

THE IMPASSE**Sandeep Kumar*****ABSTRACT**

This paper analyzes governance of development in globalized world with special reference to suffering of third world nations in the process of development. Using a regulationist analysis of the different development theories, efforts has been made to highlight the problems and issues of these theories with each other and within, through which an unbalanced and unstructured development happening in the world. The paper also point out the hegemony of West on politic, development, economy and especially education in the third world nations. It is also important to understand how development was being perceived by different theories such as modernization, underdevelopment theory, dependency theory and theory of articulation of mode of production. Entire analysis is revolved around liberalization and how aims of education become market oriented? What have we lost for the sake of development through liberalization? This paper will help to develop a critical perspective about the development, economy, politics and education and their impasse.

Key Words : Education, Technology and development

INTRODUCTION

The aim of education is always to provide a better life, and still the aim is same but the meaning of better has changed with time especially spiritual to product oriented. After second world war, third world come in existence and their basic challenge was development, specially strengthening the national identity, for which education was considered important and development was in center. Soon, the concept of development of society as a whole is supplanted by the compartmentalized idea of modernization. This leads us to social stratification, dependency and dominance in education and politics.

In 1970, when quality as a great goal came in existence, these concerns and problems increased more in social and political life, like quality for equality or quality for inequality. Then, education bringing inequality became the center point of discussion. At this point education was not only a mean of social transformation but beyond that. Questions like how to achieve liberalization or freedom from oppression were being questioned. And therefore, various changes occurred such as meaning of education gets changed, identity formation is understood in cultural term and domination and reproduction is viewed in term of politic. Therefore, investigation about these dimensions also became important.

So, education become means to create domination and subordination. It is important to note that Ivan Illich and Freire side line these discussions and talked only about power and oppression. Developed understanding of development creates alienation between social and economic development. For the advancement of technology and development of riches, it has failed to touch the bottom line of the half of the world or the people of marginalized in different way. The contradiction in development exists due to social and political reasons which reside in an economic system and its sustaining ideology that render the weak -weaker and rich-richer.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Education University of Delhi.

The third world countries have paid a heavy price for having uncritically taken of the dominant ideology of development. It is also important to know that the industrialization in developed nations was due to the internal cultural and structural pressure, but in third world it was superimposed and very painful process, which includes colonialism and neo-colonialism, cultural subordination and socio-economic distortion. Education also became sufferer of this, which could not develop according to the need of our nation.

The relationship of modernization to education and development – focus has shifted from caste association and its role to education, to role of education for economic and technology development dominantly. It does not mean that nothing else was happened but the domination was of economic aspects. Parallel other work was also taking place, like what is taught, who teaches and how, how is all this determined in actual practice. Bernstein, Bourdieu etc were working in this area. Pedagogy of oppressed (1970), deschooling society (1973) tried to make social sense of education, which includes authority of learner, teaching learning process, evaluation, hegemonies of text books etc. This change was optimism to pessimism which started the era of criticism and that is how the objective of education becomes to deal with the pressure of economy. In this entire process, it has become important to understand that what is the meaning of developments is in itself, what is its scope. It is also important to see that how it was appropriate or not appropriate to the need of the people.

At policy level colonial legacy keep influencing education policies and because of this a large part of developing world has been catering to the need of few ruling communities.

In this context, an important question emerged that, to what extent have policy maker of education in India been able to shake the colonial past? Were they able to formulate sovereign policies?

In Education, language is also a great tool to create domination. For example Bihar tried to develop a different culture based on language. For this highly *sanskritised hindi*, called *shisht bhasha* were being used in education, which was not the language of common man. Language except a medium of instruction creates hegemony like what and how to say something.

To understand this hegemony, it is also important to see that for the sake of modernization the notion of welfare state is declining in India. The idea of common good is now determined by market.

Education commission (1968) said rural education in general and agricultural education in particular and it limits the primary education till primary level. Though Gandhi's basic education talked about the need of national system of education, but it could not happened and schools became for elites.

Market oriented policies of government become the concern of discussion. China also worked upon market oriented economy but the fact is that 1.80 billion populations in china is illiterate which is 1/6 of the world population. So profit syndrome creates hurdle for academics. Indian education system has also become market dominated and with lots of ambiguities at constitutional level, such as, constitution talked about providing equal opportunities and also provides space for privatization e.g. Pre- school system is fully privatized and capitation fee has also become institutionalized.

Constitution carries contradictions about education and economics. Brain drain is also taking place because of this. We are failed to provide skill based jobs. It resulted, we neither retain high qualified people nor become able to provide education to poor people. Indian education system supports this duality. What so ever was given for the sake of education that could not associate with poor people and only elite celebrate the higher education (sen, 1982). Somehow, if these marginalized people get access to school,

they feel alienated and started feeling to leave their own community. This is one reason of developing middle class and we play with the words such as 'sanskritization.' And Situation has become like, they are away from their own community but not near to other one. In this process state always play a significant role. State always controls the system and this control may be of government or private organization. So, for better situation a more positive state intervention programme supported by community initiative is urgently required. We have to understand and accept that when we talk about upliftment of poor's, we cannot talk only about liberation for the sake of development. UNDP (1996) report says that because of very less investment in education development could not give what it supposed to be.

Above discussion leads us to the impasse in development and education, which can be understood as:

1. Inability to move beyond the weakness of old paradigms.
2. Inability to come to terms to changes the international and global order

Till 1945, Western societies were the endpoint for Development to which all other societies are inspired. This understanding was being criticized by a new theory called *underdevelopment theory*. Underdevelopment theory says that advanced capitalist world exploits the backward nations. This alternative model could not become more effective or convincing. It analyzes inequality differently in the new international economics. This idea or view was very good but the strategy was not that strong. Underdevelopment theory was being questioned by some third world nations, those were succeeded in industrialization. Then a new theory comes into existence and known as *dependency theory*. They argued that marginalized nation can be developed but with dependency on the developed nation.

The combination of new capitalist mode and traditional non capitalist modes is known as 'internationalization' of capitalization. It was known as *theory of articulation of mode of production*, through which industrialization or new division of labor take birth in third world nation. (Frobel,1980).

This theory was also being criticized because it kept talking about both. It explains both the break down and the preservation of non-capitalist mode of production in terms of 'logic of capital'.

Here again we need to talk about the impasse which come into existence. We can understand these impasse in three ways; Evolutionism, Dogmatism, Inability of theory to explain the changing reality of the world.

Evolution: underdevelopment and dependency theory challenged the tradition- modern dichotomy that stored in the heart of modernization theory. It challenges the idea that west is norm and third world is the deviation from the norm.

Dogmatism: keep challenging other theories but could not work on empirical worth and so fail to utilize the correct method.

Changes in the global order: In this context there were three issue – the neo liberal 'counterrevolution' and related to this the collapse of 'state socialism', industrialization of third world and north south debate.

Modernization theory came in existence when European and Janise Empire ended and cold war started. This word was used by left in France first time, when they said third path or third way between capitalism and communism. Firstly Nehru, Nasser etc. used this term and they raised the debate of north-south instead east- west in terms of wealth and power and raised the issue of fairer trade rule for the world, with this, neo international economic order come in existence. But still there weresome issues with this very idea. First till 1980 third world nations had associated with one of the power either USA or Russia,

second till this time all nations started believing that to achieve modernity economic growth is important or essential, specially industrialization and third, both criticize the neo classical theory of international trade. Here it is important to know, what modernity believe about how society changes.

Modernization theory believes that every society goes through these stages of development.

- The traditional stage
- The preconditions of the take off
- Take off
- The drive to maturity
- High mass consumption

And all these changes will take place through the process of industrial growth. Industrial growth will bring individualism, equality of opportunity and shared values. This will happened because a commercial industrial system imposes certain organizational and institutional requirement not only on economic but on society also (Moore, 1965).Objective of Modernization theory, which comes into existence during cold war, was not to remove poverty from third world, moreover, the objective was to create a bulwark against communism.

Here, we need to understand that the problem was not with modernity moreover, it was with ways to achieve it. Technology was considered supreme and society based on technology to achieve the modernization. But, in against, it is also important to know that societies influence technology and technology does not determine social structure, as there are many examples that,societies those use same technology does not have the same social structure. USA become advanced in technology but ethic crises also increased. It is also important to know that in India in 1960 Green Revolution increase the productivity through technology, even than benefit was taken by only rich people because social structure socialized the technology and so technology diffused in highly unequal social structure and the access of technology was also highly unequal. This inequality was being addressed by underdevelopment and world system theory. Frank (1969) argues that modern world give support to those traditional nations who promoted this modern world. But problem is that the notion of so called traditional world was the creation of modern world. It means that first world countries may advance through self-impulsion but the dependent economy can only expand as a reflection of the expansion of the dominant countries.

Here it is important to know that modernization theory was criticized on their evolutionary idea and underdevelopment theories were criticized because of their mirror image of evolution and its focus on trade –relation rather the relation of production. On these criticisms, the theory of articulation of mode of production comes in existence.

This theory says capitalist development differs in both time and space, in this way it rejected the claim of uniformity by development and underdevelopment theory. This theory emphasis on the determining role of the mode of production it provides a better mechanism to understand the underdevelopment.

They also argued that, those who talked about trade relation should talked first about mode of production, and this need to be done with reference to production of surplus product which the world into core and periphery.

Free wage labor exists in core nation but not in the periphery nations. Third world nations are included in world economy on the basis of un-free relation of production, which was non capitalist mode of production and also prevent the unprecedented accumulation of capital. So, the unequal trade relation was

actually the unequal relation of production. And that is why capitalist countries were able to establish their hegemony over non capitalist modes of production based nations.

But, the above mentioned relationship was not static and capitalist mode of production also started in the nations who are at periphery, but it was a different kind of capitalism. Firstly it was different from the core nations in terms of quality, and this difference was because of its combination with non-capitalist mode of production.

According to this, social formation and modes of production are two different things. Social formation refers to combinations of eco-political and ideological practices and a mode of production refers to economic level which determines the different level of domination in the 'structured totality' that constitutes the social formation.

It is important to know that economic level controls economic level so that it can push that level which will reproduce the mode of production.

The basic objective of non-capitalists mode is the articulation of where the capitalist mode dominant and where is the highest need of capitalist mode? For example, peasant workers do work on land and get very less wages. They can earn more if they work somewhere else. Peasant workers get exploit because capitalist buy raw material on cheap rate and sell prepared material more costly. If capitalist want this process to be continued then they have to maintain the society or community of peasant workers. A petty community mode of production also exists in capitalist economy, which will provide cheap goods to these poor workers. And the people who sell cheaper will get more cheap labor and need another cheaper market. And it will reduce the reproduction cost of workers. Meillasoux (1981) said that capitalist and domestic economy has a relation because of imperialism, because this relationship creates a mechanism of reproducing cheap labor power to its profit, and with time it become such reproductive process in which power become more poor and rich richest.

In summary, theory of articulation of modes of production argues that capitalism in the periphery 'co-exist' or join together with non-capitalist mode of production and form a social formation. Underdevelopment is not the product of trade relation even it is because of the preservation of non-capitalist mode of production. So, the preservation of non-capitalist mode of production is actually in the interest of the capitalist mode, at least when the capitalist mode is dominant.

Conclusion:

This article has defended the discipline of development studies. I have tried to show the impasse about economic, development and education. Article tried to put more attention to the specificity of particular localities, but this must not be seen at the expense of the recognition that there are universal needs, and that the struggle for these needs continues to lead to social conflict. Without such recognition, development studies will undermine its own future and patronize the so called third world rather than critically engage with it. Paper helps to develop a critical understanding about the underpinnings of different development theories with their critics and as a base of new theory. So this paper helps to understand the different development theory to understand the impasse with reference to especially in education and development.

References

- Frank, A.G. (1969). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frobel, F. (1980). *New International division of labour*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hindess, B. (1977). *Mode of Production and Social Transformation*, London: Routledge.
- Moore, W. (1965). *The Impact of industry*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Moore, W. (1963). *Social Change*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Meillasoux, (1981). *Maidnes, Meals and Money*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.