

ISSN: 2278-9529



GALAXY

International Multidisciplinary Research Journal

November 2017 Vol. 6. Issue VI

www.galaxyimrj.com

Editor-In-Chief- Dr. Vishwanath Bite

About Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/about-us/>

Archive: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/archive/>

Contact Us: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/contact-us/>

Editorial Board: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/editorial-board/>

Submission: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/submission/>

FAQ: <http://www.galaxyimrj.com/faq/>



Title of the Book: *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-system Theories*

Author: Alvin Y. So

Publisher: Newbury Park: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Publication Year: 1990

Price: \$ 36.00

Pages: 283

ISBN-13: 978-0803935471, **ISBN-10:** 0803935471

Reviewed By:

Amrit Barla

Jawaharlal Nehru University

Centre for the Study of Social System.

Alvin Y. So illustrates three dominant schools (world-system, dependency, and modernization) of thought which is very much alive and active in society about three decades. He juxtaposes by adding his theoretical frame from the number of developmental experiences of the western industrialized or modern societies on the one hand which generally term as 'First World' and the gradually developing nation which is filled with natural resources the 'Third World'. It can be explained in terms of Western and Eastern as well. This book reviews emergence, development, and transformation of all three dominant schools of development. Firstly, it talked about the dynamic nature of three dominant schools over the past three decades, secondly, it talked about the empirical studies of each development theories, and thirdly it talked about how world system is different from other theories. He wrote this book for teaching purposes for the course of development theories, since there were not combined development theories books available for teaching the students and later he prescribes the book for the undergraduate and postgraduate students.

The book is systematically arranged constituting three parts and conclusion at the end. Alvin makes his all the chapter in following headings- part one, the modernization school which again sub-headed with the modernization perspective, the classical modernization studies and the new modernization studies. In the modernization perspective, Alvin would talk about the historical



context in which the modernization perspective emerged, the theoretical heritage in the light of evolutionary and functionalist frame, the sociological approaches, the theoretical assumptions and methodology and policy implications. In the evolutionary theories of development Industrial revolution and French revolution very crucial in the west in the sociological understanding of the evolution of theories like Tonnie's *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, Durkheim's mechanical and organic solidarity, Spencer's military and industrial society, and Auguste Comte's theological, metaphysical and positive stages of evolution. Having the evolutionary features of social change in unidirectional, value judgment, the rate of social change at one hand, functionalist theories like Parsons' 'Functional imperatives' or 'AGIL model', and Pattern variables on the other. And sociological approaches on modernization perspectives given by certain intellectuals such as Marian Levy's relatively modernized societies and relatively non-modernized societies; Smelser's structural differentiation in terms of family institution; Rostow's stages of economic growth in terms of five stage model of growth (traditional society, precondition for takeoff, takeoff, the drive to maturity, and high mass-consumption society); and Coleman's differentiation-equality- capacity model in terms of political structure, secularization of political culture, and enhancement of capacity of society's political system. Furthermore, Alvin discussed four classical modernization studies; they are McClelland's study of on achievement motivation, Inkeless's study on modern men, Bellah's study on the Tokugawa religion in Japan, and Lipset's study on the relationship between the economic development and democracy. And in the new modernization studies, he talked about responses to the different critics on tradition and modernity. Wong would study traditional Chinese families with the critic to classical modernization theories in which he sees how Chinese families promote the traditionalism, paternalistic management, nepotism, family mode of ownership to base their economic dynamic ethos of 'entrepreneurial familism'. Davis talked about the Japanese religion in terms of traditional society and development and secularization. Banuazizi talked about the Islamic revolution in Iran where he appreciates the tradition in its own right. And furthermore Huntington question the democratic space, will it be more countries become democratic? Answering to the question he adds two sets of factors; the preconditions of democratization that are economic wealth, social structure, external environment, and cultural context, on the one hand, the processes of democratization in the fashion of linear, cyclical and dialectical on the other hand.



Part two, the dependency school begins with the historical context of ‘the voices from the periphery’ and challenge the intellectual hegemony of the American modernization school. And this was started during the Latin American bankruptcy of the U.N Economic Commission for Latin American in the year 1960s. Part two also constitute of three chapters the dependency perspective, the classical dependency studies and the new dependency studies. The dependency perspective deals with the two intellectual heritages; the ECLA, and the neo-Marxism in the frame of imperialism in the forms of domination or hegemony over others. Andre Gunder Frank of dependency theory ‘The development of Underdevelopment’ illustrates the concept of underdevelopment and the model of metropolis-satellite exploitation. Through this theory, he argues that whole chain of constellations of metropolises and satellites is nothing but to established mechanism to extract economic surplus from the third world villages to local bodies, to regional capitals, to national capitals and finally to the cities of western countries. For him, it is a systematic exploitation of third world countries and developing the western countries through extraction of economic surplus. Dos Santos, on the other hand, talked about the structure of dependence in the light of the theory of imperialism which ruthlessly expand and dominate over the underdeveloped countries. For Santos it is all about the relationship between dominated and dependent; the dependence mostly occurs for few things in terms of historical forms in a three ways; the colonial dependence, financial-industrial dependence, and technological-industrial dependence. To be dependence on dominated countries because of few reasons such as export sector, the balance of payments, a technological monopoly that the dominated countries have. Amin another intellectual talked about ‘theory of transition to peripheral capitalism’. In chapter sixth, there are three classical dependency studies which are illustrated briefly such as Baran on Colonialism in India; the monthly review on the debt trap in Latin America, and Landsberg on manufacturing imperialism and the debt crisis. Baran talked about the historical experience of colonialism where India was an exploited country, lots of natural resources and other valuable things were extracted and taken away. For Baran words (1957, p. 145) “the present backwardness of India was caused by ‘the elaborate, ruthless, systematic despoliation of India by British capital from the very onset of British rule’”. Baran also argues that it is all about the “transfer of economic surplus from India to Britain, the deindustrialization of Indian industries, the flooding of Indian society with British manufactured goods, and the pauperization of the Indian countryside led to the underdevelopment of India on the one hand and capital



accumulation for British on the other” (P.113). The colonialism has greatly affected the Indian economy, culture and political spheres. Then Alvin introduced “The Monthly Review Authors: The Debt trap in Latin America” where the impact of the debt problem is discussed for which Latin America was dependent once upon a time. Landsberg would talk about manufacturing imperialism in East Asia that has given the tendency to become a dependent in the hand of dominant. Furthermore in chapter seven “the new dependency studies” answers the responses to the critics in following ways; Cardoso would response the classical dependency school in the umbrella of historical- structuralism; internal structures of dependency in terms of sociopolitical aspect like class struggles, group conflict, and political movements; structural determination of dependency as an open-ended process. Furthermore, he talked about associated-dependent development in Brazil illustrating new activities in the military regime, a model of associated-dependent development, and its political dynamics. O’Donnell would provide another dependency theory of “the bureaucratic-authoritarian state in Latin America” defining its characteristics as the dominance of bureaucrats, political exclusion, economic exclusion, depoliticization, and deepening of dependent capitalism. Whereas Evans illustrates “the triple alliance in Brazil in the 1980s” in which two factors are most important in building up the dependency theory; the changing external environment and the growing internal contradictions. And lastly Gold discusses “dynamic dependency in Taiwan” looking at it in three phases; the classical dependence, dependence development, and dynamic dependency.

Part three, the world- system school also begins with the historical context of world war two; same year American social scientists start to study issues and problems related to third world development. They question the existing theoretical frame like dependency and modernization school for rationalization of imperialism which was unable to explain the real problem of the third world, so a group of radical researchers led by Emmanuel Wallerstein attack the dependency for several points like manufacturing imperialism, dependent development or dynamic dependence, failure of cultural revolution, economic stagnation and others. Furthermore, the theoretical heritage is drawn two major intellectual sources- the neo-Marxist literature of development and the French Annales School. For Wallerstein world- system perspective is not a theory but a protest “ a protest against the ways in which social scientific inquiry was structured for all of us at its inception in the middle of the nineteenth century” (1987, p.309). In this circumstance, Wallerstein proposes trimodal system constituting of Core, Semi-



periphery, and Periphery in which the whole resources pass through. This is all about the metropolis and satellite that works in the world-system in regional, national and international level and the resources and raw material flow from satellite, the regional to metropolis, the international or core system.

To understand the book fully, I realized that all three theories are mostly western contextualized; that can't be applicable to third world countries; because west and east are two different things. It is all about top-down theoretical frame implementing the policy to develop a third world country. There is a missing of democratic consensus. They just are appropriating the three theories- modernization, dependency and world-system at the third world countries which are not supposed to be. The whole idea of development theories in this book is hegemonic, dominant, and putting their shoes in our leg which may fit; here I mean the third world country. The development of underdeveloped countries always takes a much time to improve in terms of its economy, culture, politics, social and others aspects as well. According to Antonio Gramsci, it is like proposing cultural hegemony over others from the west to east in terms of their norms and values that determine their modernity as superior to inferior in traditional. Even Gunnar Myrdal who talks about the soft state in the context of political situation describing the general societal indiscipline that seen in South Asia and by extension of many developing countries in comparison to modern state of the western world. Here, I make a point that how strict in following the rules and regulation in terms of well-established procedures without failing in western world but in third it is mostly softened in nature in all sphere of life that could of political, economic or culture in democratic space.

References:

Bates, T. R. (Vol. 36, No. 2 (April - June, 1975)). Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony .
Journal of the History of Ideas, 351-366.

Singh, R. P. (2000, August Tuesday). *Are we a Soft State?* Retrieved October Wednesday , 2017,
from The Hindu: <http://www.thehindu.com/2000/08/29/stories/13290831.htm>



So, A. Y. (1990). *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories*. Newbury Park, California : SAGE Publications, Inc.