

Chapter 6

THE CRITICAL EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT THEORIES

Dilan CIFTCI¹

INTRODUCTION

Development, as being an important term, generally would be defined changing over the time. Also with development both we can gain or loss. By losing we can have more inequality, which means that the gap between rich and poor increased for a while as a result of the scarce natural resources. On the other hand, the term development in terms of gaining refers to more accumulation, innovation or growth. To emphasize development with respect to less developed countries (LDCs), we can conclude the situation by saying they have to receive technology from advanced countries. Contrary to less developed countries, advanced countries are more stable and rich on economy, which emerged as a term; North-South Dilemma. For the North side development understood as a term for protection of personal proportion, in contrast, for the South side, which is poor concept, liberalization much more important issues with agriculture purposes.

In the light of above mentioned information, Chilcote (1994) defined development by these words: ‘ within American political science development usually is equated with political democracy or formal and representative institutions, often under capitalism and sometimes under socialism based on division of powers in government and a parliamentary system based on political parties and coalitions of parties’ (Chilcote, 1994:215). Under the knowledge of these definitions one can claim that the grounds of development and underdevelopment based on the Capitalism versus Socialism. Also most of the parts of the theories are depending on the conservative and liberal social scientists understanding versus Marxist understandings of development and underdevelopment theory (Cowen and Shenton, 2017; Caria and Dominugez, 2016).

The historical roots of the idea of development were important in order to understand the process of different theories. According to most explanations as Chilcote (1994) mentioned that the changing in the political shift between Europe and South America is based on the conservative, fascist-leaning dictatorship to

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr., Near East University Faculty of Communication Nicosia, Cyprus dilan.ciftci@neu.edu.tr

REFERENCES

1. Amin, A. (2017). An institutionalist perspective on regional economic development. In *Economy* (pp. 59-72). Routledge.
2. Barone, C. A. (2016). *Marxist thought on imperialism: survey and critique*. Routledge.
3. Cain, P. J., & Hopkins, A. G. (1987). Gentlemanly capitalism and British expansion overseas II: new imperialism, 1850-1945. *The Economic History Review*, 40(1), 1-26.
4. Caria, S., & Domínguez, R. (2016). Ecuador's buen vivir: A new ideology for development. *Latin American Perspectives*, 43(1), 18-33.
5. Chilcote, R.H. (1994) *Theories Of Comparative Politics: The Search For A Paradigm Reconsidered*, Westview Press; (2nd Revised edition). pp.215-268.
6. Cardoso, H. F. (1972). Dependent capitalist development in Latin America. *New Left Review*, (74), 83.
7. Cowen, M., & Shenton, R. (2017). The invention of development. In *Development ethics* (pp. 3-21). Routledge.
8. Frank, A. G. (2018). The development of underdevelopment. In *Promise of development* (pp. 111-123). Routledge.
9. Furtado, C. (2018). Economic Development of Latin America. In *Promise Of Development* (pp. 124-148). Routledge.
10. Harvey, D. (2005) *The New Imperialism*, pp.137-182.
11. Harvey, D. (2005). From globalization to the new imperialism. *Critical globalization studies*, 91-100.
12. Kiely, R. (2005) "Capitalist expansion and the imperialism–globalization debate: contemporary Marxist explanations", *Journal of International Relations and Development*, Vol. 8, pp.27–57.
13. Lenin, V. I. (1999). *Imperialism: The highest stage of capitalism*. Resistance Books.
14. Leys, C., (1996) *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*, Chapter 1 and 2.
15. Warren, B. (1973). Imperialism and capitalist industrialization. *New left review*, (81), 3.