

THE BASIC DILEMMAS OF THE MODERNIST DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM'S VIEW TOWARDS CULTURE

Hatice Karaçay ÇAKMAK*
İtir ÖZER**

Abstract

Especially after the 1990s, as a result of the shortcomings that the modernist development paradigm features, the deficiencies of the modernist development paradigm concerning issues such as women's problems, ethnicity, and minority rights have been scrutinised. In this framework, the way the modernist development paradigm views culture has also been questioned. Social scientists have generally examined the modernist development paradigm's way of viewing culture implicitly under different disciplines and different dimensions. In this study, under the light of these studies, we aim to put forward explicitly the basic dilemmas of this view.

Keywords: Culture, modernist development paradigm, modernism.

Öz

Modernist Kalkınma Paradigması'nın Kültüre Bakış Açısının Temel Açmazları

Özellikle 1990'lı yılların sonunda, modernist kalkınma paradigmasının kadın sorunu, etnisite, azınlık hakları gibi çeşitli konulara bakış biçimi mercek altına alınmıştır. Bu çerçevede, modernist kalkınma paradigmasının kültüre bakış biçimi de sorgulanmıştır. Pek çok sosyal bilimci modernist kalkınma paradigmasının kültüre bakışını örtük olarak farklı disiplinler altında ve farklı boyutlar çerçevesinde incelemiştir. Bu çalışmada ise, bu bu bilgiler ışığında, bu paradigmanın kültüre bakış biçiminin temel açmazlarının ortaya konulması amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kültür, modernist kalkınma paradigması, modernizm.

* Asst. Prof., Hacettepe University, Department of Economics, 06800, Beytepe/ANKARA, hatice@hacettepe.edu.tr

** Res. Asst., Hacettepe University, Department of International Relations, 06800, Beytepe/ANKARA, ozeri@hacettepe.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

The modernist development paradigm¹ was especially active after World War II. Although it was mainly based on the development theories of the neoclassical school, it has its roots in the economic development theories from Adam Smith to Karl Marx. The modernist development paradigm studies the phenomenon of underdevelopment that may change and will be destroyed with capitalism. It has been influential in the determining of development policies imposed on underdeveloped countries, especially on those countries, which have gained their political independence after World War II. The modernist paradigm asserts that not only the economic structure but also many areas of the social structure, from ways of thinking and living to technological structure, need to change if the main aim of development policies is to break the cycle of poverty. It has had such an impact until the end of the 1970s that development theories and the modernisation theories proposed by this paradigm have been seen as identical. To this extent, Inglehard (1997) defined modernisation as follows:

“[A] Process that increases the economic and political capabilities of a society: it increases economic capabilities through industrialisation, and political capabilities through bureaucratisation. Modernisation is widely attractive because it enables a society to move from being poor, to being rich” (Inglehart, 1997: 5).

Within the framework of the modernist development paradigm, basically, *sustained positive growth* has been aimed and in order to reach this, (economic) growth and economic development have been deemed as one and identical. In this development paradigm, it has been claimed that more industrialisation, more commodity production and hence more increase in national revenue are necessary for economic development to become a reality, and to this end, various policies have been proposed.

However with the coming of the late 1970s, it has been noted that through the policy proposals of the modernist development paradigm, the income gap between less developed countries and developed countries was not decreasing, but widening. Hence, the way the modernist development paradigm presented / imposed information was being questioned explicitly or implicitly. Along with this questioning, it has been claimed that targeting economic development in the framework of the modernist development paradigm not only contained deficiencies, but also created many undesirable results. Some social scientists have stated that the modernist paradigm has, in addition to having further widened the income gap between countries, paved the way to certain global problems such as alienation, cultural deterioration and conflict, deterioration of the world’s ecosystem, and tragedy of commons.

As a result of the defects and shortcomings that the modernist development paradigm features, especially after the 1990s, some social scientists have scrutinised the deficiencies of the modernist development paradigm concerning issues such as women's problems, ethnicity, and minority rights. In this framework, the way the modernist development paradigm views culture and the problem of cultural development has also been questioned. In this context, this study aims to present the basic dilemmas of modernist paradigm's way of viewing culture. To this end, firstly the basic assumptions of this paradigm, and the theoretical / philosophical structure behind these basic assumptions will be studied and then the role that this paradigm attributes to culture on the path to economic development will be examined. Later on, the dilemmas of the way this paradigm views culture will be exposed.

1. THE BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MODERNIST DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM²

The most crucial characteristics of the modernist development paradigm are:

- In the modernist development paradigm, it is assumed that the individual is *homoeconomicus*. In this paradigm, the individual is a rational being who is aiming to maximise his/her own interests, a being who is materialistic and autonomous.

- In the modernist development paradigm, exchanges that take place among individuals who are economically autonomous and materialistic beings are entirely of economic nature, and hence, these exchanges can be regulated by the market mechanism.

- The modernist development paradigm has an economically deterministic characteristic. Since this paradigm accepts the laws of economics as the sole scientific knowledge, within the framework of this paradigm, *only* these laws explain the phenomenon of underdevelopment. Again under this paradigm, economic growth and economic development are seen as one and identical, and it is assumed that economic development will also bring along the overall development of the society and the individuals.

- In the modernist development paradigm, the main aim is to obtain sustained positive growth. In this context, (economic) development and economic growth are considered to have the same meaning.

- In the modernist development paradigm, there is confusion of means and end. In the early studies in the literature of development economics, it has

been indirectly or directly stated that *development for human* was the main aim and that in order to achieve this goal, sustained growth of production should be seen as an instrument. However, in the formation of the modernist paradigm, studies that emphasise the aim of sustained growth of production have been dominant. Besides, the aim of sustained positive growth would bring along problems such as alienation and the deterioration of the world's ecosystem. And as a result, the individual who uses nature and technology to achieve sustained positive growth would live increasingly under the constraints of nature and technology. In the modernist paradigm, these facts have been ignored.

- According to the modernist development paradigm, economic development is an *a priori* process, which needs to be defined, analysed, explained, and planned, and it would not be sensible to judge this process. In the economic development process, the good/bad, positive/negative, right/wrong oppositions are as meaningless and unscientific as the discussion of whether vanilla ice cream or chocolate ice cream is better. (Markovic, 1993: 50).

- The modernist development paradigm, which sees the development of societies and individuals in the economic development and more accurately in sustained positive growth, has a viewpoint which is far from being *homo-centric* and which is *commodity-centric* aiming to maintain a sustained growth of production.

- The modernist development paradigm holds a *Euro-centric* viewpoint along with the commodity-centric viewpoint. The Euro-centric viewpoint asserts that in the process of development there is an absolute and universal path, valid for all societies and economies, and that due to this, the "development" cannot differ among societies and cultures. This viewpoint ignores the fact that people could perceive development differently according to their identity (gender, religion, ethnic identities) or to the communities to which they feel they belong. In other words, in the Euro-centric viewpoint, an attitude which is closed to the difference of human existence and hence to its incomparability is displayed.

2. THE MODERNIST DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM AND CULTURE

In order to evaluate the role given to culture in the modernist development paradigm and its effect on the economic development process, first definition of culture needs to be provided.

2.1. The Meaning of Culture

The definition of the concept of culture is not distinct and clear, and this concept is being discussed in various disciplines, especially by anthropologists and sociologists. Although various definitions of culture exist, the oldest known and accepted one belongs to anthropologist Tylor (1871, 1958). According to this definition, “culture or civilisation is a complex thing which includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morality, laws, customs and all the dispositions and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Gbotukama, 1992: 18). Half a century later, other anthropologists, Kroeber (1948), and Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) have taken up another definition, which was close to Tylor’s (Alexander and Kumaran, 1992: 11). Kroeber (1948) described culture as consisting of speech, knowledge, beliefs, customs, art and technologies, ideals and rules; what is learned from other men, from elders and what is added to it (Alexander and Kumaran, 1992: 11). Besides, in the studies of Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) the new dimensions of culture were evaluated and culture has been defined as a social heritage that the individual, as a social being has acquired. This definition emphasises that culture is shared and has distinctive forms that shapes human behaviour, and its essence is the values embodied in the beliefs of people (Alexander and Kumaran, 1992: 12).

Another important analysis on the definition of culture has been undertaken by sociologist Parsons (1951) who has considered culture or the belief system under four categories, which depended on whether they were cognitive or evaluative or whether they could be justified empirically: (1) cognitive ideas which are empirically verifiable are called knowledge; (2) cognitive ideas which are not empirically verifiable are philosophical ideas; (3) evaluative ideas which are empirically verifiable are ideology; (4) evaluative ideas which are empirically non-verifiable are religious ideas.

Following Durkheim and Weber, Parsons acknowledges the *Functionalist Approach* which focuses less on a progressive, even historical understanding of culture, but instead takes societies as static wholes, and seeks to discern the key social facts governing behaviour within each. The Parsonian theory of social action published in *The Structure of Social Action* (Parsons, 1937) posited three levels of analyses –structure, culture and personality, none reducible to any other (Bickerton, 2003: 5). Parsons’ study had a strong effect on relating subsequent theories of culture. It was one that some development economists including Rostow, and Leibenstein somehow dealt with³.

From the early 1970s, the attention of antropologists started to shift away from “functions” towards “meanings and symbols”. Geertz (1973), who

developed *Symbolic Anthropology*, asserts that cultures should be concerned with a product of active social beings who are trying to make sense of and find meaning in the world. Geertz took a neo-Boasian approach to cultures⁴, with an interest in pluralism and relative perspectives (Varisco, 2004: 96).

On the other hand, by developing four separate definitions with different meanings, Bocock (1992) has summarised the different definitions of culture: Culture has been defined as (1) cultivation of mind, arts, civilisation; (2) process of social development; (3) meanings, values, ways of life; and (4) practices which produce meaning (Bocock, 1992: 234). In addition, through two definitions that he developed, Kim (1993) has demonstrated that there were connections between these basically accepted definitions of culture and he has presented a definition of culture that is quite accepted among today's social scientists. According to this definition, in one, more narrowly circumscribed and traditional sense, culture is a realm of symbolic forms (literature, fine arts, music etc). In the other one, culture is the internally coherent and cohesive set of values, attitudes, beliefs, customs and ways of behaviour. In this broader case, culture is a realm of meanings. But the two concepts of culture are not mutually exclusive. In fact, culture as a realm of symbolic forms constitutes an important part of culture as a realm of meanings, since meanings are more often than not, expressed in symbolic forms (Kim, 1993: 83). Kim's two definitions of culture have become definitions that are more or less agreed upon by many of today's social scientists.

Apart from the different definitions of culture, which were stated by Bocock (1992) and Kim (1993), recently, some scholars (Asad, 1973; Wallerstein, 1990, 1997; Said, 1983, 1993; Gellner, 1994; Bhabha 1994) have highlighted the other crucial dimensions of culture, which bring up the relationship between culture and imperialism/eurocentrism, and also between culture and pluralism. While all of their contemporary readings of cultural dynamics pose themselves as manifest of Eurocentric thinking, at the same time, they shift the focus from "meanings and symbols" to (implicit/ explicit) "hegemonic power" in the study of culture. Reconsidering colonial anthropological texts, Asad (1973) asserted that the Western project's study of mankind had failed in practise because of inherent contradictions in their understanding of culture. Asad notes the two images of Non-Europeans that emerge from the European scholars: Islamic societies were persistently portrayed as inherently violent, thus necessitating external intervention and control, whereas many African societies (under indirect rule) were documented without any reference of colonial regimes (Bickerton, 2003: 8).

In his concept of culture, Wallerstein (1990) considers culture as a weapon in the battle between interest groups. Wallerstein (1997) asserts that

social science is a product of the modern world-system and there are five different ways in which social science has been claimed to be Eurocentric; (1) its historiography, (2) the parochiality of its universalism, (3) its assumptions about (Western) civilization, (4) its Orientalism, and (5) its attempts to impose the theory of progress. And it is the culture which has been the crucial expression in the formation of Eurocentrism which is based on these five different ways. Similarly, Said, who is the author/writer of *Orientalism* also considers this important dimension of the idea of culture: "...that is the power of culture by virtue of its elevated or superior position to authorize, to dominate, to legitimate, demote, interdict, and validate: in short, the power of culture to be an agent of, and perhaps the main agency for, powerful differentiation within its domain and beyond it too." (Said, 1983: 8-9). He clearly claims that culture literally serves both the international hegemonic powers and the state (Said, 1993).

2.2. The Way Modernist Development Paradigm Views Culture, and the Role Given to Culture in the Process of Economic Development

Modernist development economists have indispensable common ground in terms of the role that they give to culture in the economic development process, and this enables them to be considered under the same paradigm. However, at some point they partially disagree and support three important views (Gasper, 1996). According to the first of these views, culture is a factor, which prevents economic development. This is because the continuing and obstructive persistence of tradition would block substantial modernisation, as traditional values and institutions are incompatible with modernity (Dube, 1988: 506). According to the other argument, culture is considered to be a secondary policy tool in the economic development and the modernisation project. In fact, in both of these arguments, the traditional values and institutions of less developed countries have negative impact on the process of economic development. However, the most important difference in the second argument is that a linear transformation process from a traditional society to a modern society is unavoidable and that because of this, traditional structures which have a negative effect on economic development would inevitably end. The first view emphasised the immutability of tradition, the second considered it of no special consequence in halting the process of history. The former view continued to persist, though with a slight shift (Dube, 1988: 506). Thirdly and lastly, according to some modernist social scientists, culture is considered as a dependent variable, which does not influence economic development and which is therefore negligible.

Weber (1952) who first mentioned the positive effect of Protestantism in the development of capitalism is one of the first modernist social scientists who

asserted that culture would be an obstacle in the way of economic development. Weber did not mention the dynamic structure of culture much (Schech and Higgs, 2001: 21). Weber found that Protestant religious teaching and the secular interests that it generated, substantially contributed to the development of the spirit of modern capitalism. And, he argued that the spirituality and otherworldliness of Hinduism and Orientalism, along with its associated caste system, were not compatible with this system (Adams, 2001: 153). Some modernist social scientists (McClelland, 1969; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Mishra, 1962; Kapp, 1963) who followed Weber, have tried to lay out the inhibitive effects of non-western cultures on development in the 1960's (Alexander and Kumaran, 1992: 18). On the other hand, recently, there has been a return to Weberian approach by a number of scholars that commonly refer to themselves as "neo-Weberians" such as Holton and Turner (1989), Swedberg (1998) or Landes (2000). In the leading article in the study of Harrison and Huntington (2000) in which the debate of 'culture and development' is broadened with 22 articles/papers, Landes begins with an important sentence "Max Weber was right". He claims that European capitalism was based on a unique combination of a particular institutional matrix and certain cultural values (Thompson, 2001:5).

However, the second view has a more optimistic outlook on the economic development processes of eastern cultures. This view has a relatively better grasp of the dynamic structure of culture in the modernist development paradigm, and asserts that cultural change is an indispensable element in the modernisation project (Dube, 1988). This is because, according to this view, along with the modernisation process, the structure of the eastern culture, which is an obstacle in the economic development, will dissolve, and at this point it will be possible to use cultural change policies in the economic development process as a secondary policy tool. For example, Rostow claims that cultural change would certainly occur throughout the linear stages of growth, and he openly asserts that cultural change policies are necessary for accelerating this process (Rostow, 1971: 18). Because, according to Rostow, individuals of these countries need to change their old cultures in order to adapt to modern institutions and activities: "Psychologically, men must transform the old culture... The face to face relations and warm, powerful family ties of a traditional society must give way, in degree, to new, more impersonal systems of evaluation in which men are judged by the way they perform specialised functions in the society" (Rostow, 1971: 58-59). Similarly, Leibenstein (1978) and Myrdal (1968) just like Rostow, have considered the process of cultural change as a requirement of transformation from traditional society to modern capitalist society and have accepted the accelerating policies of this process as secondary policy tools of economic development.

In summary, those who viewed underdevelopment as a direct consequence of a country's lack of sophisticated cultural traits, believed that the traditional values were not only mutable but should be replaced by modern values, enabling these societies to follow the (virtually inevitable) path of capitalist development (Thompson, 2001: 4).

On the other hand, according to a third approach, within the framework of modernist development paradigm, culture has been considered as a variable dependent in the economic development process. For example, in the 19th century Orthodox Marxist based literature, which is considered within the framework of the modernist development paradigm, techno-economic infrastructure has been dealt with as the primary factor in the determining of production systems, and as an ideology, culture has been considered as a reflection of this infrastructure (Kim, 1993: 80). According to this approach, the actualisation of (economic) development is dependent on the development of the techno-economic infrastructure, which displays a straight and linear change structure. In this development process, culture, which is a higher structure factor, is a dependent variable which does not influence economic development and which is hence negligible. In fact, there are certain problems associated with considering Marx's analyses of the capitalist system as development theory. Marx did not undertake a study of development of capitalism in the backward parts of world, limiting his attention to the maturing capitalism of Western capitalism⁵. To be sure, he understood capitalism to be a global phenomenon and treated it as such (Ake, 1988: 491). In the final analysis, this literature considers capitalism and imperialism as a stage of growth for underdeveloped countries as for the developed countries, and assesses development as a universal phenomenon, which occurs in essentially the same way through societies and phases of history (Ake, 1988: 493).

Just as in Orthodox - Marxist analysis, some mainstream economists also consider culture as a variable which does not affect economic development. Especially according to some modernist mainstream economists who emphasise universality, if economy is operating properly there is no obstacle for economic development to occur. "Get the prices right, get the policies right, and efficiency and growth are yours for the having" (Adams, 2001: 153). No matter what their religious belief, level of knowledge, or culture, all societies will catch up with the economic development process because, self-interest, the eye of profit, and the devising of labour-saving advancements are, irrespective of time or place, omnipresent (universality) features of the human nature (Adams, 2001: 153).

Considered under the modernist development paradigm and studied under three categories because of the partial differences that they present, these three different viewpoints have some basic mutual factors which cause them to be

considered under the modernist development paradigm: Firstly, these three different viewpoints, in terms of their basic characteristics, have all of the general characteristics which the modernist paradigm has. Secondly, in terms of the way they view culture, all three different stances have ignored the internal dynamism that culture as a living organism has, and they have considered culture as epiphenomenal. Thirdly, all of these three different viewpoints have considered western culture as the only suitable culture on the way to economic development and industrialisation process. Lastly, all three points of view have disregarded the power that culture has in influencing the other areas of society (economy, technology, politics, etc.). In fact, culture is an indispensable base of each country's modernisation project. Yet, the determining role of culture on socio-economic events, through the effect of a modernist / positivist tradition, has been limited in both the neoclassical development literature and the Orthodox-Marxist literature.

3. THE MAIN DILEMMAS OF THE MODERNIST DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM'S VIEW TOWARDS CULTURE

The modernist development paradigm, which enabled the successful industrialisation of the West, has certain problems in itself in terms of the way it views culture, and it contains the seeds of its own death. The outlook of the modernist development paradigm towards culture and the cultural dimension of the paradigm, which considers non-western cultures as homogenous, unchanging and incompatible with their cultures have mainly three separate important dilemmas and each of these is treated by social scientists as separate study areas.

The first of these dilemmas is the cultural conflict, which emerges from the inability of simultaneously implementing economic development and cultural development. Since the modernist development paradigm aims for unlimited *economic* growth and advancement, even if the *social* targets of the development model in this paradigm (such as attaining welfare state) are attained, the unlimited commodity production demand will continue. In this case, a conflict will openly emerge between the cultural values system and fast changing socio-economic realities; this is such that, the system of cultural values would fall behind socio-economic change (Kim, 1993: 82). The gap between cultural system and socio-economic realities will cause various problems; will cause the formation of cultural deterioration problems.

According to Bell (1976) who studies the sources of the cultural conflicts of the modern capitalist society, in the modern western world there are two basic motives. One is "Puritan, Whig capitalism, in which the emphasis was not

just on economic activity but on the formation of character (sobriety, probity, work as a calling)", the other is a "secular Hobbesianism, a radical individualism which saw man as unlimited in his appetite which was restrained in politics by a sovereign but ran fully free in economics and culture" (Bell, 1976: 80). While the western industrial society demands the continuation of the protestant ethic in the production area, at the same time it nourishes a feeling of satisfaction to create conspicuous consumption in the consumption area. As a result, in order to better deal with new and changing conditions, to adapt to continuous commodity increase and unlimited consumption increase, cultural synthesis need to change in a manner that will conflict with puritan capitalism. In other words, a crisis occurs between the motivation of the individual born out of Hobbesianism and the ethical aim of the society born out of puritan capitalism, and hence a conflict emerges between the socio-economic area and the cultural area of the modern capitalist society.

The second important dilemma created by the way the modernist development paradigm views culture results from the economic dimension: This development paradigm forms its spatial organisation theories within the framework of modernist-rationalist rules and considers space in a dead, static and non-dialectic manner. However, the Fordist mass production system, which can be considered as an extension of the modernist paradigm, has begun to dissolve starting from the 1970s. In this system, space has been considered as a dead, static factor, and in this framework, local values and culture have been perceived as dependent, secondary or passive factors. With the dissolution of the Fordist production system, capitalism especially in the 1980s and 1990s has re-oriented itself to new quests in order to re-nourish itself. In this process of capitalism to regenerate itself, space, is being presented as a natural element of all social, economic, cultural and political developments; in other words, space, is no longer a passive element, but becomes an active element in the formation and generation of the structure (Eraydin, 1992: 31). Space becoming an active element in explaining social and economic facts has brought locality to the foreground in the production process and has enabled the formation of the local development approach⁶ instead of general development or old regional development policies. As a result of this, under the local development approach, the issues of "industrialisation, spatial interaction, and spatial transformations" and with this, the issue of the human in location and cultural elements have appeared in the agenda (Eraydin, 2002). In other words, especially since the 1990s, in a world where globalisation and localisation continue as a whole, capitalism has entered a process of creating new areas for itself by using the comparative advantages of non reproducible geographical / historical / cultural values at the local/regional level, and hence the outlook of the modernist development paradigm towards location and culture has dissolved because capitalism, which has entered into a process of globalisation, clashed with the

demands of economy. As a result, in the self-regeneration and re-nourishment process of capitalism, unlike in the modernist development paradigm, it is not the reduction of regional, local and hence cultural diversities and differences that has been emphasised but the need to protect and use these diversities and differences in a manner appropriate for the needs of the capitalist system.

The third important dilemma created by the way that the modernist development paradigm views culture results from ethical dimension. As mentioned above, in the modernist development paradigm, an ethnocentric understanding, which considers different cultures as a difficulty for development, is dominant. In this understanding, on one hand the existence of one single culture which will catch the spirit of development, and which is most appropriate for human civilisation is accepted and desired, on the other hand, the engagement of the remaining cultures onto the dominant culture under cultural imperialism is considered as a natural process of industrial development. In the framework of this paradigm, hegemony will be formed in whole; this is such that, whoever holds hegemonic power in the economic area will wield that power politically, military and culturally as well. In other words, with the modernist development paradigm, under an ethnocentric approach, an understanding which asserts the existence of a best culture or group of cultures over all other cultures and which claims that cultural dominance is a function of economic-military-political power and hence places western culture as the protector of other cultures is dominant (Oruka, 1993). And of course, such an understanding presents the ethical dimension of culture (Oruka, 1993).

The ethical aspect of the way modernist development paradigm views culture has been questioned especially after the 1990s by certain development ethics studies such as the *Basic Needs Ethics* and the doors to a new development paradigm have been opened. With the literature of development ethics and the basic needs ethics, issues such as human rights, equality, identity, local cultures, local values, and minority rights started to be dealt with widely in the concept of development. However, it is only under recent development ethics studies (Sen, 1985; Nussbaum, 1992; Crocker, 1992; Gasper, 1996; Khan, 2004) that these issues have lead to more profound discussions, the issues discussed have become more distinct and clearer, and the conflicts concerning these issues were revealed, and studied in the framework of alternative theories.

While *Basic Needs Ethics* objects to universal-modernist paradigm which ignores both cultural choices/cultural identities and individual choices/identities, and which presents an absolute and universal knowledge in this framework, this approach also challenges post-modernism which presents relativity as the primary characteristic and hence misses certain universal forms. With this new approach, in the development concept the need to raise the

quality of living standard for all of the world societies and individuals under criteria such as human rights, equality, diversity, identity, local cultures, local values, minority rights, democracy, welfare has been put forward. In the framework of this paradigm, any consideration of quality of life will be meaningless if it does not take into account deeply held cultural values. Similarly, human resource development has vital cultural underpinnings. The notion of basic or minimum needs again is originally linked to culture. And most human situations and goals lean on cultural definitions and valuations (Dube, 1988: 507). Since, culture has important aesthetic, psychic, creative, and integrative functions, according to this paradigm, culture cannot for any reason be given a secondary role (Dube, 1988: 508).

As a result, through the last two major cultural problems (the economic and ethical dimension of culture) created by the general structure of the modernist development paradigm, and specifically by the way it views culture, the modernist development paradigm has started to dissolve. Today, the connection between techno-economic structure and culture is being considered more realistically.

Many scholars (Lash and Ury, 1987; Wallerstein, 1990; Amin, 1997; Appadurai 1998) who aim to understand the complexity of global cultural economy either within neo-Marxist approaches or not, have recently begun to theorise the fundamental relations between economy, culture and politics. For example, Wallerstein strictly criticised modernist paradigm which separates social life into three three relatively autonomous spheres; a political sphere centring around the state, an economic sphere centring around the market and more vaguely a sort of socio-cultural sphere centring around civil society (Kumar and Weiz, 2001: 222). According to him, culture can not be understood independent of economics and politics or derivate of others, it has to be seen as a part of an integrated process. Similarly, according to Appadurai (1998), in order to analyse global cultural economy, culture needs to consider the relationship between five dimensions of the system: ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, financescaples and ideoscaples. His hypothesis is that the relationship of these dimensions is context-dependent relating to social forms, events or cultures, which doesn't mean that the relationships among them are random or meaningless⁷.

Hence, in summary, for many social scientist culture is no longer epiphenomenal, but it is linked with economic structure, sometimes as the initiating factor, at other times as the reactive factor. With the dissolution of the way the modernist development paradigm views culture, culture is now seen as a dynamic factor in determining the conditions of development and the view,

which considers the role of culture on economic development as a secondary, or luxury parasite is considered as an anachronism.

CONCLUSION

The modernist development paradigm and the way this paradigm views culture have started to dissolve especially starting in the 1990s because of certain dilemmas. Although there are disagreements concerning the way the modernist development paradigm views culture, these have basically not been disruptive to the essence of the paradigm. This ethnocentric outlook of the modernist development paradigm, which basically fails to reconcile non-western cultures and economic development, holds major economic, sociological and philosophical problems. First of all, there is an ethical dimension to this ethnocentric viewpoint. In addition to this, sociologically, the social ethical values of puritan capitalism, and the unlimited production and consumption demands based on secular Hobbesianism cause an opposition and a conflict between economic development and cultural values. Lastly, the static spatial theories of the modernist development paradigm, and its understanding of culture, have conflicted with capitalism's process of creating new areas for itself by using the comparative advantages of non reproducible geographical/historical/*cultural* values at the local/regional level, especially since the 1990s in a capitalist world where globalisation and localisation continue as a whole.

The cultural conflict dimension of the problems concerning the way the modernist development paradigm views culture, displays a characteristic that is different from the ethical and economic dimension. In the quest for finding alternatives to ethical and economic problems that the modernist paradigm holds, the modernist paradigm's view "non-western cultures cannot coexist with economic development process" is being rejected, and solutions are being sought out again in the capitalist system. However in the analysis of the cultural conflict dimension, it is mainly not the dilemmas of the view of the modernist development paradigm to non-western cultures, but the dilemmas that capitalism and the modernist paradigm carry within themselves that are exposed.

Along with the two important cultural problems (ethical and economic dimensions) that the general structure of the modernist development paradigm and especially the way it views culture create, the modernist development paradigm has started to dissolve. Today, the link between techno-economic structure and culture is evaluated more realistically. Far from being epiphenomenal, culture is connected with the economic structure, sometimes as

an initiating factor, other times as a reactive factor. In this new viewpoint, where culture is accepted as a living organism, it is asserted that all cultures could perform successfully in the economic development process provided that they protect and re-generate their values, and that they engage in cultural exchange with other cultures.

NOTES

¹ We have accepted Mainstream, Orthodox-Marxist and Keynesian development analyses under *the modernist development paradigm* since they have been formed under the rationalist and modernist-positivist framework. The modernist viewpoint can in short be defined as the extreme scientific attitude where as a tool for producing knowledge, the determinism of empiricism and positivism is dominant, where a sharp distinction is placed between the knowing subject and known object, where knowledge about known object is absolute and universal (Ercan, 2001).

² This section was presented at the 7th Annual Conference of the Association for Heterodox Economics "Pluralism in Economics" City University, London, on 16 July 2005.

³ Rostow (1971), in the add-on section of his famous book "Politics and the Stages of Growth," gave important coverage to Parsons's definition of culture and asserted that this was deficient and faulty. According to Rostow, Parsons had defined culture outside of the theoretical structure. But it played the essential role of giving substance to cognitive, cathetic, and evaluative modes of orientations, which led men to act in particular circumstances, with respect to the objects of orientation, and culture itself was one of the objects of orientation. (Rostow, 1971: 336). Along with this, Rostow has stated that this was a landmark study about culture: "specifically, this book's insistence on the inescapable uniqueness of culture — and therefore, its unabashed, theoretical open-endedness — may encourage more work on culture, spirit, or national style..." (Rostow, 1971: 355).

⁴ The move towards a more pluralistic and historical approach to culture was already being developed by F. Boas (1858- 1942). Boas emphasised the notion of cultures rather than a single culture and accepted that cultures were always a fusion of elements originating in various times and places.

⁵ In fact, in Orthodox-Marxist literature, through analysis of Asian type production it has been exposed that the production style of eastern societies is quite different when compared to the feudal production style. However, this analysis holds some deficiencies. Firstly, the continuity of this production style with other production styles has not been established. It lacks internal dynamism, and there are no dialectics of development specific to it. In Engel's *Anti-Duhring* and *The Origins of the Family*, where he analyses modes of production, it simply disappears (Ake, 1988: 491). In Orthodox-Marxist literature, the deficiencies of development discussions specific to less developed countries was reflected upon the Internationals as well, and this problem in the Internationals did not generate interest.

⁶ Local development in short is defined as the process of activation of change processes that are characteristic to the locality. In this process, instead of regional plans where large scale public / private sector investments are emphasised, a development route

which adopts the principles of smaller-scale projects, sustainability, and participation is being formed. In this development route, each sub region can have its own potentials and these sub regions can compete in the information society. Hence, in local development, an approach, which considers the economic, social, environmental, and locational structures and the situation of human resources, is gaining ground instead of a standard interference area of plans approach. (Elvan, 2002: 94).

⁷ Appadurai states that the causal-historical relationship among these various flows is not random or meaninglessly contingent but that current theories of cultural chaos are insufficiently developed to be even parsimonious models at this point, much less to be predictive theories, the golden fleeces of one kind of social science (Appadurai, 1998: 47).

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (2001) "Culture and Economic Development in South Asia", **The American Academy of Political and Social Science (AAPSS)**, 573, 152-176.
- Agazzi, E. (1993) "Cultural Development as a Goal for Mankind" in I. Kucuradi and E. Agazzi (eds.), **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.
- Ake, C. (1988) "The Political Economy of Development: Does it have a Future?", **International Social Science Journal**, 118, 485-497.
- Alexander, A. and K. Kumaran (1992) **Culture and Development: Cultural Patterns in Areas of Uneven Development**, London: Sage Publications.
- Amin, A. and N. Thrift (1995) "Globalisation, Institutional Thickness and the Local Economy" in P. Healey, S. Cameron and others (eds.), **Managing Cities: The New Urban Context**, London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Amin, S. (1997) **Capitalism in the Age of Globalization: The Management of Contemporary Society**, New York: Zed Books.
- Appadurai, A. (1998) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in **Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalization**, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Asad, T. (1973) **Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter**, London: Ithaca Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) **The Location of Culture**, London: Routledge.
- Bell, D. (1976) **The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism**, New York: Basic Books.
- Bickerton, E. (2003) "Multiculturalism in Anthropology", **Culture Wars**, Essays 2003-1. Available at <http://www.culturewars.org.uk/2003-01/multiculturalism.htm>

- Bocock, R. (1992) "The Cultural Formations of Modern Society" in S. Hall and S. Gieben (eds.), **Formations of Modernity**, Cambridge: Polity with Open University Press.
- Calaval, P. (1981) "The Region as a Geographical, Economic and Cultural Concept", **International Social Science Review**, 112, 159-172.
- Crocker, D. (1992) "Functioning and Capability: The Foundations of Sen's and Nussbaum's Development Ethic", **Political Theory**, 20, 584-612.
- Dube, S. C. (1988) "Cultural Dimensions of Development", **International Social Science Journal**, 118, 506-511.
- Elvan, L. (2002) "Bölgesel Gelişme ve Bölgelerarası Gelişmişlik Farkları" in S. Sayan (ed.), **Yerel Ekonomilerin Sürdürülebilir Kalkınması ve Çanakkale Örneği**, Ankara: Türkiye Ekonomi Kurumu Yayınları.
- Eraydın, A. (1992) **Post-Fordizm ve Degişen Mekansal Öncelikleri**, Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Matbaası.
- Eraydın, A. (2002) **Yeni Sanayi Odakları: Yerel Kalkınmanın Yeniden Kavramlaştırılması**, Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Matbaası.
- Ercan, F. (2001) **Modernizm, Kapitalizm ve Azgelişmişlik**, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Gasper, D. (1996) "Culture and Development Ethics: Needs, Women's Rights, and Western Theories", **Development and Change**, 4, 627-661.
- Gbotokama, Z. (1992) "Voices from Africa" in Z. Gbotokama (ed.), **Cultural Identity and Under-Development in Sub-Saharan Africa**, Geneva: United Nations Publications.
- Geertz, C. (1973) **The Interpretation of Cultures**, New York: Basic Books.
- Gellner, E. (1988) **Encounters with Nationalism**, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hamilton, P. (1992) "The Enlightenment and the Birth of Social Science" in S. Hall and B. Gieben (eds.), **Formations of Modernity**, Cambridge: Polity with Open University Press.
- Harrison, L. and S. Huntington (2000) **Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress**, New York: Basic Books.
- Heresh, J. (1993) "Cultural Development? A Tentative Answer" in I. Kucuradi and E. Agazzi (eds.), **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.

- Holton, R. and B. Turner (1989) **Max Weber on Economy and Society**, London: Routledge.
- Inglehart, R. (1997) **Modernization and Postmodernization: Cultural, Economic and Political Change**, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Khan, H. (2004) "Development as Freedom", **CIRJE Discussion Paper**, 78.
- Kim, Y. (1993) "Culture and Development: Toward a Conception of Cultural Development" in I. Kucuradi and E. Agazzi (eds.), **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1948) **Anthropology: Culture Patterns and Processes**, New York: Harcourt: Brace and World.
- Kroeber, A. L. and C. Kluckhohn (1952) **Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions**, New York: Vintage Books.
- Kuçuradi, I. and A. Agazzi (1993) **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.
- Kumar, A. and F. Welz (2001) "Culture in the World System: An Interview with Immanuel Wallerstein", **Social Identities**, 7: 221-231.
- Lash, S and J. Urry (1987) **The End of Organized Capitalism**, London: Polity Pres.
- Leibenstein, H. (1978) "Population, Development and Welfare" in K. Button (ed.), **The Collected Essays of Harvey Leibenstein**, Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Markovic, M. (1993) "Culture and the Prevalent Paradigm of Development" in I. Kucuradi and E. Agazzi (eds.), **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.
- McClelland, D. (1969) **Motivating Economic Achievement**, New York: Free Press.
- Myrdal, G. (1968) **Asian Drama: An Enquiry into the Poverly of Nations**, New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Nussbaum, M. (1992) "Human Funtioning and Social Justice: In Defense of Aristotelian Essentialism", **Political Theory**, 20, 202-246.
- Oruka, O. (1993) "A Philosophical Conception of Cultural Development" in I. Kucuradi and E. Agazzi (eds.), **Philosophy and Cultural Development**, Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey Publications.
- Parsons, T. (1937) **The Structure of Social Action**, New York: Mc Graw Hill.

- Parsons, T. (1951) **Social System**, New York: Free Press.
- Rostow, W. W. (1971) **Politics and the Stages of Growth**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Said, E. (1983) **The World, the Text, and the Critic**, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Said, E. (1993) **Culture and Imperialism**, New York: Knopf.
- Schech, S. and J. Haggis (2003) **Culture and Development**, Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Sen, A. (1985) **Commodities and Capabilities**, Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Swedberg, R. (1998) **Max Weber and the Idea of Economic Sociology**, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, H. (2001) "Culture and Economic Development: Modernisation to Globalisation", **Theory & Science**, 2.
- Touraine, A. (1988) "Modernity and Cultural Specificities", **International Social Science Journal**, 118, 443-457.
- Tylor, E. B. (1958) **Primitive Culture**, New York: Harper.
- Varisco, D. M. (2004) "Reading against Culture in Edward Said's Culture and Imperialism", **Culture, Theory & Critique**, 45, 93-112.
- Wallerstein, I. (1990) "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System" in M. Featherstone (ed.), **Global Culture**, London: Sage.
- Wallerstein, I. (1997) "Eurocentrism and its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science", **New Left Review**, 226, November-December, 1-16.