the Modern World." Library Journal 91
(1966): 4948.
- Lall, S. "Is 'Dependence' a Useful Concept in Analysing
Underdevelopment?" World Development 3.11/12
(1975): 799-809.
- Lanternari, Vittorio. "Ethnocentrism and Ideology." Ethnic and
Racial Studies 3.1 (1980): 52-66.
- Leacock, Eleanor. "Women, Development, and Anthropological
Facts and Fictions." Latin American Perspectives
4 (1977): 131-142.
- Lemco, Johathan. "Economic and Political Development in
Modernizing States." Journal of Developing Societies
IV (1988): 9-21.

- Lerner, Daniel. The Passing of Traditional Society. London: The Free Press, 1958.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. Race and History. Paris: UNESCO, 1968.
- . The Savage Mind. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- . Structural Anthropology Vol.II. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.
- . The View From Afar. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985.
- LeVine, Robert A. Culture, Behavior, and Personality. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1973.
- LeVine, Robert A., and Donald T. Campbell. Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1959.
- Logan, Bernard. "Towards a Redefinition of African Development: A Paradigmatic Re-appraisal." Journal of Developing Societies. III (1987): 137-155.
- Marek, George R. "Heritage: Civilization and the Jews." TV Guide. 32 Oct. 1984: 40-43.
- Mauviel, Maurice. "Vers une solution éducative à l'ethnocentrisme: la communication interculturelle." Recherche, Pédagogie et Culture Paris 8.46 (1980): 44-49.
- Mazrui, A. Cultural Engineering and Nation-Building in East Africa. Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1972.
- Mazrui, A. and Hasu H. Patel, eds. Africa in World Affairs. New York: Joseph Okpaku Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Mazrui, A. and Michael Tidy. Nationalism and New States in Africa. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1984.
- Merquior, J.G. Foucault. London: Fontana Press, 1985.

- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1957.
- Metzger, T., and R. Myers. "Sinological Shadows: The State of Modern China Studies in the U.S." Methodological Issues in Chinese Studies. Eds. A. Wilson, S. Greenblatt, and R. Wilson. New York: Praeger, 1983. 14-50.
- Moore Jr., Barrington. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- Morishima, M. Why has Japan "Succeeded"? London: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Mukherjee, B. Darkness. Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1985.
- Mukherjee, B., and C. Blaise. Days and Nights in Calcutta. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1977.
- Nakane, C. Japanese Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Neale, Walter C. "Property in Land as Cultural Imperialism: or, Why Ethnocentric Ideas Won't Work in India and Africa." Journal of Economic Issues XIX.4 (1985): 951-958.
- Needham, Joseph. Moulds of Understanding. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- "No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries." Choice 13 (1976): 1209.
- O'Donnell, G. Bureaucratic Authoritarianism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- . "Corporatism and the Question of the State." Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America. Ed. J. Malloy. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977. 47-87.
- Oldroyd, David. The Arch of Knowledge. New York: Methuen & Co., 1986.
- Organski, A.F.K. The Stages of Political Development. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

- "Orientalism." The Booklist 75.2 (1978): 151.
- "Orientalism." Choice 16.2 (1979): 210.
- Outhwaite, William. "Hans-Georg Gadamer." The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences. Ed. Q. Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 21-39.
- Parsons, Talcott. Sociological Theory and Modern Society. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Piaget, Jean. Structuralism. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.
- Ping-Ti Ho and Tang Tsou, eds. China's Heritage and the Communist Political System. Volume I, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Plumb, J.H. "How It Happened: Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World." The New York Times Book Review LXXI (1966): 10-12.
- "Political Capacity in Developing Societies." British Book News June 1982: 411.
- "Political Capacity in Developing Societies." Choice August 1982: 1636.
- Popper, Karl R. Objective Knowledge. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- . The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume II, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Powell, Bingham G. "No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries." American Political Science Review 72.2 (1978): 735-736.
- Preston, P.W. Rethinking Development: Essays on Development and Southeast Asia. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Pye, Lucian W. Aspects of Political Development. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- Reading, Hugo F. A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

- Reynolds, V., Falger, V., and Vine, I., eds. The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism. London: Croom Helm Ltd., 1987.
- Robbins, Bruce. "American Intellectuals and Middle East Politics: An Interview with Edward W.Said." Social Text 19.20 (1988): 37-53.
- Rohrlich-Leavitt, Ruby, ed. Women Cross-Culturally: Changes and Challenge. Chicago: The Hague, 1975.
- Rushdie, S. The Satanic Verses. London: The Penguin Group, 1988.
- Sachs, Ignacy. "Ethnocentrism -- source and aggravating factor of conflicts." Impact of Science on Society XVIII.2 (1968): 125-130.
- Said, E. Covering Islam. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- . Orientalism. New York: Random House, Inc., 1979.
- Scholte, Bob. "The Structural Anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss." Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Ed. John Honigmann. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. 637-716.
- Schrijvers, J. "Viricentrism and Anthropology." The Politics of Anthropology: From Colonialism and Sexism toward a View from Below. Eds. G. Huizer and B. Mannheim. Mouton: The Hague, 1979. 97-115.
- Senghor, Léopold Sedar. Nationhood and the African Road to Socialism. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1962.
- . The Foundations of "Africanité or "Négritude" and "Arabité." Paris: Présence Africaine, 1971.
- Somjee, A.H. Development Theory: Critiques and Explorations. Basingstoke: The MacMillan Press, Ltd., 1991.
- . Parallels and Actuals of Political Development. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- . Political Capacity in Developing Societies. London: The MacMillan Press, Ltd., 1982.
- . Lecture, 90/07/30.

- Spradley, J.P., and D.W. McCurdy. Anthropology: The Cultural Perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975.
- Sumner, William Graham. Folkways - A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals. Boston: Ginn, 1940.
- Tang Tsou, ed. China's Policies in Asia and America's Alternatives. Volume 2, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Taylor, Charles. "Language and Human Nature." Interpreting Politics. Ed. M.T. Gibbons. New York: New York University Press, 1987. 101-132.
- Taylor, Paul W. "The Ethnocentric Fallacy." The Monist 47.4 (1963): 563-584.
- The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of The English Language: Deluxe Encyclopedic Edition. New York: Lexicon Publications, Inc., 1987.
- "The Stages of Political Development." Choice 2 (1965): 641.
- Toulmin, Stephen. Human Understanding. Volume 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. "Capitalism and Material Life." New York Times Book Review. November 1974: 31-32.
- Voget, Fred W. "The History of Cultural Anthropology." Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology. Ed. John Honigmann. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. 1-88.
- Wamba-Dia-Wamba, E. "La philosophie en afrique ou les défis de l'africain philosophe." Canadian Journal of African Studies 13.1-2 (1979): 225-244.
- Wiarda, Howard J. "Ethnocentrism and Third World Development." Society 24.6 (1987): 55-64.
- . "The Ethnocentrism of the Social Science Implications for Research and Policy." The Review of Politics 43.2 (1981): 163-197.

---. Politics and Social Change in Latin America:
The Distinct Tradition. Massachusetts: The
University of Massachusetts Press, 1974.

Wilson, Bryan R., ed. Rationality. Oxford: Basil Blackwell,
1977.

Wright, Jr., Theodore P. "The Sociology of Knowledge: Jewish
and Muslim Impact on American Social Sciences." The
American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences 4.1 (1987):
89-100.