

## ON BOURGEOIS DEVELOPMENT THEORY (1) A CRITIQUE OF BEHRENDT

By

*Ansa ASAMOA\**

### INTRODUCTION

Lewis MORGAN's theory of evolution and Karl MARX's Historical Materialsim, most powerful tools of sociological analyses, emerged in the transitional stage of capitalism from free competition to monopoly capitalism, also termed imperialism in the 19th century. The social conflicts and tensions generated by the rapid concentration of capital in industry and banking, in agriculture, coupled with unscrupulous land grabbing and calculated elimination of the weak and small-scale entrepreneurs, constituted the fertile socio-economic soil from which both progressive theories shot up (2).

Seeing in the contradictions between the forces and relations of production (usually generated by private ownership of means of production) the root of the qualitative transformation of past human class societies, evolutionism (MORGAN's) and historical materialism predicted an eventual negation of the bourgeois capitalist system by a qualitatively higher form of socio-economic formation. Bourgeois sociology was quick to react and has ever since been bitterly opposed to both theories.

Several bourgeois theories aimed at combating the growing power of Morganian evolutionism and marxism mushroomed — Ward's utopian sociocracy, German culture-Historical school with its racist under-tone, Anglo-American diffusionism, Parsonian action theory, different brands of positivism, a hotchpotch of psychological schools of thought initiated by people like Ruth BENEDICT, HERSKOVITZ, MEAD etc.

Functionalism, nick-named «the synchronic revolt», was and has been most prominent and dedicated in the anti-marxist, anti-evolutionist vanguard of international bourgeois sociology. Overzealous to provide the best therapy for social conflicts in many parts of the world and thereby check the spread of marxism functionalism especially the Malinoswkian brand, extended its activities to many a colony in the service of colonialism and imperialism. The most prominent of functionalist vehicles used by colonialism were B. MALINOWSKI, Evans PRITCHARD, FORTES, Radcliffe BROWN (3), anthropologists who are still worshipped today in neo-colonial circles in African sociology.

In spite of the concerted effort by bourgeois sociologists all over the world to stop or at least undermine the spread and effects of the progressive dynamic scientific ideas of MARX, ENGELS and MORGAN — later on developed by younger generations of marxists — I stand to be corrected on the fact that marxism has been the agent of change in those Third World countries that have undergone qualitative social transformations.

---

\* Senior Lecturer, University of Cap Coast, Ghana.

The spread of marxist ideas, accelerated by national and international events such as the people's revolutions in the Soviet Union, E. European countries, Cuba, China, Vietnam, North Korea etc., by the liberation of almost all colonized peoples, by the armed struggle in racist southern Africa, by periodical inflations and other general crises of capitalism, has been weakening steadily and making obsolete several bourgeois sociological theories of societal development.

Prominent among the reactionary sociological theories that have been more or less brought to the end of their resources by historical events is functionalism, whose usefulness nearly ended with the death of colonialism in many parts of the world.

The inhuman colonial economic and social legacy inherited by the newly independent countries; the continuation and intensification of exploitation of the so-called Third World by the multi-national corporations in collaboration with their national states and the comprador bourgeoisies in the developing nations; reactionary coups d'état, usually staged by incompetent, greedy and corrupt army and police officers who see in the seizure of political power the quickest way of enriching themselves at the expense of the mass of the people; the subsequent stagnation of the forces of production coupled with mass abject poverty, starvation, undernourishment etc. etc. — all create serious social conflicts and tensions in many a developing country, conflicts which now and then culminate in armed clashes between the popular classes and their bourgeois oppressors. Haunted by the possibility of marxist led people's revolutions eventually resulting from this bitter class struggle in the developing countries (as it has been the case in North Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, Angola etc.) bourgeois sociology has been quick to manufacture a reactionary, neo-functional middle range theory of modernization. The theory, loaded with procapitalist principles of functionalism, is intended to guide the developing countries in planning and executing their socio-economic development strategies.

This paper is a contribution to the efforts by marxists to expose the reactionary nature of the theory; the exposure would, among other things, make it extremely difficult for our tightly cornered African palaeo-functionalists (4) to eventually hide unnoticed under the umbrella of the new theory using the latter as a cover for the continuation of their palaeo-functionalist operations. The paper will thus help further the course of the anti-neo-colonial struggle in the social sciences not only in Africa but also in other parts of the developing world.

While casual references will be made here and there to different theoretical modes and trends represented by bourgeois modernization theorists, Richard BEHRENDT's «*Soziale Strategie fuer Entwicklungslaender*» (1968) will constitute the basis of the critical discussions in this paper for the following reasons:

1. At the request of the neo-colonial government of the Second Republic of Ghana headed by the late Dr. K. A. BUSIA, a puppet of imperialism, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany dispatched a delegation of highly qualified technocrats and experts to Ghana in 1971. Their terms of reference: To study and assess the general economic situation in Ghana and advise the West German Government on how best it could «aid» Ghana in her development efforts.

The German delegation prepared a 100-page confidential report on their findings in Ghana. The report clearly shows that the delegation was allowed access to very important confidential documents on the Ghanaian economy. According to my investigations «Das Ministerium fuer wirtschaftlichen Zusammenarbeit» (5) of the West German Government had been asked to have similar reports prepared on Senegal, Guinea and other African countries.

The report on Ghana attributes the economic problems of Ghana in the late 60's and early 70's to the so-called economic mismanagement by the nationalist government of the First Republic headed by Dr. NKRUMAH. NKRUMAN's development strategy, especially his emphasis on the need to develop rapidly the reproduction sector of the economy, is described in the report as prestigious, if not wasteful. The state-owned enterprises are regarded as a serious negative factor in the economy.

The secret report carefully dissects the Ghanaian economy identifying areas of possible limited investment and where «aid» could be given – and, of course, with quick returns to West Germany. To forestall any losses on investments and «aid» by any other western country in Ghana it is proposed in the report that the west German Government communicate the findings of the delegation to other members of the western imperialist camp (6).

The report asks the West German Government to advise Ghana to decentralize the economy and its management, encourage private small scale enterprises, reduce public expenditure, give priority to the provision of good drinking water to the rural areas, etc.

Apparently basing obediently their economic policies on earlier imperialist expert advice (IMF – World Bank) and on West Germany's pre-conditions for its «aid» to Ghana the ultrarightist military junta (7), which preceded the Second Republic, and the Busia Government of the Second Republic stopped and paralysed enterprises in the reproduction sector of the economy; state-owned enterprises were sold to Ghanaian and foreign entrepreneurs and multi-national corporations while viable projects were abandoned; Ghana's promising steel Industry, the Atomic Research Centre, the Fishing Industry, the State Housing Corporation, the State Rubber and Tyre Manufacturing Industry (now Fire Stone Ltd.) and several other state enterprises have been adversely affected by the new economic policy. Busia's policies boomeranged, culminating in his overthrow in January 1972. And since this time Ghana's economy and social services have been systematically disintegrating.

2. The West German Secret Report radiates an ideological flavour symptomatic of Richard BEHRENDT's much publicised blue-print for socio-economic development for the developing countries (8). BEHRENDT, a West German bourgeois sociologist, worked several years in Panama, Peru, Guatemala, Puerto Rico, Paraguay and Uruguay where he industriously propagated neo-colonial strategies of social development.

The special attention paid to BEHRENDT's strategy in this paper could thus expose crucial aspects of the ideological framework of West Germany's neo-colonial offensive in the Third World.

3. BEHRENDT's approach to the study of problems of development in the developing nations synthesises the three main trends in the methodology of bourgeois sociology of development. The trends, according to NASH, are: The ideal typical index Mode, the Acculturation Mode and the Psychological Approach (9).

NASH outlines the three modes as follows:

1. *The Ideal Typical Index Mode:*

«... the general features of a developed economy are abstracted as an ideal type and then contrasted with the equally ideal typical features of a poor economy and society. In this mode, development is viewed as the transformation of one type into the other... (10) NASH refers to works by PARSONS, HOSELITZ and LEVY as «developed examples of this mode (11).

2. *The Acculturation View:*

«The West (taken here as the Atlantic community of developed nations and their overseas outliers) diffuses knowledge, skills, organization, values, technology and capital to a poor nation, until over time its society, culture and personnel become variants of that which made the Atlantic community economically successful... (12). W. MOORE, D. FELDMAN and D. LERNER are portrayed as typical exponents of this approach.

3. *The Psychological Mode:*

«... is the analysis of the process as it is now going on in the so-called underdevelopment nations. This approach leads to a smaller scale hypothesis, to a prospective rather than a retrospective view of social change, to a full accounting of the political and cultural context of development» (13). NASH claims that it is the «most profitably pursued» (14).

It should be stressed that psychological factors like McCLELAND's n-Achievement drive, a notion, criticised by FRANK are regarded here as decisive in development efforts. Synthesizing these three modes Richard BEHRENDT identifies the following features which he claims are typical of a developing country (15).

(a) Social groups hierarchically structured, i.e. caste – or classwise organized and undermined by religion and tradition; while group membership is determined by birth and destiny, privileges and obligations, way of life, level of income and education are normally dictated by membership of a particular group (16). Total submissiveness vis-à-vis problems, deprivations, need, distress and to misery – scepticism about the capability of man to solve such problems (17); continuous practice of out-moded traditions (18); occupational orientation determined by taboos and not by economic rationality (19). As a result little or no vertical mobility because the latter, usually based on birth and not on individual achievement, always involves whole families or kin groups.

(b) Kinship loyalty and solidarity as opposed to weak relation to larger social units such as the nation or empire.

- (c) Patriarchal structure of primary groups characterized by men's domination and gerontocratic authority.
- (d) Stagnation in technique and economic activity.
- (e) Considerable importance of subsistence economic undertakings.
- (f) Authoritarian monarchical absolute forms of government or oligarchic feudal types of hegemony, all divinely justified.
- (g) An insignificant, culturally or racially heterogeneous middle class, i.e., urban property owners and intelligentsia closely linked in diverse ways with West and Middle Europe.

Essential features which, according to BEHRENDT, characterize a relatively developed society «from a relatively undeveloped one» are as follows:

- (a) Elastic stratified structures (20), mostly based on differences in education and occupation (21), with considerable social mobility, advanced social division of labour and money economy; individual achievement as an important criterion for vertical or downward social mobility (22); occupational specialization, secular instead of divine in character, with individual interests and capabilities as the decisive factors.
- (b) Reduced importance of kinship relations; decline of primary groups territorially based and rooted in common tradition and religious belief.
- (c) Tendency to equality of rights and of general social and economic functions between the sexes (23); greater juvenile autonomy.
- (d) Dynamic experiments in technique and economy coupled with the development of more accurate methods of information and calculation, by means of modern machines, especially the automatic ones.
- (e) Dominance of money economy, universally oriented through trade.
- (f) Decentralization tendencies in state administration and economic planning, impersonal social control based on rational sanctions, laws and rules whose application is in the hands of well trained efficient technocrats.
- (g) Secularization and concentration of the legal system and administration of justice (24).

## BEHRENDT'S CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT AS A SOCIAL PHILOSOPHICAL CATEGORY

Sure and satisfied to have been thus able to grasp the essence of the so-called dynamic Western culture and that of the so-called static cultures of the developing countries by formally contrasting arbitrarily selected traits from both camps, bourgeois modernization theorists work out general development strategies (25) which should help the «relatively undeveloped» parts of the world to harmoniously synthesise borrowed western culture categories with carefully chosen indigenous ones. The various strategies, more or less identical in essence, seem to be based on a general nebulous concept of the philosophical category of development, which is given an elaborate treatment by BEHRENDT (26).

Social Development, Richard BEHRENDT argues, is a guided dynamic culture transformation within a social set-up with growing participation of ever greater numbers of members of that society in the promotion and control as well as in the share of the fruits of the transformation process. Social Development means «resolute determined spread of human energy in all areas of man's social life: spiritual, mental, intellectual, technical, economic, physical» (also in terms of overcoming natural environments and geographical distances, not to mention the need to prolong life), and finally social i.e., with regard to active involvement of ever-growing numbers of people in dynamic social activities such as deliberations and decision-making on aims and enjoyment of development-oriented precautions, functions which are more than a mere execution and fulfilment of orders and normative obligations respectively (27).

It would be wrong, BEHRENDT continues, to identify Social Development simply with economic growth; the former includes general cultural transformations. Economic growth and development are, however, interdependent and in the long run economic growth without change in terms of basic democratization of social structure is impossible.

Richard BEHRENDT develops a strange thesis out of this development concept:

«It cannot be overemphasised that development as a conception of (in subjective terms) a better and realizable future and as a program of concrete social actions — is relatively something new, a phenomenon which for the first time manifested itself in the dynamic phase of culture, while earlier it was nothing but utopia and a religious type of eschatological promise in the minds of people» (28).

The static nature of the so-called pre-dynamic cultures, BEHRENDT says, is relative, that is, culture transformation occurs but does not manifest itself in the consciousness of most people — if at all, not clearly — in the direction of cultural growth. He defines culture transformation as every change in cultural conditions so far as it influences the structure of the functioning of the social set-up concerned. BEHRENDT thus differentiates between culture transformation and what he terms limited or superficial changes of material or personal nature without structural effects. Culture transformation, BEHRENDT concludes, affects the following social categories which always inter-relate with one another:

1. Moral values, intellectual interests, religious views, methods and institutions of education.
2. Technical and economic proceedings and production ability.
3. Manifestations of pictorial or graphic art, of music, poetry and of dance.
4. Dimension and intensity of human relations, demographic structure, especially the distribution of population between rural and urban settlements; degree and forms of division of labour; occupation structure, the various economic sectors and finally the whole social order with a special emphasis on social stratification; the relevance of the basic social units such as the family, sib, community, state etc.

## BEHRENDT'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

BEHRENDT's elaborate development strategy for the developing countries is based on this philosophical concept of development. We shall now discuss the outline of this development model.

1. Development as controlled culture transformation should proceed within the framework of a social development strategy. Capital and technical know-how is scarce, but more scarce is the readiness and institutional ability to employ the latter productively (29). An equally intensive social-cultural infrastructural work should augment achievements in technico-economic infrastructure.

2. The western powers must participate in the working out of a development strategy aimed at eliminating differences in methods and orientations between indigenous and foreign private economic interests, between international and national authorities, between intellectuals and the military on the one hand and the organized labour force and the mass of the people, especially the rural population, more or less destitute as regards development impulses, on the other hand (30).

3. This (i.e. point 2) should mean: Democratization of the development strategy by limiting the increased duties and functions of the state — BEHRENDT regards these duties and functions as the weakest point in the development strategies of the Third World countries; reproduction of cells of development (31); decentralization of the development efforts; more pronounced encouragement of individual and small group initiatives as well as those of co-operatives, communities, trade unions and small scale enterprises (32). All these small groups would not only be economically effective; they would also create the conditions for the development of rational methods in economic activity and administration, for independent participation in discussions and decision making not to mention the implementation of decisions within the democratically structured social set-up. Development must be regarded as the responsibility of everybody and not as a natural law imposed from above and outside. Planning, advice and action on local levels should be emphasized instead of being monopolized by international organizations and national state authorities. For the local development strategy to be effective a greater number of the best indigenous and foreign manpower must be trained for direct engagement in the development programme (33).

4. There is no other way to overcome apathy and irrationality which dominate life in the majority of the developing countries, today, a situation which, in BEHRENDT's view, has resulted from centuries of authoritarian rule and exploitation (34). It is irrationality and apathy, BEHRENDT claims, that make peoples of the developing nations shun responsibility for the solution of problems which very often are pushed to international organizations and the developed countries to shoulder (35).

5. Superstition must stop. Waste of money and manpower, disregard for good-will-all usually products of clumsiness, irrationality, politicization and inability (they all characterise international organizations and

national political leaderships) must be eradicated. A bitter struggle should be waged against the formidable forces of conservatism, usually bred by intellectual immobility, ideologies (36), and by particular political individual interests.

6. An extensive reduction of red-tapism and «depoliticization» as regards development policies or programmes must be propagated and carried out in favour of decentralization. Without these precautions it would be impossible (a) to realistically organize and accomplish development blue-prints and prevent their fruits being appropriated by oligarchies (37) and (b) to solve one of the biggest problems facing the developing nations today namely lack of responsible and efficient partners (38). Several possibilities for what BEHRENDT calls experimental learning of the correct disposition and behaviour towards cultural change on all social levels could further result from the decentralization strategy.

7. The strategy (being discussed), BEHRENDT boasts, would liberalize and accelerate the development of the Third World societies and their economies. It would be the only effective alternative to what he jargonizes as «totalitarian state socialist development methods of communism».

8. The role of social science, i.e. sociology, psychology, socio-metry, group dynamics is more than vital. Research results and other scientific findings should be utilized in the development strategy; pragmatically oriented field studies and experiments with new methods as regards cultural change should be intensified while regular participation (on interdisciplinary basis) of social scientists in the planning and execution of development projects must be pursued.

9. Social Development strategy should include ways and means of improving relations between the developed and developing nations. The developed nations should, in addition to their economic and technical know-how develop understanding towards the static cultures of the Third World; they must regard development aid policies as a humanistic political venture and not as a tactical foreign policy (39). More effective methods of discussions, deliberations and decision making should be adopted by the rich developed countries with the aim of creating the basis for mutual confidence between them and the developing countries. Concepts of dynamic economic and social policies as regards concrete projects could then be worked out on this basis by exports from the rich giver countries and their partners in the poor receiver nations.

10. The gradual development of the democratic state (40) in materially undeveloped countries depends on how far creative development policies succeed in institutionalizing and rooting democratic thought (41) and behaviour in all aspects of daily life in small social units. The entrenchment of this democratic thought and behaviour would not only relieve the state of its ambitious economic managerial aspirations that finally lead to totalitarianism; it would also minimize the extreme contrasts in income and status. Only a social development strategy of this nature, BEHRENDT claims, can help create a free social order to replace the existing popular parliamentary or feint plebiscitary façade that covers the alienated and unrepresentative character of most governments in the Third World.



11. The concept of functional democratization as an inevitable long process, BEHRENDT concludes, would contribute to the solution of a big dilemma that plagues the western countries (BEHRENDT calls them «representatives of ideals of freedom») in their relations to dictatorially governed developing nations. The criterion of the ability of a government is not the existence of a quasi-democratic façade of objectively powerless parliaments and manipulated elections, but rather the realization of development policies based on fundamental principles of democracy. It is only on the basis of this pre-condition that one could expect the just utilization of international aids. Every development aid from the West, BEHRENDT advocates, must be given on the condition that the recipients, in accordance with pluralistic principles (42), co-operate with voluntary groups and politically independent organizations on all levels of the social structure without pressure and check from the political organs or the indigenous government or a united party. Failure to heed his social development blueprint for the Third World, would open the door to authoritarian fascist and «state-socialist communist» takeover.

## CRITIQUE OF THE STRATEGY

The different modes of bourgeois modernization theory mentioned have been severely criticised by several marxist social scientists: WERTHEIM's critique of the theory (43), GRIENIG's attack on Ghausy (44), MAFEJE's illuminating refutation of bourgeois dualist theoretical interpretation of social economic relations in East and Central Africa, in Rhodesia and Apartheid South Africa (45); ARRHIGI's «Labour supplies in Historical Perspective – A study of Proletarianization of the African Peasantry» (46) which crashes William BARBER's dualist explanation of underdevelopment of the African population in Rhodesia; G. HAUCK's «Das Elend der Bürgerlichen Entwicklungs-theorie» (47) etc. are a few examples of marxist scientific contributions to the general debate on modernization in the developing countries.

But it is Andre Gunar FRANK, greatly influenced by Paul BARAN (48), who has delivered the most devastating blow to bourgeois modernization theory so far. In his «Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology» he examines penetratingly the «empirical validity», «theoretical adequacy» and «policy effectiveness» of the three modes of bourgeois development theory using NASH's classification schema as a starting point.

FRANK's brilliant critique of bourgeois modernization theory eclipses Richard BEHRENDT's social development strategy, which, as pointed out earlier, tries to synthesise the index, acculturation and the psychological models (49). The same empirical and theoretical inadequacies (pointed out by FRANK) which permeate the three models are clearly discernible in BEHRENDT's strategy, which in spite of its eclectic undertones, is structural functionalism. BEHRENDT's clumsy attempt to flavour it with diachronic ingredients as expressed in his definition of development could not camouflage the synchronic integrationist overtones of the development strategy. BEHRENDT's dualist classification schema, rooted in

the Index Model, cannot escape FRANK's main criticism of those bourgeois modernization theorists who «associate particularism, ascription, and diffuseness in underdevelopment with the extended family, the primitive tribe, the folk community, the traditional sector of a dual society, and with the underdeveloped countries and part of the world in general» without making the connection with «the developed part of the world nor with the contemporarily dominant social organization in the world taken as a whole (50).

In other words, by metaphysically detaching those symptoms of underdevelopment allegedly characteristic only of the developing countries from the overdevelopment of the so-called modern capitalist countries, Richard BEHRENDT, like his bourgeois colleagues criticized by FRANK, establishes in his fantasy an absolute distinction between the Third World and the highly developed capitalist world; his conceptualized dichotomies are thus nothing but an attempt to define the essential elements of that utopian distinction. BEHRENDT's argument that diffused technology and capital wrapped in bourgeois liberal thought is the key to development in the developing nations is also diluted by FRANK's contentions, supported by very revealing data, (1) that «the developed countries have always diffused out to their satellite colonial dependencies the technology whose enjoyment in the colonial and now underdeveloped countries has served the interests of the metropolis ; and the metropolis has always suppressed the technology in the new underdeveloped countries which conflicted with the interests of the metropolis and its own development» (51). FRANK cites as an example the destruction of agricultural technology and installations in India, the Middle East and Latin America «by Europeans or as the English did with industrial technology in India, Spain and Portugal» (52), (2) that «the metropolitan investment in... underdeveloped countries... has notably failed to develop the underdeveloped countries, but has instead interposed a whole series of obstacles to their development...» (53).

FRANK's critique of bourgeois modernization theory, though generally accepted by social scientists with marxist orientation, has been criticized by scholars of the marxist camp, and correctly too, for placing too much emphasis on market relations at the expense of an analysis of class relations, especially of the internal social structure. This is a fair criticism of FRANK's work including his «metropolitain-satellite» model, which suffers equally from this serious weakness» (54). MANGHEZI accuses FRANK of having failed «to recognize and deal appropriately with the role played by internal factors in the process of underdevelopment», a weakness which «will make it very difficult if not impossible to devise and formulate more appropriate and effective policy measures for the eradication of the problems with which the underdeveloped countries are beset» (55). MANGHEZI refers to the following text from MAFEJE's «The Fallacy of Dual Economies Revisited» as the summary of «this fundamental question» — «... our unit of analysis is the national socio-economic system and the internal and external moment of the same dialectic or contradiction. For a proper allocation of instances, it is well to remember that from the point of view of underdeveloped countries the international

system in historically and analytically prior but not procedually and strategically ultimate, i.e. for the comprehension of underdevelopment as dynamic process, it is necessary to understand the former; but for its liquidation, a firm grasp of the internal system is indispensable (56).

Much as I agree that FRANK has under-emphasized the internal class relations, especially in terms of his agitation for cataclysmic revolutions as the only solution to the problem of underdevelopment, I would have thought that the suggestion that he has «failed to recognize the role played by internal factors in the process of underdevelopment» is far-fetched. In fact, in his studies of underdevelopment in Chile and Brazil, let alone his «Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology» FRANK depicts or identifies capitalism as the principal contradiction responsible for underdevelopment (57). He dissects the diachronic and synchronic dimensions of capitalism in its international and *national* contexts and comes to the conclusion that *without its negation in the developing nations through revolutions there could not be any socio-economic emancipation for that part of the world*. Now, is FRANK's successful identification of the principal contradiction of underdevelopment seperable from a firm understanding of the internal situations in the developing countries plagued by underdevelopment? Perhaps it is the following specific weaknesses of FRANK's critique of bourgeois modernization theory that have invited MANGHEZI's observation which unfortunately leaves much to implication or speculation.

1. While FRANK rules out, and rightly so, the possibility of the developing countries taking off economically because of the domination of their economies by foreign capital and the restriction of the weaker indigenous capital to commerce, he is silent over what would happen if, say within a nationalist political framework, anchored essentially in a capitalist economy, the indigenous and foreign bourgeoisies and forced by *extra-economic pressures* like trade union agitation, unemployment and its attendant social unrest, leftist rebellions, political pressures from a neighbouring progressive country etc. to divert capital to industrial production in addition to massive state investments especially in the reproduction sector. The forces of production could develop rapidly and even at an astronomic rate if these economic precautions are backed by a well planned mobilization of human and natural resources and by a stubborn protectionist policy. FRANK, like BARAN, dismisses the possibility that a Third World country could today modernize its economy, technology and social life within the capitalist *status quo* no matter how rich that country is (58). But as a matter of fact, internal forces of capitalist reaction in developing nations have realised the need to divert part of imperialist surplus capital and local state, and private commercial capital to production in order not only to establish a solid basis for a long term profit maximization but also to dilute the internal contradictions which potentially threaten the capitalist *status quo*. While poor developing countries experimenting with this strategy are bound to fail, the rich ones are scoring successes in their modernization offensive within the capitalist framework (59). This is exactly what the bourgeois modernization... theorists are advocating. Our awareness of this subtle strategy

by the international bourgeoisie is vital in our attempt to conceptualize a general anti-capitalist revolutionary development strategy and tactics. FRANK has ruled out this possible bourgeois offensive in the production sector of a developing economy apparently because of his over-emphasis on, as his critics rightly point out, the marketing spheres of the developing economies.

2. FRANK does not take seriously the subjective factor, usually a chain of secondary contradictions, like nepotism, superstition, tribal dissensions and solidarity, out-moded customs in rural peasant socio-economic life in the Third World – all products of the existing pre-capitalist mode of production, i.e. of the incompleteness of capitalism – which have been obstructing development and which could still seriously frustrate development efforts within a revolutionary socialist political framework (60). FRANK may have correctly assumed that with the negation of capitalism as the principal contradiction the above-mentioned secondary contradictions will eventually disappear (61). But the mere fact that bourgeois modernization theorists notoriously regard them as the principal stumbling block in the development process should not allow their omission in our critical analysis of bourgeois development theory. Put differently, the so-called ascriptive, diffuse, particularistic, affective and collective orientational values and norms, though also observable in the advanced countries as FRANK rightly points out, are likely to be more pronounced in the developing countries, a contradiction rooted in imperialism's conscious underdevelopment of capitalism in the Third World.

3. Though FRANK has not worked out any comprehensive development blue-print for the developing nations he however has repeatedly argued that only radical socialist revolutions will end global underdevelopment. The role of the anti-capitalist forces in the pre-revolutionary period, FRANK seems to argue, should be abandonment «of bourgeois ideology and theory, of reformist and revisionist policy and opportunism, and adoption of revolutionary Marxist strategy and tactics in the popular leadership of... the underdeveloped countries, the socialist countries, and among the colonized and exploited people in the heart of the imperialist metropolis itself, ...» (62). This, FRANK claims, will deepen the contradictions of capitalism and finally negate it.

This propositions, though basically accepted, leaves a chain of theoretical and practical questions unanswered e.g. are the anti-capitalist forces in the Third World guilty of opportunism and reformism, if they contribute to the material development of the productive forces in the pre-revolutionary period? Could that role, coupled with politicization, ideological education and participation generate a gradual *qualitative* transformation of the capitalist *status quo* culminating in its peaceful negation? (63). The possible success of this strategy in circumstances where there are obstacles to the organization and realization of a violent revolution has led to the emergence of the theory of «Non-capitalist Way of Development» (64). With the experience of Ghana, Chile, Brazil, Indonesia still fresh in our memory, we could be easily inclined to dismiss the strategy and tactics of the «Non-capitalist Way of Development» where specific, local historical conditions are potentially favourable to its success. But

could we not improve on the peaceful, piecemeal theoretical strategy by identifying and avoiding the mistakes of Chile, Ghana, Indonesia, Brazil?

The strategy of «Non-capitalist Way of Development» is tricky ; and much as I remain suspicious of it, I regard its total rejection by any serious marxist contribution to the modernization debate as unfortunate.

Marxist theory regards development, a social philosophical category, as «the process of self-motion from the lower (simple) to the higher (complex), revealing the internal tendencies and the essence of phenomena, and leading to the appearance of the new...» (65). The development of every society is thus the process of self-motion of that society, the process being governed by general internal laws of dialectical development. To simplify it: the development of a culture must be regarded as a coherent manifestation of internal single dialectical processes each «having a beginning, and the completion of one cycle of development marking the beginning of a new one, in which some elements of the first may be repeated» (66). Development for the marxist, is therefore an immanent process in which symptoms of the higher, partly immanent in the lower, reveal themselves at a sufficiently higher stage of development. Development cannot therefore be limited to only a historical period in the development of a culture as BEHRENDT and others want us to believe. Marxism recognizes evolution as an aspect of development, as accumulated quantitative changes in the development of society. The quantitative changes that take place in society and finally change its quality result from the interactions of opposites immanent in the evolutionary processes taking place within the society. The newly generated qualitative change is identical with the revolution of the social set-up. Evolutionary and revolutionary processes are thus inseparably connected constituents of development. Human cultural development has always obeyed these laws of development. But there have been stagnant and dynamic moments in the development of society everywhere, with the level of development usually determined by the level of the forces of production and its relation to the relations of production.

The up-and-down development processes experienced in every human society are dialectically determined; development proceeds in the form of a spiral, with the spiral form always reflecting the essence of the relation between the forces and relations of production and its impact on superstructural phenomena at a given time.

There are laws, very often effects of human actions, which operate within, and therefore in the development of society, independent of our will. Not seldom do we stand bewildered and helpless vis-a-vis these laws. But mankind has succeeded at various historical stages, at different levels of cultural development in identifying and controlling social and natural laws using them whenever and wherever possible for its own benefit and advancement. The degree of success in this human endeavour has varied from culture to culture. But however primitive a society is, i.e. in terms of its ability to exploit and control its social and environmental forces, the cultural transformations it undertakes can be said to manifest themselves without the awareness of the human beings (constituting that society) only if one denies the latter human intelligence and places them in the category of wild animals obeying only the laws of instinct.

The development of a phenomenon, whether social or natural may not hinge solely on internal factors; external forces and influence can play a decisive role. Their effectiveness in the development process depends, however, on the extent to which they can manifest themselves through internal factors constituting the essence of the phenomenon undergoing change. The interplay of the external and internal forces in this drama, if seen only in its quantitative dimension, i.e. if the qualitative seeds inherent in the cumulative quantitative changes resulting from the interaction of the internal and external forces are lost sight of, then it becomes impossible to identify the most important laws behind the whole process of development.

Access to these objective laws, with regard to society, can only be gained through a clear understanding of the essence of the socio-economic formation of the society concerned. The category of socio-economic formation embraces the totality and interaction of economic, ideological, legal and political relations with the essence of the relationship between the forces and relations of production decisively moulding the course of development of the whole society.

What I have been trying to point out is that Richard BEHRENDT's strategy, like several other bourgeois development strategies, is nothing but a monstrous mosaic of repeated jargons rooted in a scientifically invalid concept of development. By seeing development as a phenomenon characteristic only of the Western world; by regarding cultural transformations in the developing countries as a process occurring without the knowledge of the producers of those cultures; by disregarding the category of socio-economic formation as the basis of his development strategy, BEHRENDT mystifies the social category of development. The logical consequences: he overlooks basic important internal laws of development and principal contradictions in the developing nations and arrogantly over-emphasizes the role of external forces (western, of course) in the development of those countries.

BEHRENDT eliminates the category of socio-economic formation from his theoretical concept by formally contrasting the so-called dynamic, modern industrial societies with the so-called static ones. Stagnation, traditionalism and agriculture are too ambiguous and general for any meaningful scientific classification of human societies; the same applies to the features dynamism, industrialization and modernity. Any classification attempt of human societies not based on the social category of socio-economic formation is bound to be misleading.

For example there exist several societies based mainly on primitive agriculture and are feudal, in terms of socio-economic formation, with the stagnation of the forces of production featuring prominently. There are others which are non-feudal but also based on agriculture with a similar or lower level of technological development. Today there exist only capitalist and socialist industrial countries, that is, industrial societies having qualitatively different forms of production relations.

Certainly because of their similar levels of agricultural technology, pre-capitalist peasant societies show some common features such as virtues, values, behaviour patterns, some of which may be identical in form but diverse in content with the content diversity often closely linked with the

different forms of production relations dominant in the various societies. The same could be said of the capitalist and socialist industrial societies which have similar technology but different production relations.

As a tool of imperialist neo-colonial exploitation bourgeois modernization theory ignores these basic scientific facts and regards social conflicts and tensions, i.e. the various forms of the class struggle in the developing countries as contradictions caused by the inability of the «static» cultures to cope with «dynamic» imported foreign culture traits in the process of acculturation or culture diffusion. It thereby tries to subtly camouflage the true objective cause of the class struggle in the developing nations. It further under-rates and vulgarizes the struggle between the exploiter and exploited in the capitalist countries and in the so-called Third World (67). The basic objective laws and the principal contradictions inherent in the developing nations since colonialism are consequently ignored by the bourgeois modernization strategists.

Colonialism certainly contributed to the development of the forces of production in all areas of its hegemony – for example modern infrastructure, education, new occupational avenues, new methods in agriculture and animal husbandry, expansion of internal markets, integration of the colonial economies into the world imperialist dominated economy, etc... (68). But it is the same colonialism propelled by its own laws of capitalism that brutally blocked further development of the colonial forces of production by robbing the colonies of their potential sources of capital accumulation, thus making it impossible for the colonized to develop their own modern industries with their so-called attendant normative variables of universalism, achievement orientation, functional specificity etc. Colonialism by this strategy, coupled with wilful destruction of traditional industries of the colonies, turned the latter into the dumping grounds for manufactured goods from the metropolis. The reduction of the colonies to mere suppliers of raw materials and agrarian stuff; the strengthening of the indigenous exploiter classes especially in the commercial sphere, (who were checked at the same time from developing into serious competitors for the metropolitan monopolists); the continuation of these policies in the neo-colonial era by the multinational corporations through subtle and brute channels of neo-colonialism (69); the choice and practice of capitalism in most cases protected by imperialist supported reactionary coups – all these testimonies of recent and current history are wickedly covered with empty glorification of colonialism and capitalism.

As Horst GRIENING rightly points out, bourgeois development sociology sees in the imperialist West the producer of the so-called dynamic culture, which they must make accessible to the developing countries by means of acculturation or/and diffusion. Dynamic development of society is thus identified with occidentalization which in the final analysis equals the imposition of capitalism as the only and best development model on the so-called Third World (70).

The pro-capitalist development model for the developing nations, accompanied by emotionally charged, malicious anti-communist propa-

ganda, is accordingly supposed to take the form of social evolution. In other words, the bogus development blue-print should be an improved capitalism which must be accomplished by means of reform. The broad capitalist framework should remain intact while changes here and there, especially as regards the relation between the haves and have-nots, must take place. These changes, BEHRENDT and others argue, would prevent the development of proletarian class consciousness and therefore socialist revolutionary situation (71). They thus advocate the reorientation of the neo-colonial expansionist strategy of international imperialism, seeing in reform inclined bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and comprador elements in the developing nations better stabilizers of capitalism than traditional conservative aristocracies whose activities could only breed the forces of socialist revolutions.

Stabilization of capitalism in the developing nations implicitly advocated is not to be equated with economic independence for them. The doors of the Third World economies should be opened widely to monopoly capitalism. Only in this light could the co-operation between the Third World and the West be understood.

The main objective of bourgeois modernization theory is to protect the capitalist *status quo* in the developing nations against the on-going struggle which increasingly arms itself with the marxist world outlook. In the light of this danger marxists should not only intensify their ideological war against bourgeois social scientists, but must also be constantly reappraising their own theoretical and strategic positions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrighi G., Labour Supplies in Historical Perspective – A Study of Proletarianization of the African Peasantry in Rhodesia in: *Journal of Development Studies* 1969.
- Behrendt N., *Soziale Strategie fuer Entwicklungslaender* – Frankfurt/M 1968.
- Eisenstadt S., *Tradition and Modernity*, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 1973.
- Frank A., *Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology*, Afrographika, Lagos.
- , *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (Pelican Publishers 1971).
- Gerbard H., and Rathman L. (ed.) *Nichtkapitalistischer, Entwicklungsweg*, Berlin 1972.
- Ghaussy G., *Probleme der Entwicklungshilfe* In: *Entwicklungspolitik. Handbuch und Lexikon*; Stuttgart 1966.
- Grienig H., *Buergerliche Theorie des Sozialen Dualismus* in: Gerbard, H., and Rathman L., (ed.) *Nichtkapitalistischer, Entwicklungsweg* – Berlin 1972.
- Guerin D., and Mandel E., *Einfuehrung in die Geschichte des amerikanischen Monopolkapitals*, Berlin 1972.
- Hauck G., *Das Elend der buergerlichen Entwicklungs-theorie* in: *Handbuch II, Untereentwicklung*. ed. by B. Tibi and V. Braudes. Frankfurt 1975.
- Lane D., *Leninism as an ideology of soviet Development* in: de Kant, E., and Williams, G. (ed.) *Sociology and Development* pp. 23 ff. – Cambridge 1976.
- Mafeje A., *The Fallacy of Dual Economics Revisited* in: *Dualism and Rural Development in East Africa* (Institute for Development Denmark 1973).
- McClelland D., and Winter D., *Achievement Motive and Entrepreneurship* in: Meier, G., (1 ed.) *Leading Issues in Economic Development* – Oxford 1976.



- Malinowski B., *The Dynamic of Culture Change* — New Haven 1961.
- Manghezi A., *Class, Elite and Community*, Uppsala 1976.
- More W., *The Social Framework of Economic Development in: Braibanti R., and Spengler J., (ed.) Traditions, Values and Socio-economic Development* London 1961.
- Parsons T., and Shils E. (ed.) *Towards a General Theory of Action* 1951.
- Rosenthal M., and Yudin P., (ed.) *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, Moscow 1967.
- Rostow W. *The Stages of Economic Growth, A Non-comunist Manifesto*, Cambridge 1961.
- Wertheim F., *The Rising Waves of Emancipation — from Counterpoint towards Revolution*, In: de Kant, E., and Williams G., (ed.) *Sociology and Development*, Cambridge 1976 — pp. 315 ff.

## FOOTNOTES

1. A paper presented at the 11th Annual Conference of the Ghana Sociological Association in April 1977 at the University of Cape Coast.
2. For details on monopoly development in the U.S. in the 40's and 50's of the 19th century see, Mandel E., Guérin D., 1972, pp. 28–331.
3. Wertheim depicts him as «the devil's advocate» while he sees in Durkheim's «Reification of geographically circumscribed societies... the original sin of western sociology»; (Wertheim F., 1974, p. 319).
4. That is, apologists of colonial functionalism in neo-colonial Departments of Sociology in African Universities.
5. Ministry of Economic Cooperation.
6. Their attention is to be drawn to the areas of the economy which are particularly weak and where investment would be a liability.
7. Dr. K. A. Busia was its principal adviser.
8. Behrendt's book has been recommended in various issues of the Federal Government periodical «Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit» by the Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation to all West German specialists sent to the developing countries.
9. Nash M., 1963 p. 5 (cited in Frank, A., *Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology, Afrographika, Yaba, Lagos* pp. 1–3).
10. op. cit.
11. op. cit. The variables attributed to the developed countries are regarded as symptomatic of the so-called instrumental values and therefore as the main force behind development in the industrialized societies while those attributed to the developing ones are said to be characteristic of expressive values. Put differently: Rationality in terms of task accomplishment is regarded as the basic value system of a modern society with its sophisticated bureaucracy while irrationality in terms of emotional satisfaction is supposed to permeate the fundamental value system of a developing nation.
12. op. cit.
13. op. cit.
14. op. cit.
15. See Behrendt H., 1968, pp. 144–146 (original German text translated by me) See also Parson T. and Shils, E. 1951; Ghassay G., 1966. Elisenstandt S. 1973.

16. Behrendt seems to suggest here that social stratification in the developing countries is determined by religion and tradition, a factor which obstructs social mobility. With this notion Behrendt tries to subtly divert attention from the principal capitalist contradictions which fetter development in the developing countries. Even in the handful of Third World countries where the traditional aristocratic element is active in political decision making the indigeneous commercial and industrial bourgeoisie are largely nonaristocratic let alone the influential intelligentsia and bureaucratic bourgeoisie. Behrendt has probably never heard of the British House of Lords, of the privileges, way of life of its members and of the members of the European and Japanese Royal families.
17. That is, the urge to improve is non-existent. One sees clearly here the influence of McClelland's reactionary n-Achievement theory on Behrendt. (See McClelland, D.; and Winter, D., 1976, pp. 548 ff).
18. For example, like the feudal institution of Monarchy in present-day Britain, Japan, Sweden, Belgium, Spain, Holland and elsewhere in Europe.
19. What about the pro-imperialist bourgeoisies and the personnel of the state organs, of the social services, of the educational and medical establishments in the developing countries – their occupational orientations dictated by taboos?
20. It is not unusual to expect a protagonist of the capitalist imperialist system, in the person of Behrendt, to regard Western societies, dominated by the giant multinational corporations as elastic structures.
21. For Behrendt, naturally, ownership and domination of means of production by the minority in the West is not an important agent of social stratification.
22. Frank who comments on a similar argument by Hoselitz draws attention to the «ascription of roles, and the consequent reward to the American Negro» which «speaks silently and eloquently for itself through his contemporary Freedom Movement» (Frank, A., *Afro graphika*, p. 6).
23. In the Federal Republic of Germany, home country of Richard Behrendt, pay discrimination against women, a common phenomenon in the «free» western world, is a good example of «equality of rights between the sexes».
24. Behrendt, R., 1968, pp. 147–149; see also works mentioned under footnote 1 below (p. 15).
25. See for example (a) More, W., 1961, pp. 57–87; (b) Rostow, W., 1961 (c) Ghaussy, G., 1966; (d) Parsons, T., and Shils, E., 1951; (e) Eisentadt, S., 1973; (f) Malinowski, B., 1961.
26. Behrendt, R., 1968, p. 130 ff.
27. Behrendt, R., *op. cit.*, p. 130.
28. *Op. cit.*, p. 131 (my own translation).
29. One sees clearly here again the influence of McClelland on Behrendt. «Readiness» here implies the right disposition of the individual to the employment of capital and modern technology. Behrendt thus seems to agree with McClelland that it is the so-called n-Achievement drive which is the decisive factor in any development efforts, an eclectic element in Behrendt's general functionalist structuralist theoretical framework.
30. Behrendt implicitly means the class struggle in the Third World should be eliminated by the implementation of a development strategy to be worked out by the multinational corporations and their henchmen and class allies in that part of the world.

31. Richard Behrendt's «cells of development» are what he calls old and new elites, the new entrepreneurs, students, women, the military, urban and rural workers and peasant co-operatives. In short, everybody.
32. In other words, capitalist mode of production should be encouraged. But again the impact of the psychological model is clearly discernible here. Summarizing his so-called blue-print for economic growth in the developing countries McClelland writes: «So we end on a practical note: a plan for accelerating economic growth through mobilizing more effectively the high n—Achievement resources of a developed country to select and work directly with the scarcer high n—Achievement resources in underdeveloped countries particularly in small and medium scale businesses located in provincial areas». (McClelland, D., *The Achieving Society* — pp. 391—437 — cited in: Frank, A., op. cit. p. 47). The emphasis on the need to concentrate on small-scale industries should be regarded as a calculated attempt to dissuade the developing countries from developing the reproductive sectors of their economies, which produce means of production and therefore constitute the bedrock of the economic emancipation of a country.
33. The implication here is that both foreign and indigenous technocrats should be most instrumental in the neo-colonialist oriented development programme. The diffusionist element is clearly discernible here.
34. The subject of authoritarian rule and exploitation being referred to by Behrendt here is the indigenous feudal aristocracies in the developing countries (Behrendt emphasizes this point over and over again, see Behrendt, R. 1968); the forces of colonialism and imperialism which have been draining the human and natural resources of the developing countries for decades are not regarded as exploiters.
35. Of course, the countless social upheavals, sporadic uprisings, armed clashes that occur in the developing countries as a result of social injustice are all signs of «irrationality and apathy», attention is again here drawn to Behrendt's emphasis on the psychological element.
36. Marxism — Leninism is implied here.
37. Behrendt's sermon here means: any extra-economic measures which might obstruct rapid development of capitalism and the dominant role of foreign capital in the developing countries must be prevented. These certainly must include protectionist policies that might curb the domination of foreign capital.
38. A clear reference to the Third World comprador partners of the multinational corporations, who according to Behrendt, are most effective in culture transformation. (See Behrendt, R. 1968, p. 222).
39. This moral advice by Behrendt to the monopolist controlled imperialist states will not work because of the capitalist laws of surplus appropriation which dictate the essence of the development aid policies of imperialism.
40. Behrendt certainly means the bourgeoisie controlled state.
41. That is, bourgeois social liberalism.
42. Capitalist principles are implied here. Andre Gunar Frank rightly depicts the diffusion of western institutions and their attendant values advocated by diffusionists as nothing but «old fashioned or new fangled» political liberalism which should protect the capitalist status quo in the developing countries. (Frank, A. op. cit., p. 34).
43. Wertheim, W., 1974.

44. Grienig, H., 1972.
45. Mafeje, A., 1973
46. Arrhigi, G., 1969.
47. Hauck, G., 1975.
48. Baran, P. 1957.
49. See Frank, A., op. cit.
50. Frank, A. Lagos pp. 12–13.
51. Frank, A., op. cit. p. 32.
52. Op. cit. See also (a) Baran, P., p. 144 ff. – (b) Rodney, W. 1973, p. 112 ff.
53. Frank, A., op. cit., see also below, p. 30 – footnote No. 1.
54. Manghezi, A., 1976, p. 30.
55. Op. cit.
56. Manghezi does not specify the internal factors though he implicitly regards social consequences of forced proletarianization in South, East and Central Africa as examples.
57. See, for example, Frank, A., 1969, pp. 140–141. In fact this work shows that he has a deep analytical insight into the capitalist mode of production in the Third World.
58. Frank, A., 1969, p. 177; Baran, P., 1968, pp. 211–215.
59. Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Iran, Nigeria and other developing nations rich in capital generating export raw materials like oil are examples. Even rich ultra-reactionary conservative nations like Saudi Arabia and the Gulf Emirates threatened by Social progress in progressive Arab countries are modernizing fast. It should be emphasized that these countries regard fully developed modern capitalism as their final goal and not as a means to ushering in a qualitatively more advanced socio-economic formation. Peru's attempt to take off industrially within the capitalist status quo, an effort precipitated by social tensions culminating in periodic left wing armed rebellions, has failed because she lacks rich natural resources. On the other hand, Venezuela, with her rich oil wealth and also plagued with unemployment and its attendant social vices, marxist led armed rebellions etc. seems to be making a head-way contrary to Paul Baran's pessimism.
60. Lenin was aware of this. That is why he, in his teaching on labour ethic in socialism does not only condemn «slovenliness, carelessness, untidiness, unpunctuality, nervous haste, the inclination to substitute discussion for action and talk for work» but also «the rich, the swindlers, the idlers and the rowdies» as «the dregs of humanity... (like) an ulcer inherited from capitalism». (S.W. 2515) cited in Lane, D., 1976, p. 29.
61. While Lenin foresees the quick disappearance of such factors in the socialist political framework, he stresses the need to incorporate the most advanced forms of capitalist managerial technique, labour discipline etc. into the socialist economy. He even goes to the extent to advocate the utilization of certain principles of Taylorism (which for him, «is the last word of capitalism») because «its greatest – scientific achievements (lie) in the field of analysing mechanical motions during work, in the elimination of superfluous and awkward motions, in the working out of correct methods of work, and in the introduction of the best system of accounting and control etc.» (C.W.27:259) – cited in Lane, op. cit.  
This is what imperialism and its intellectual coolies fear mostly, since they see in the rapid development of the forces of production in socialism a serious threat to the global influence of capitalism.

62. Frank, A., 1969, p. 145.
63. Especially if progressive forces occupy key positions in government but do not control state power.
64. See, for example, Gerbard, H., and L., Rathman (ed.) 1972. Peaceful and piecemeal elimination of capitalism, not its reformation, is the final goal of this strategy. Marxism — Leninism is expected to be the ideological guideline of the progressive forces involved in the exercise.
65. Rosenthal M., and Judin, p. 119.
66. *Op. cit.*
67. For example while Behrendt advocates a better pattern of Wealth distribution in the developing countries through the elimination of conservative feudal exploiters, he expects the better wealth distribution to be realized in a capitalist framework. (Behrendt, R. 1968, pp. 623—626). See also Ghassy, G. 1966, p. 819, quoted by Griening H. 1972, p. 345.
68. Make no mistake! Colonialism needed this basic development to be able to exploit the colonies effectively.
69. Frank regards foreign capital in the Third World as a major neo-colonial channel of brute exploitation. Frank refers, for example to conservative estimates of the U.S. Department of Commerce which show: (a) That «between 1950 and 1965 the total flow of capital on investment account from the United States to the rest of the world was \$ 23.9 billion, while the corresponding capital inflow from profits was \$ 37.0 billion, for a net inflow into the United States of \$ 13.1 billion. Of this total, \$ 14.9 billion flowed from the United States to Europe and Canada while \$ 11.4 billion flowed in the opposite direction, for a net outflow from the United States of \$ 3.5 billion. Yet between the United States and all other countries that is mainly the poor underdeveloped ones, the situation is reversed \$ 9.0 billion of investment flowed to these countries while \$ 25.6 billion profit capital flowed out of them, for a net inflow from the poor to the rich of \$ 16.6 billion» (Frank, A. *op. cit.*, pp. 27—28). (b) That of the total capital obtained and employed from all sources by United States operations in Brazil in 1957, 26 per cent came from the United States and the remainder was raised in Brazil, including 36 per cent from Brazilian sources outside the American firms. (Frank, A., *op. cit.*).
70. Griening H., 1972, p. 346.
71. See Behrendt's strategy point 11 discussed above; see further Behrendt, R., 1968, p. 535.

## RESUME

L'auteur situe son article dans le cadre de lutte continue que doivent mener les spécialistes africains en sciences sociales marxistes contre la prolifération des théories bourgeoises de développement qui sont souvent proposées aux pays du Tiers-Monde. Il consacre l'essentiel de son article à une critique fine de la thèse de BEHRENDT, un théoricien allemand dont les principes ont été recommandés à plusieurs états africains qui avaient demandé des conseils au gouvernement allemand en ce qui concerne leurs stratégies de développement. Cette même thèse a plus tard été épousée par les organismes internationaux de financement tels que la Banque Mondiale et le F.M.I. Cette thèse qui, selon l'auteur, contient une forte dose de principes fonctionnalistes pro-capitalistes, repose sur trois paramètres, définis par ailleurs par NASH et qui sont :

- le «Ideal Typical Index Mode» qui définit ce que doivent être les caractéristiques d'un pays développé
- le «Acculturation View» qui fait des pays développés des communautés dont la mission est de propager les connaissances, les aptitudes, l'organisation, les valeurs, la technologie et le capital.
- le «Psychological Mode» que constitue l'analyse du processus comme il se déroule actuellement dans les pays dits sous-développés.

Sur la base de ces principes BEHRENDT dresse la liste des traits qui caractérisent les pays en développement qu'il oppose d'une manière arbitraire et sélective à ceux caractérisant les pays développés. De cette opposition il élabore sa conception du développement qu'il identifie à une «catégorie philosophique sociale». Selon BEHRENDT, dit l'auteur, le développement social est une transformation culturelle guidée, à l'intérieur d'une société donnée, avec une participation de plus en plus importante des membres de cette société à la promotion, le contrôle et la répartition des fruits du processus de transformation. A partir de cette conception du développement il définit sa stratégie du développement dont la critique constitue l'essentiel de cet article. Dans cette partie, l'auteur rappelle les points de vue de différents critiques qui ont eu par le passé à analyser les différentes thèses de la théorie bourgeoise de modernisation. Il insiste plus particulièrement sur l'importante contribution de Andre Gunnar FRANK qui, selon l'auteur, a porté le coup le plus sévère à cette théorie.

Cependant les points de vue de FRANK, bien que partagés par la plupart des spécialistes africains en sciences sociales d'obédience marxiste, ont fait l'objet de certaines critiques. Certains spécialistes lui reprochent notamment d'avoir mis l'accent beaucoup plus sur les rapports commerciaux que sur l'analyse des rapports de classes, plus particulièrement sur la structure sociale interne.