

Final Paper: Development

Cassandra Smith
Dr. Timms
GEOG 408
Final Paper: Development
December 14, 2016

Development in the simplest terms means change. Change that is often times associated with progress and growth of social, political, economic and environmental ideals. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, development is defined as, “the act or process of growing or causing something to grow or become larger or more advanced.”(www.merriam-webster.com) This definition of development is often shared by westernized and industrialized societies and nations, and reflects a highly constructed Eurocentric view of the world.

This constructed lens, that many westernized nations have used to view development within the rest of the world, has lead to the creation of distinct and specialized classifications. These classifications include the phrases First, Second, and Third World, Majority and Minority World, as well as Global North and South. The key characteristic of these classifications is that they inevitably become a systematic ranking of the multiple developmental traits that they observe. Ultimately deeming certain developmental traits as better and more advanced than others. Katie Willis, a professor of Human Geography and author of *Theories and Practices of Development*, highlights that the way in which, “different parts of the world are described can tell us about who has the power to decide what should be valued and what denigrated.” (Willis, 16) The “who” that is in power refers to the people in regions identified as the Global North and First World nations, including Japan, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, USA, and countries within Europe. An important aspect of these countries in power is that they all share a common history revolved around establishment and spread of colonialism and their progression to post-colonialism periods.

Before looking at the various ways in which colonialism shaped the world, it is important to look at the progression of change and development that colonizing countries had first

encountered over several hundreds of years. We began to notice significant change when Europe made its way out of being a feudal society constructed on indentured servitude and concerns about survival rather than production. It wasn't until the fifteenth century and the development of mediums, such as the Gutenberg printing press, did knowledge about religion, economics, and politics began to accumulate and spread between people. With this new found spread of ideas came the early notions of imperialism and colonialism known as mercantilism, an economic system founded on the first ever world trading of guild produced goods and gold bullion. Much like feudalism this era of development saw little production of new items of commerce and was more fixed however on the acquiring of new goods. Around the nineteenth century is when we truly see these nations began to build on the concepts of industrialization, free trade and capitalism through the expansion of power and colonizing. Nation heads in power began to look to scholars and geographers to help catalog and survey the world's regions 'discovered' during early exploration. It was during this period that newly founded countries like the US engaged in the outsourcing of slaves and European head powers divided up the continent of Africa between their own leading nations, known as the 1884-85 Berlin Conference. While this period is labeled as the last era of direct colonialism, certain aspects, traits and attitudes of the post World War/ Post-Colonialism era continued to highlight the affects of colonialism throughout the Global South. While the original colonizers were mostly no longer entering other regions and directly establishing direct political control, they indirectly discussed about the reconstruction of nations affected by non-democratic rule, establishing global systems and legitimating ideologies. An example of this democratic and anglo attitude can be found in USA's former President Harry Truman's inaugural address about the importance of universal democracy challenging and

putting an end to communist regime and control. (Truman, 1949) This ideology was one commonly shared amongst the nations who had preciously colonized the nations they know wished to save and establish new law and order.

When looking at the multiple paths in which different regions of the world developed it is clear that the foundations in which we base development off of do not hold the same meanings universally. From a Global North viewpoint the outcomes of colonialism, economics, political systems, environmental and agricultural practices, infrastructure, social and cultural changes, have been rewarding and helped to establish those regions as “more developed.” Which then leads to the idea that the regions who were colonized were at one point, or continue to be, “under developed” in comparison. As Eric Sheppard writes in *Knowing the Third world: Colonial Encounters*, when applying this systemized lens of development we see some nations as having to play “catch up” with our part of the wold. While development in the simplest terms means change, we have created the idea that change includes progress and growth and those who have not experienced the change are not growing or developing. As members of society we are aware that there are different viewpoints around the world that categorize what societal structures are and are not developed, the idea of development itself can be traced historically. The starting point for development was geographical colonialism, imperialism and an early form of capitalism known as mercantilism. The 17th and 18th centuries saw the transition from mercantilism to classical economic theories, categorized as the British Enlightenment period. With Neo-Liberalism rising out as a critique on Keynesian economics in the 20th century. Overall these two forms of development continued to promote a biased and specifically weighted view of global economics.

One of the most important traits of classical development is the particular circumstances in which it grew out of and responded too. With mercantilism it was merchants and trading companies that were responsible for almost the entirety of the economic growth of early industrialized nations. As Willis points out in *Theories and Practices of Development*, merchants were supporters of protectionist measures that produced high tariffs on imported goods so that domestic goods were cheaper for customers to buy. (Willis, 36-37) This particular method of economics was viewed as damaging to the greater wealth of citizens as well as a country's overall economic growth. It was during the Enlightenment period that classical economic and social theorists began to come forward with their views on the matter and help reshape global economics.

One important classical economic theorist from the 17 and 1800's was Adam Smith. From Scotland Adam Smith was both a social philosopher and political economist that is especially known for his "Laissez-Faire" economic theory and writing the five-book series *The Wealth of Nations*. One of the defining aspects of Smith was that he believed in establishing a free market system where individuals would act in self-interest and adapt to the changing market; from production and consumer costs to wages. While he rejected the concept of mercantilism and promoted the free market, Smith still believed that the government had a very limited but important role to play in economic practices and it, "should enforce contracts and grant patents and copyrights to encourage inventions and new ideas." (www.econlib.org) Overall it was to promote the nature and cause of a nation's prosperity (increased division of labor), a concept heavily expressed in *The Wealth of Nations*. While these theories influenced the likes of other classical economists like David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill, it was events like the 1929 Wall

Street Crash and the Great Depression of the 1930's that challenged free market systems and brought the attention towards national economies.

A key person in highlighting a change towards national economies is British economist John Maynard Keynes. His 1936 book *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* argued against the free market system and that the key to growth was, "real investment in new (rather than replacement) infrastructure projects." (Willis, 39) Keynes believed that through the multiplier effect these investments would continue to generate wealth while also positively affecting job creation. This approach was used in the 1930's by former US President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his 'New Deal' policies which attempt to advance the US economy and produce new jobs after the crash. It was also seen during the post-Second World War period that Western nations began to look into suitable forms of international organization and intervention, a plan they thought wouldn't allow for the 1930's economic crises to happen again.

However, during the 1970's economic theorists began to draw back on early classical economic theories of Adam Smith and once again argue on the reduction of state intervention and establish the 'invisible hand of the market.' Neo-Liberalism went mainstream in the 1980's what top political heads like the UK's former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and US former President Ronald Reagan adopted and advocated for it. (Timms, 2016) They believed overall in the lessening of government and international aid claiming that it hindered free market systems and that economic individuality was of the most importance. Globally this form of economic theory was used as the IMF and World Bank began to administer loans for development to nations within the global south who also moved closer to the free market system without even taking into consideration their political and social institutions. This gave way to a Debt crisis on

a global scale as over 20 countries including Jamaica, Africa, and Mexico fell harder and harder into debt loan and increase in interest rates and a decrease in income. As a response under Neo-Liberalism structural adjustment programs were developed in the north and imposed in the south to raise government revenue while cutting its spending and continuing the promotion of free trade. Even with SAP's, transfers between classical and Neo-Liberalism continue to promote a hierarchal and therefore economic reliance of the global south on the north. The theorists seemed to ignore flaws in encouraging market individuality in a country that houses offshore production for the industrialized nations that seek little to no in-state interference.

In the last couple of centuries other forms of development theories have stemmed away from the limited state and government control Classic and Neo-Liberalism theories. These theories are Neo-Marxist, Socialist and Structuralist development ideologies. Another key aspect of these three theories are their individual origins, regions where they were implemented and influence as a non-westernized development plan. Overall the Neo-Marxist, Socialist and Structuralist theories encouraged forms of development that reached and influenced all members of society by creating equal opportunities that were heavily monitored by the state. While they are not always widely accepted, these theories are well known and continue to shape the way the western world looks at global development.

The first of these three theories to emerge was Neo-Marxist or Marxism, growing out of the personal ideologies and through processes of 17th century philosopher, economist and revolutionary socialist Karl Marx. Heavily influenced by the written work of Adam Smith and David Ricardo Karl Marx along with the help of his colleague Friedrich Engels, developed the Marxist theory. According to *Theories of Development* by Richard Peet and Elaine Hartwick,

was “a materialist philosophy of social existence and a dialectical theory of human development.” (Hartwick and Peet, 91) Meaning that unlike other economic, political and social theories at the time, Marxism focused on the personal growth and development of people especially the working class. Marx was a firm believer in the notion that capitalism while necessary for initial growth would be the inevitable downfall of a society. The downfall would be triggered by the economic and social inequality of capitalists accumulating all of the capital. Through Marxist theories came the widely known and practiced developmental ideologies of Communism and Socialism.

Deriving from Marxism both Communism and Socialism are rooted in the idea that there is a communal and collective ownership of means of production. Socialist theories revolve around state ownership of means of production while Communism is when there is working people or proletariat ownership of means of production. Overall both ideologies strive to eliminate people’s individual struggles and needs by having multiple distribution systems. (Willis, 71) For true Marxists Socialism is seen as a “stepping stone” towards full Communism. Despite their similarities and differences the two forms of development were implemented in several different regions around the world during the 1900’s and produced numerous outcomes.

When looking at the various outcomes of 20th century communist and socialist structures, one must consider the difference in previous economic and political sanctions and whether or not they were threatened by autocratic rule. The main regions where we can see the different effects of these structures are in the Soviet Union, Chinese Maoism and African Socialism. The Soviet Union in particular stands out because of its unique upbringing that did not match the ideas of classic Marxism. Instead of an urban industrial working class

overthrowing the capital regime it was done by the peasant class and agriculture workers. This factored greatly into the plans of communist leader Josef Stalin who came to power in 1929, intensified collective ownership of agricultural goods and hunted down those who opposed the communist party. According to Katie Willis the socialist systems implemented in the Soviet Union highlight the extreme negatives and positives of this form of development. While there was an impressive drive towards modernization as the once peasant agriculture economy transformed into a highly-industrialized one, it did so under a Dictatorship. (Willis, 91) For some social and economic theorists this is the downfall of communism and socialism, in theory it works towards equal ownership but can easily be taken over by an overreaching central power. A trait that was seen in multiple regions that experimented with this form of development.

While most developmental theories focus on the western world and give a narrow perception of how different parts of the world progressed and changed, the Structuralist theory challenged western thought. In the 1900's Latin American academics and economists associated with ECLA, the Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, argued that Latin America in nature was very different than western nations. Historical context, global environment, and individual regions' paths to development should all be taken into consideration when measuring overall development. In the *Theories and Practices of Development* Katie Willis writes that ECLA believed, "national development strategies should involve greater state intervention to protect national industries." (Willis, 74) This approach was built off of German economist Friedrich List's 'infant economy' and allowed for the elimination of competition from foreign firms. Allowing for domestic markets to flourish.

While communist social development plans have not always completely worked and Marxist theories derive from capitalism, they offer alternative views of development. Overall they began to challenge the westernized view that all regions have endured the same circumstances and resulted in the same developmental outcomes. Presenting the notion that each region will have unique traits that should be considered when observing their overall change. The first major developmental theories to step away from following the specific structures that have been predetermined by governments were grassroots theories. During the 1970's economists began to rethink and reshape the ways in which poor societies and countries experienced development and economic gains. This led to the formation of grassroots development and a focus on the social and cultural factors that play a significant part in shaping the ways societies develop.

Some of the biggest and most significant differences of the grassroots development theory is that it reflects an organic changing system that focuses on local level economies and improving standards and quality of life. It challenged the idea that all societies within the global north and south experienced economic, social, and political development the same way. Therefore allowing for certain societies to receive the attention and help that they needed. In the 1970's the World Bank and the International Labour Organization (ILO) promoted the concept of 'basic needs,' switching the focus of development theories from macro-level to poor people on a micro-level. (Willis, 103) These basic needs included basics of personal consumption such as food, water, shelter, and clothing as well as access to education, sanitation, healthcare, and participation in the decision-making of the local economic sector. As American economist and Columbia University Professor Jeffrey D. Sachs writes in his book *The End of Poverty*, "the poor

face structural challenges that keep them from getting even their "first foot on the ladder of development. Most societies with the right ingredients...have escaped extreme poverty." (Sachs, 47) Sachs highlights the idea that poor societies can not be entirely to blame for being poor. That it was westernized structural views of economic, social, and political ideology that narrowed out specific societies from ever 'developing' and that when given the necessary tools they too can begin to prosper. In *Geographies of Developing Areas* author Glyn Williams explains how mainstream developmental theories are driven by only market forces and doesn't take into consideration individual action and facilities within the local economy. These individual actions include economic and socio-cultural relations and involve domestic, communal and volunteer work within the civil society and formal/informal work within the market economy. This outlook on development allows for societies to continue their individual work, have value placed on their individual work, and receive necessary aid. Grassroots works as a whole to support those at the bottom independently from those on top who already benefit from a traditional capitalist market system.

Along with grassroots development theories is the understanding that there are multiple factors that contribute to the way societies function, progress and develop. These are the social and cultural factors that are determined by race, ethnicity, gender, age, socioeconomic status, cultural and religious practices. Economists and sociologists observe these factors when explaining how developed or underdeveloped a society is. While all these factors are important most are often overlooked when determining developmental processes. In 1996 Swedish writer and Professor Emeritus of Peace and Development Research Björn Hettne argued, "that both modernization theories and classical Marxist theories fail to consider ethnic diversity in great

detail.” (Willis, 133) Different ethnicities should be taken into consideration when looking at diversity within class grouping and economic advantages. Hettne also listed the four aspects of ethnodevelopment as territorialism, internal self-determination, cultural pluralism and ecological sustainability. Territorialism is when decisions about development are conscious of the spatial concentration of ethnic groups while internal self-determination is when ethnic groups have the ability to control their destiny within a nation-state. Cultural pluralism is when there is mutual respect established for all cultures within a society and ecological sustainability ensures that development does not destroy the natural environment and affect those living in it. By addressing these factors of ethnicity and culture certain societies can be seen as self-efficient rather than merely a failed product of colonialism lacking a capitalist market.

Majority of the countries in the global south have lasting relationships with countries in the global north. While certain relationships are promoted as beneficial, it is often argued that they portray the lasting affects of imperialism and colonialism. Some of the ways in which these relationships play out is through tourism, charity and aid. There are multiple types of tourism that include focus on specific areas such as ecotourism, heritage, community, adventure, and volunteerism. As a whole tourism promotes the idea that affluent travelers go and visit a country and either observe, participate, or try and fix the inhabitants life styles. Most of the time these tourists will travel to countries within the global south that are seen as underdeveloped and many of the activities they participate in will further enforce the divide between locals and guests. In his article *The Geography of Volunteer Tourism* Dr. James Keese a geography professor at Cal Poly State University, writes about how volunteer tourism is gaining popularity and how non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a big part in narrowing down what countries tourists

travel to. Volunteers have become the number one source of funds for NGOs which are in charge of placing volunteers in countries. Therefore a cycle of filtering out undesirable countries, climates and activities for prospective volunteers and their donations begins. The same countries either receive or see volunteer tourists over and over again. Other problems with tourism in less developed countries is that only seasonal jobs are offered to locals and many resort destinations and transpiration is foreign owned by the countries that send the tourists. Therefore very little money is actually being earned and entered into the under developed country's economy. However, tourism attractions and destinations continue to sell the idea that countries in the global south want affluent tourists to visit and reap what little benefits they have.

The process of foreign aid is also a very troublesome concept. While the idea of giving aid to underdeveloped countries to help boost their economy or quality of life seems like a good decision, many problems can arise. As authors Warwick E. Murray and John Overton point out in their book *Progress in Development Studies* 16, one serious problem with international aid is the heavy involvement of private sectors. Private sector involvement reflects a longstanding neoliberal principle that development should not be carried out by the state, and moves further away from the idea of sustainable economic development.

The grassroots development theory coupled with focus on social and cultural factors, brought a new outlook on the way that people view economic and societal development around the world. These factors, which can be inherent or simply a product of imperialism, are important when observing a society's development process. Comparing the positive and negative affects of foreign aid and tourism to 'underdeveloped' countries also calls attention to the fact that most efforts by global north countries is subjective to their own entertainment and well being.

Showing very limited concern for the global south's growth and success. A key element that is often overlooked is these societies as well as our own's, relationship and partnership with the environment. Grassroots along with colonialism, mercantilism, classical theories, structuralist and socialism theories, fail to acknowledge the affects human populations have on the environment as well as how the environment affects human development. The use of natural resources, cultivation of land, and rise of technological and sustainable practices are all ways in which the environment contributes to development theories. Regardless of wether it is in the global north or south the practices and relationships that human populations have with their immediate environment contributes to economic development.

One of the earliest notions of the relationship between the environment and human populations came from Thomas Malthus in the late 1700's. While his argument did not specifically focus on 'development', it contributed greatly to later environmental development theories. In his 1798 Essay on the Principle of Population the English cleric and scholar wrote about the affects of rising populations on natural resources by highlighting how food supplies and populations expand and grow in different ways, food supplies linearly and populations geometrically. (Willis, 164) Malthus claimed that if human populations did not regulate reproduction they would outgrow and diminish food supplies. This claim was later challenged by the idea that sustainable practices and technological advancements could contribute to and increase in agriculture productivity. However, in many areas of the world where ample food supplies are produced it is not guaranteed that all people have access to the food.

Another way in which the developmental theorists have used humans' relationship with the environment to determine behavior and success was through environmental determinism. A

form of naturalist theory, environmental determinism was a popular development theory of the early 19th and late 20th centuries that was used as an explanation for why different societies around the world lived, behaved, and obtained economic success the way they did. Katie Willis writes, “that theorists argued that people from the temperate parts of the world were naturally ‘better’ than those from the tropical zones, and so justified the domination of Europeans over the inhabitants of other places.” (Willis, 166) Environmental determinism downgraded the lives of people living in the global south by painting the idea that they were inherently below the global north’s level of economic and social success. Thus the theory greatly contributed to racial domination and imperialistic views of certain societies. As a whole the theory was not only damaging to the views of specific groups of humans and views of different environments, but they took away from the individual relationships that come out of living in those environments.

One of the relationships that human populations have with the environment is the constant give and take of natural resources and cultivation of land. What most of history and the world’s natural landscape will show is that human populations reap the environment’s natural resources to add to the growth of civilization. Humans use natural gasses and oils for fuel, timber for infrastructure, and land for cultivation and agriculture. It was not until the last couple centuries did people began to theorize and notice the beginnings of environmental depletion, and the direct affect it has on human lives. Creation of resource conservation and sustainability practices have been some of the key plans to fix and give back to the environment. However, not everyone believes that sustainability practices can save us or the environment. American professor and ecological and Georgist economist Herman E. Daly wrote in his book *Valuing the Earth: Economics, Ecology, Ethics* that, “politically it is very difficult to admit that growth, with

its almost religious connotations of ultimate goodness, must be limited. But it is precisely the non-sustainability of growth that gives urgency to the concept of sustainable development.” (Daly, 12) This argument highlights that the earth at some point can not continue to support all the people living on it as well as to being able to adapt to conservation efforts. The environment can only grow so many trees in the limited fertile land it has. It is important to understand that there are many options when it comes to sustainability projects, those that promote environment growth, economic growth, as well as limiting the amount of resources used. Peter Victor a Canadian professor and economist believes that developed societies should not strive away from seeking economic growth, but just understand how to achieve it within planetary limits. In his article *Questioning Economic Growth* published in *Nature* magazine Victor writes, “One option is for developed countries to continue striving for economic growth, while attempting to reduce impacts on the planet.” (Victor, 370) He calls attention to green development projects that work within physical and environmental limitations, but can still ensure quality growth for the world’s rising population. He argues that it role of developed nations to continue to strive for developmental growth without further straining the earth’s resources.

Most developmental theories focus on economic, social, and political growth throughout different societies. While these classifications of development are important to categorize and evaluate, they often times overlook the most significant element that aids to life on earth, the environment. The earth contains numerous amounts of unique environments and ecosystems that have been home to millions of people for hundreds of thousands of years. During this time humans have developed different ways to utilize the resources their unique environments provide

to aid to their growth. However, the ways in which we have utilized these resources have not left the environment in pristine condition or have proved easy to use. It is our job as humans to acknowledge the ways in which we treat the environment and understand that human growth not only depends on the environment but also is the thing that is killing it.

One of the defining reasons humans began to explore the world and seek out new regions was the rate in which populations were increasing and starting to mobilize power. Globalization, as it is now known, is the transaction and interaction between people, companies, and governments of different nations revolved around trade, investment, and technology. It is a process that people from all around the world have been participating in for thousands of years, and has shown to affect the environment, economic development, culture, political systems, and human well-being and prosperity. Globalization like the other developmental theories discussed has both positive and negative critiques. These critiques revolve around the notion that globalization while extending past the physical and distant barriers of nations leads to more and more countries entering into the global competition for development. Globalization as a development theory has highlighted the differing affects that systemized and global scale development comparisons have had on nations within the global north and south. Understanding globalization has lead to economists, scientists, and data analysts to look to new ways of determining development without using comparison of third world to first world structures.

When comparing the course that globalization has taken throughout human discourse, it is clear that there are two ways in which different nations around the globe have experience it. Often times communities or whole nation are comply to assimilation, adoption of practices, and foreign agreements for fear of falling behind those who put themselves in first place. Author

Katie Willis cites economic geographer, professor, and author Philip Kelly when discussing the choices that some nations's governments face when development strategies through globalization approach. He writes, "it is regarded as an opportunity to promote growth and poverty alleviation or because 'globalization' is viewed as an inevitable reality within which nations must either play the game, or lose out in the search for development." (Kelly 2000) This infers that choosing to globalize gives nations opportunities and access to foreign markets, relations, and resources that might not ever had the chance to acquire. However, these decisions come often times at the price of losing their own economic, cultural, and political practices to those of global north nations. The decision has also proven to have lasting violent affects.

When communities and nations enter into the predominately western sphere of influence through globalization they face threats that can inflict violence in many forms. This includes environmental and economic violence as well as attacks on cultural practices and beliefs. Eric Sheppard a professor of geography and associate director of the Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Global Change co-wrote the text *A World of Difference: Encountering and Contesting Development*, as a critical analysis of contemporary approaches to economic development and how they causes inequality on a global scale. In the chapter *Toward Different Worlds* when talking about formal European colonies he writes, "The achieved formal independence have bought increased globalization of economic and social life in the third world, with large and increasing disparities in wealth and income, continued privation and poverty for billions of people, and serious environmental degradation." (Sheppard, 595) This highlights the idea that countries and regions once colonized by western and european nations or introduced to their systems of development, will endure drastic and lasting change. Change that results in the

disconnecting of multicultural identities and brings a rise to racial, ethnic, political, and class conflicts. Sheppard also points out in page 596 how the physical environment of third world countries is under attack from first world countries. They simply do not possess the knowledge and management practices that local inhabitants have gained from living in tropic and subtropic areas. Without this knowledge foreign entities pose as a threat to the land and eventually bring systematic change at local levels.

While the quest to expand and promote development can come at a cost, the cost of losing age-old cultural practices and ethnic identities as well as harming the environment, some good can come from globalized development. Careful analysis of the past and current affects of globalization coupled with new conscientious approaches to global development practices could change the way western/modern development is viewed and implemented. Authors professors of geography Richard Peet and Elaine Hartwick write in their book *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives* about the differences between critical and post modernism, and how understanding both is necessary to continue the positive change and end the negative affects of globalization and western modernism. They write the differences of critical and post modernism as one promoting a transformative plan and the other favoring rejection of global development practices. Critical modernism, “gains insight from Marxist, poststructural, and feminist critiques of modernity and emphasizes belief more in the potential, rather than the practice.” (Hartwick & Peet, 313) Meaning that critical modernism reevaluates the global systems that have brought negative systematic change to third world countries and seeks to find alternative ways to continue and advance on the positive change they bring. The positive change includes combating disease, famine, poverty, and militant rule without harming and completely

westernizing a nation's cultural, social, and environmental practices. They write that critical modernism, "should be understood as social, democratic control over economic progress." (Hartwick & Peet, 314) That the development practices westernized countries try to implement and explained into foreign countries should do so under consent and within their control. Every nation should have access to the development programs they want and have equal say in the way the world develops.

Development theories have shared a lot of things in common, the main characteristic being that these practices are created to benefit westernized nations and used to promote their ideals within the global south. This is especially seen in the globalization of economic, political, social, and environmental programs and agreements throughout the last few centuries. While not all the change these programs can bring is bad, they often times come at the expense of third world countries' own systems of development. Deeming them inferior to those of the western world. In order to change the way the global south is viewed in relation to the global north change must come to the ways in which development policies are created, viewed, and implemented. They must be agreed upon by the nations that they are introduced to and must work only to promote positive change within that country and not advance the progression of the western country that tried to place it there.

After learning and evaluating the different development theories from Classical Neo-Liberalism, to Socialist, to Grassroots, and even Post-Modernization is clear that there are a number in ways that we as individuals can look at the world. Some nations and societies then to favor theories that focus on economic growth and others on our relationship and impact on the environment. While others view some societies are less developed without even considering the

social and cultural factors that play a huge role in a nation's economic, political, and social policies. To say there should be only one way at viewing development would be wrong, but also ignoring the the negative accusations of current theories is also damaging to the general understanding of what development really means. In my opinion the main development theories that industrialized nations within the global north use to rank development are skewed and focus to little on cultural factors and unfairly promote capitalist policies. As an advocate for socialist and communist theories that support universal economic and social programs within industrialized nations. Too many nations defined as the global north revolve around capitalism and the inevitable wealth and social inequalities that come along with it. It was in the growing stages of merchant societies that people began to let their hunger for power and money prohibit them from seeing the negative affects that were conjured. I am a firm believer in economic, social, and political policies that first establish equity to those who need and ask for it while then establishing equality. A favor a system that focuses on preserving the environment through conservation programs that work and drastically reducing the amount of waste that is produced. While it is important to solve the social inequalities that plague almost every region, it is no use trying to fix the inhabitants if there is no world to live in.

Bibliography

By Directing That Industry in Such a Manner as Its Produce May Be of Greatest Value, He

Intends Only His Own Gain, and He Is in This, as in Many Other Cases, Led by an

Invisible Hand to Promote an End Which Was No Part of His Intention. "Adam Smith." :

The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Oct. 2016.

Daly, Herman E., and Kenneth N. Townsend. "Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem."

Valuing the Earth: Economics, Ecology, Ethics. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1993. 11-16.

Print.

Harry Truman's 1949 Presidential Inaugural Address

Keese, J. 2011. "The Geography of Volunteer Tourism: Place Matters". *Tourism*

Geographies 13 (2): 257-279.

Merriam-Webster. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. 03 Oct. 2016.

Murry, W. E. and J. Overton. 2016. "Retroliberalism and the New Aid Regime of

the 2010s". *Progress in Development Studies* 16 (3): 244–260.

Peet, Richard, and Elaine R. Hartwick. "Chapter 4 Marxist and Neo-Marxist Theories of

Development." *Theories of Development*. New York: Guilford, 1999. N. pag. Print.

Peet, Richard, and Elaine R. Hartwick. "Chapter 8 Critical Modernism and Democratic

Development." *Theories of Development*. New York: Guilford, 1999. 307-25. Print.

Sachs, J. 2005. "The End of Poverty." *Time* March 15: 41-54.

Sheppard, E. et al. 2009. "Knowing the Third World: Colonial Encounters." In *A World of*

Difference, pages 53-67

Sheppard, Eric S. "Chapter 24 Toward Different Worlds." *A World of Difference: Encountering and Contesting Development*. New York: Guilford, 2009. 594-608. Print.

Timms, Benjaimn, Dr. "Neo-Liberalsim and the Debt Crisis." GEOG 408. Cal Poly University, San Luis Obispo. 10 Oct. 2016. Lecture.

Victor, Peter. "Questioning Economic Growth." *Nature* n.d.: 370-71. Print.

Williams, G. et al. 2014. "Making a Living". In G. Williams et al. *Geographies of Developing Areas*, pages 199-229.

Willis, Katie. *Theories and Practices of Development*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.