

## **Chapter- I**

### **State-development Interface in the Third World: The Research Problem and its Theoretical Framework**

#### **Introduction**

Development is one of the main preoccupations of the post Second World War world. Though its roots can be traced back to antiquity (Baeck 1993: 7-8), the concept of development has been widely used, with greater social legitimation, during this time. In spite of a 'widely shared sense that social research and theorizing about development had reached some kind of impasse' (Booth 1994: 3), or a sense of the 'irrelevance of development studies' (Edward 1989: 116) in the 1980s, and the 'post-development' assertions (Ferguson 1990; Sachs 1992; Escobar 1995; Crush 1995; Rahnema and Bawtree 1997; Rist 1997) in the 1990s development thinking has reached the twenty-first century. With much challenges ahead, development has not lost its unanimous acceptance of all types of political regimes. There is not a single government today, irrespective of its political and ideological position that does not assert that it is pursuing development. 'Everywhere in the world today, what divides left and right, however defined, is not whether or not to develop, but which policies are presumed to offer most hope that this objective will be achieved' (Wallerstein 1994:3). The Millennium Development Goals - born of the historic Millennium Declaration adopted at the UN Millennium Summit in September, 2000 - point to this ubiquitous nature of development (UNDP 2003: v).

While as a socio-political and economic objective development has got a unanimous acceptance, the question of agency for implementing development programmes in practice has been an issue of academic debate and practical concern with increasing importance since the late 1970s. Till the early 1970s the importance of

state was visible in the theories and practice of development. Indeed, in 'those countries which tried to 'catch up' with the west at the end of the nineteenth century and in the twentieth century, it is the structure and functioning of the state which primarily explains both the failures and relatively few success stories' (Mouzelis 1994:126). In the 1970s some thinkers associated with 'another development' favoured the civil society organizations or the 'third system' with the agency of development (Nerfin 1977, 1987). However, with the emergence of neo-liberal 'counter revolution in development theory and practice' (Toye 1993: vii), the central role of state in development especially in the Third World was challenged, in favour of the market with complementary role of the civil society organizations. The exponents of neo-liberalism (Balassa 1982 ; Bhagwati 1982 ; Little 1982 ; Lal 1983) advanced the thesis 'that free competition and market mechanisms, in all countries and under all circumstances, would bring about a more optimal allocation of production factors and a more optimal distribution of commodities, than a regulated economy with administrative control and central planning' (Martinussen 1997 : 261). They rejected the idea that any special theory or practice of development is required for the Third World (ibid). Neo-liberalism ushered in globalization through liberalization, deregulation and free market economy. Arguably, central role of the state in theory and practice of development became unsure. More over, as a response to the centripetal force of globalization, there emerged increased assertion of localization. This process has aptly been termed as 'glocalization' (Harris et al 2004: 8), which entailed in decentralization and devolution of state power. These transformations are reflected in theories and practices of development, 'which have increasingly turned to the 'local' as a prime site of development in the context of globalization' (ibid). Thus, it is said that the central role of the state in development is being hollowed out 'from above as well as from below' (Schuurman 2000:12). From the above there is the increasing importance of international political organizations and from the bellow there is the growing phenomenon of decentralization and local government. One of the major challenges of development research to day is, therefore, to find out the exact location of state in the development arena of Third World countries. However, it may be noted that since late 1970s some scholars (Stephan 1978; Waterbury 1983;

Trimberger 1978; Hamilton 1982; Evans et al 1985a; Bates 1981) have voiced analytical concerns and in various ways 'attempted to restore the significance of the autonomy of the political to their respective analyses of development issues' (Kohli 1986:17). The present work attempts to focus a light on the role of the state in Third World development vis-à-vis the theories of development.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The state-development interface is a multidimensional problem having heuristic as well as on the ground implications. While dealing with the Third World countries it brings a host of issues for renewed explications. What is meant by development when development of the Third World is talked of? How has the idea of development been shaped? Are there alternatives to development? What political economies do different theories of development represent? How far has the praxis of the theories of development been maintained in implementing development in the Third World countries? What exactly the state is thought of when its role becomes the centre of debate in Third World development? Do the theories of development contribute to understanding the state-development interface in the Third World? The examination of the role of the state in development involves two more fundamental questions: (1) What is the identity and ideology of the state itself? (2) What kind of development has been followed by the state itself? These are questions generally left out. The answers are taken as general presuppositions in development research. The present study humbly submits that they need serious attention. Indeed, these questions have assumed renewed importance in the light of the long trajectory of state's role in socio-economic development and its current exposition in the neo-liberal framework.

### ***Changing contours***

In the first three quarters of the twentieth century state held clear authority in socio-economic transformations, acquired growing functions and tended to perform them on their own. Especially in the Third World the state was an extensive. In the 1950s and 1960s aid programmes and academic advisers propagated the idea of the state bureaucracy as the lead agent for the transition to what was then known as 'modernization'. Aid agencies favoured large scale projects of industrial and agricultural development with the guidance of government involvement (Esman

1988). On the side of the new political elites, the idea of state led development was attractive: it apparently offered a way of satisfying popular expectations and demonstrating a concern with social justice and development (Bately 2002: 135).

State directed development was not only imitative, but also local circumstances demanded so. Market institutions and indigenous entrepreneurs were weak and only state enterprises were capable of investing or taking over foreign owned plant (ibid). Linked to international economy through primary goods exports, the case was made for the state to take the lead in restructuring the economy towards 'inward directed' industrial development on the basis of import substitution (Todaro 1994).

This role of the state was, however, criticized simultaneously. The first, appeared in 1950s and 1960s, was based on the experience of operating aid programmes. Critics challenged the view that public administration could act as an agent of development. They argued that bureaucracies were biased to stability or only incremental change, were anti-developmental and suppressed entrepreneurial interests. Moreover, public sector agencies which on the surface looked like rational bureaucracies, in practice often served particular interests (Hyden 1983). The second criticism, referred to the softness or 'weakness' (Myrdal 1968; Migdal 1988) of the state, in which the state apparatus maintains a loose hold over society, lacking legitimacy and therefore the capacity to enforce policy (Bately 2002:136). The third criticism emerged from neo-Marxism and dependency theory. It saw the apparatus of the state as being subordinated to non-national interests, particularly international capital. Far from being an agent of development, the state was seen an agent of underdevelopment or distorted development (ibid). By the end of 1970s, with international recession, growing national debt in Latin America and Africa, and wide spread military regimes, there was deep pessimism about the scope for development and skepticism about the state's role in development. For the Third World countries two ways were open: (a) the example of newly industrializing countries of East Asia and (b) the neo-liberal development model. The East Asian 'newly industrializing countries' (NICs) demonstrated, contrary to Left oriented dependency development thinking of the 1970s, that it was possible for poor nations to develop in a sustained and inclusive way whilst engaging with the international economy. Contrary to the

Right liberal thinking of the 1980s, they also showed that states could play a positive role in achieving development. <sup>2</sup> In the context of debt crisis in early 1980s, neo-liberalism was forced upon Third World countries. Thus, the earlier criticisms of the state's role in development questioned whether the conditions existed for Third World states to operate effectively. In the absence of these conditions, the tendency was for state agents to become self serving, patrimonial and linked to powerful, often, foreign interests. The neo-liberal view held a deeper skepticism about state's role and argued for its substitution by market.

### ***The neo-liberal onslaught***

The debate on the role of the state in development became pinpointed since 1980s when the neo-liberal policies, in the form of structural adjustment programme (SAP) was forced upon the debt ridden Third World countries. Thus the post- colonial states of Afro-Asian and Latin American countries have suffered the most severe onslaught of neo-liberal policy. These are states that have inherited the colonial form and substance and came into being as a result of decolonization through national liberation. Nigel Harris has summed up the precarious condition of these states under neo-liberal globalization. While their national liberation freed the state at the time of independence, now restructuring of economy and liberalization freed the capital.

Thus, paradoxically, national economic development that was impelled by the rivalries within state system now produces a new component in the market system that in part contradicts the independence of the state. Governments preoccupied with retaining a group of powerful companies within their border and seeking to beg or bribe international companies to invest there in order to secure privileged access to the surpluses generated by world, rather than national, capital. The state moves from being the "executive committee of the (national) bourgeoisie" (if such a phrase was ever adequate) to a local authority for a world bourgeoisie, *from the incubator of capitalism to one of its many and changing homes* (Harris 1992: 78-79 emphasis added).

Harris, however, asserts that the role of the state remains important for the Third World development, for world capital will locate in the country concerned only if the government can guarantee certain conditions of productions of goods, the reproduction of labour of certain quality and price, and of effective management. Competition by states in the economic field now shifts from geographically specific advantages to much less tangible elements (Harris 1992:79). De Anne Julius has succinctly summed up the position:

What is most important to competitive success is no longer a country's land or mineral endowment or even, in many cases, its labour costs. Rather it is a whole range of non-geographical factors: access to technology, flexible management techniques, marketing strategy, closeness to consumers, speed of response to changes in the market place etc. All these are firm specific not territorially based (Julius 1990:82 quoted in Harris 1992:79).

Henry Bernstein (1990:23) has noted that a central postulate of neo-liberal diagnosis is of 'states marked by a full misery of their own contradictions – as documented in the symptomology of irrationality, inefficiency, corruption, and authoritarianism'. On such a view the state and its activities represent the essential obstacle to the emergence of a vigorous rapidly growing capitalism. The state must be 'rolled back' must be made 'leaner'. Also Bernstein notes the curious paradox that, where neo-liberal policies are practiced, a 'critical double contradiction' exists; whereby the very effort to push back the state has to be pursued via the state; while the necessary 'leaner state', in effect by no means a minimalist state, but one in which greater demands of technical expertise and efficient performance and macro economic management are imposed as well as greater effectiveness in terms of control. Thus, neo-liberalism in one sense challenged the very essence of the Third World states-their stateness.

### ***Probing stateness***

This precariousness calls for a probe into the 'stateness' of these states. The post-Westphalian model of nation state is indigenous to the West. The attributes of this model that have been ascribed upon the societies of the Third World were thought to be naturalized after independence through the processes of 'state building' and 'nation building'. But it did not turn that way. There arose new forms of legitimacy crisis or what Kohli (1991) calls the 'crisis of governability'. The assertion of localization on the basis of implicit and explicit grounds makes the issue more complex. The implementation of development programmes through such states which have been designated as 'soft' or 'weak' (Myrdal 1968; Migdal 1988) demands a serious probe into the nature of the states themselves. This would help in understanding the inherent conflicts and contradictions by which the idea and practice of development are impregnated.

While dealing with 'stateness' of the Third World states it is important to highlight the distinction between a producer state and a regulator state. When state intervention is talked of with reference to development the producer state – a state that produces goods and services – is very much involved. The regulator state is like a regulating agent in its global economic activity. Despite the fact that the state's role as a producer and as a regulator is closely linked, the two situations create very different situations. 3

### ***Globalization, state and development***

The adherents of globalization perceive that both the nature of capitalism and the role of the state are being transformed. Linda Weiss (2001:6) has summed up the argument succinctly:

On the one hand, capitalism is becoming increasingly 'ungoverned' as markets are disembedded from institutions. On the other hand, state power over territory is withering, giving rise to a different kind of state – one which has lost sovereignty, scaled back welfare programmes and industrial policy, and entered into multilateral governance arrangements.

It is the declining, or at least changing, position and status of the state, which has been at the core of the literature on globalization. Theories of development try to connect, economic, political and cultural aspects of inequality and development trajectories. The connection between these aspects is realized by using the state as the linchpin. This importance of the state became visible in both modernization and neo-Marxist dependency theories. Globalization changed all that. The common perception of the role of the state in general and the Third World states in particular has been that it has been 'rolled back'. But a careful analysis demands further probe into the matter. Martinussen highlights the issue thus:

As regards the role of the state, it may be true that Third World states in general have come under increasing external pressure and that their roles as containers of distinctive business practices and as regulators of economic activities within and across their borders have diminished. But to what extent these changes have been brought about vary significantly from country to country. Moreover it can be argued that all developing country states continue to critically affect, positively or negatively, both the attractiveness of their countries to foreign investors and the overall competitiveness of their domestic industries (Martinussen 1999:11).

This new reality, shaped by neo-liberal globalization, presents a new and exciting challenge for development studies and this has relegated the so called

'impasse' to a past period. This is strongly felt in studying the role of the state in development. This necessarily involves the clarification of the idea of development.

### *Nature of development*

Development is not a simple concept to be amenable to single meaning. It involves its essence, goal, and strategy. Thus it is complex as well as contested. A Unesco document has nicely gone into the core of the problem:

Development is a value-laden concept, with historical, philosophical and ideological dimensions. When we speak of development we need to reflect not only on *what* it is that we wish to develop, and *how* we are to do it, but also *towards what* we wish the process to lead (Unesco 1988:9 emphasis original).

Hyden has identified three reasons contributing to the general disagreement on the meaning of development. (a) By connoting human aspirations and preferences, the concept of development has always been subject to domestication by specific groups for their particular purposes. (b) Through the single move of development a host of things are attempted to get implemented and consequently, the risks of failure are enhanced rather than reduced. Disillusionment and eventual abandonment of a particular meaning silently occur. (c) Part of disagreement is associated with the concept's historical origin. It is closely related to the conscious human choice and the institutional mechanisms, notably the market and bureaucracy that have been put in place to facilitate and regulate such choices. The controversy here is not only that the concept first emerged in the west. 'Equally important is that linked to the concept is an ontological position that is not inherent in all cultures' (Hyden 1994: 103-4). Still 'academics and practitioners alike strive to find a holistic definition of development. Academics want it for research purposes; practitioners for operational reasons (ibid: 103).

Ever since President Truman's declaration of 'point four' in 1949, there emerged different notions of development. The beginning was marked by economic growth (Rosenstein-Rodan 1943, 1957, 1964; Nurkse 1953 ; Lewis 1954, 1955; Rostow 1960 ; Hirschman 1961, 1963; Kuznets 1966) and subsequently came modernization (Bellah 1957; Lerner 1958, Lipset 1963; Inkeles 1964; McClelland 1964; Smelser 1964; Apter 1965; Pye 1966; Levy 1967; Coleman 1968), elimination of dependency (Prebish 1950 ; Baran 1952 ; Furtado 1964 ; Frank 1966 ; Cardoso 1973 ; Amin 1976), redistribution with growth (Chenery et al 1974), another or

alternative development emphasizing that development ought to be indigenous, self-reliant, need oriented, environment friendly and open to institutional change (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation 1975), meeting basic needs (ILO 1976, 1978 ; Streeten and Haq 1982), participation (Friere 1970 ; ILO 1978 ; Korten 1980 ; Chambers 1983 ; Lisk 1985 ; UNDP 1993), sustainable development (Medows et al 1972 ; World Commission on Environment and Development 1987 ; Redclift 1987 ), Washington consensus or market fundamentalism (Williamson 1990 ; World Bank 1991 ; Soros 1998), human development (UNDP 1990 ; Streeten 1994 ; Haq 1995), fulfillment of human rights (UN 1986 ; Hauser Mann 1998 ; UNDP 2000), fulfillment of freedom (Sen 1999), empowerment (Friedman 1992), reduction of poverty (Sen 1981 ; UNDP 1997 ; World Bank 1990, 2000) and others. Despite these notions and their concomitant paradigms, the persistence of poverty and inequality, particularly in the midst of economic affluence continues to be one of the most problematic issues in development to day (Hamner et al 1997). The object of the study of development that is 'social, economic and political inequality with respect to the third world, has made it to this century rather effortlessly' (Schuurman 2000: 7). There is, therefore, a serious need to 'explore ideas about what development constitutes and the important relationship between theory and practice (Kothari and Minogue 2002: 7). The present study attempts to perform this task with reference to the ideology and philosophy of development. An exploration of the theories of development is of great help in this context.

### ***Theories of development***

The notions of development are the products of overarching development thinking-development strategy, philosophy, ideology and theory (Hettne 1995: 15-16). The search for new theoretical conceptualizations of development has been mirrored by changes in the practice of development in the field. The period since the Second World War has seen the promotion and application of many and varied theories of development – the economic growth theory, modernization theory, dependency theory, world system theory, alternative development perspectives, the neo-liberal theory, and the sustainable human development school of thought. The literature on development theory and practice appears to have burgeoned particularly since mid -

202086

24 MAR 2007

1980s (Apter 1987 ; Preston 1986; 1987; 1996; Leeson and Minogue 1988; Schuurman 1993; 2001; Crush 1995 ; Streeten 1995 ; Brohman 1996 ; Cowen and Shenton 1996; Leys 1996; Rapley 1996; Potter et al 1999; Simon and Narman 1999; Sklair 1991, 1994 ; Booth 1994a ; Griesgraber and Gunter 1996 ; Martinussen 1997 ; Chakravarty 1987 ; Hunt 1989 ; Kay 1989 ; Toye 1993 ; Baeck 1993 ; Bartoli 2000 ; Chambers 2005 ; Rist 1997 ; Kothari and Minogue 2002; Nederveen Pieterese 2001). At the earlier stage, theorizing about development was more or less mechanical application of the main body of theory of what ever discipline to the countries in the Third World, under the assumption that the differences between the contemporary problems and the 'original transition' (Roxborough 1979:1) was one of degree rather than of kind (Hettne 1995:1). But theories of development of any shade have got their normative orientation. They are the meeting place of ideology, politics and explanation. It is in this context the genesis and the basic premises of the theories need to be scrutinized.

The emergence of modernization theory in the late fifties and early sixties set the stage for contemplating development in the Third World. The role of modernization theory in stimulating and legitimating work on developing countries was fundamental, but dissatisfaction with the approach was as important as lessons it offered. Thus, beginning in the mid sixties, various alternatives to modernization theory became increasingly important. According to Evans and Stephens (1988), 'These challenges involved recovering parts of the classic sociological traditions that had been neglected in the earlier reconstruction of modernization theorists, including Marx and the comparative historical side of Weber'(ibid: 740).

The challenges to modernization also involved a new emphasis on international factors. The dependency and world system theories turned the modernization theorists' emphasis on diffusion as a primary instrument of development on its head arguing instead that ties to 'core' countries were a principal impediment to development (ibid).

By the early 1980s two important but opposite position took lead. On the one hand development studies mostly turned away from structural questions and political critiques and took different points of departure. One important new development was

a growing concern with social actors, agency and local expression of change. Now the hopes for progressive change in the context of military or authoritarian rule were being pinned on the new social movements and on the experiments with popular participation that some how or other were able to work at the “grassroots”(Wilson 1994:5). On the other hand, the neo-liberal theory found the development of the Third World in the macro perspective and, contrary to the basic assumptions of dependency and world system theories, asserted that deregulated world economy would assume development of the Third World countries.

By the 1990s neo-liberalism remained triumphant, especially in the wake of the end of the Cold War. Neo-liberals were rushing to proclaim the end of history, the emergence of a new world order, and as a minor foot note the irrelevance of development studies. However, this self confident position has increasingly been questioned in the late 1990s and the early years of the twenty-first century, especially when the social protest against the negative consequences of the neo-liberal economic policies mounted. This should provide some space for alternative theoretical perspective (Kay 1994:10).

The political economy of the emergence of the theories clearly indicates the basic purpose of a particular theory. It involves the whole gamut of development thinking related to a particular theory. From this point of view the present study focuses the position of the major theories with respect to the role they assign to the state as an agency for translating development strategies.

### ***State's role in theories of development***

The deliberate intervention of the state was taken as an indispensable development strategy in the Third World countries in the immediate post war years. The goal was to close the gap between them and the developed countries and articulate economic growth. But these countries that had just acquired political independence did not see clearly in what direction they should develop their economy.

The attempts made during the 1950s to adapt Keynes's theory to their purpose soon turned out to be unsuccessful. Models of the Domar-Harrod type, with parameters of a cumulative character, a multiplier and an accelerator, were hardly appropriate to the socio-economic structure of these countries, where the traditional sectors predominated and market relations were almost embryonic. There existed no valid theory that could be applied to state intervention under conditions where a

traditional socio-economic structure had trade relations with world capitalism. So in the Third World countries, with their very complex socio-economic problems, the first stage in the history of state intervention was a stage of trial and error (Alechina 1982:27).

At the same time the, the post war history of development studies offers clear evidence of fundamental shifts in theories of development. 'Theoretical perspectives on development have changed in response to the changing historical reality of the developmental process and of relations between developing and developed countries. They have also changed in response to the dialogue and debate among those engaged in theory building' (Evans and Stephens 1988: 739).

The earliest theory of development - the growth theory, especially as it was formulated by Rosenstein-Rodan (1943), Nurkse (1953), and Hirschman (1958), did imply state intervention to take care of incidents of market failure, or of markets which are too far from perfect or too thin, or which simply do not exist (Naqvi 1993). Likewise the Harrod-Domar model argued that the national saving rate had to be equal to the product of the capital-output ratio of growth of the labour force if the economy was to keep its stock plant and equipment in balance with its supply of labour so that steady growth could occur. In this model, increasing economic growth basically involved increasing the savings rate, in some cases, through state budget. Thus growth theories of such a type established the legitimacy of state intervention into market economies with the aim of achieving growth rates decided on the basis of social policy (Peet1999: 39-40).

The modernization theory takes development as modernization of 'traditional societies' through the establishment of networks and institutions similar to those of advanced industrial societies, including strategic norms of work, values of social discipline and beliefs about equity and motivations representing the internalization of these norms, values and beliefs in a manner ensuring role performance through appropriate behaviour. The political dimension of development under this modernization scheme involves how to create the nation by means of the state and how to incorporate within the state social networks that generate development (Apter 1987:16-17).

The modernization perspective implicitly or explicitly opts for capitalist development. It is premised on the creation and maintenance of the basic structures

and institutions of the prevailing society. Thus, it has accorded central role to the state and public policy. The state has been thought of as an entity that stands out side and above society, an autonomous agency that is vested with an independent source of rationality and the capability to initiate and pursue programmes of development for the benefit of the whole society. There is an implicit disjunction between the state and policy. The problematic of the state is then narrowed down to that of the efficacy of its public institutions and organs to achieve objectives and programmes of modernization focusing especially on the respective roles of 'ruling elites', political parties, the bureaucracy and the military (Alavi 1982: 289).

The theorists of dependency drew conclusion in respect of the appropriate spread of policy for local national governments committed to the pursuit of national development goals. The theorists of dependency looked to foster an independent pattern of development. The strategic differences with modernization theory came to revolve around the role of the state, which was to become the key vehicle of the new political-cultural project of autonomous development. This was to be the overriding objective in the attempt to remove the damaging handicaps of dependency (Preston 1996: 194-195)

According to the world system theory, it is possible for a peripheral country to move to the semi-peripheral status. Similarly, a semi-peripheral country can move to the core status. This possibility is contingent upon historical moments of opportunities. In Wallerstein's (1979) view at this moment the economy concerned extracts surplus from the periphery while at the same time yields surplus to the core. Thus the dependent development thesis of the new dependency thinkers was reinforced by world system perspective. Wallerstein's (1978) analysis emphasized the role of the national state in carving out a space for indigenous political and economic actors to play a role in both the global economy, and in the international state system (Henderson and Appelbaum 1992:3).

To the neo-liberal theory state involvement in the economy is inefficient, bureaucratic and unnecessary drain on public coffers. Hence by selling off loss-marketing and inefficient public enterprises and parastatal corporations, and restricting the role of the state to regulation and economic facilitation, taxes could be cut

substantially (Simon 2002: 87). The neo-liberal onslaught and its relentless anti-statism, was directed at advanced capitalist countries, less developed countries and socialist countries alike. All of these, it was postulated, were infected by the virus of state intervention.

### ***The Indian experience***

This study of state-development interface from the perspective of development theories in the Third World has been attempted at a rather abstract and general level. But in order to avoid a high level of generality, a second stage analysis has been pursued. The Indian experience with the praxis of the theories of development and the concomitant role played by the state in implementing development strategies will serve this purpose. It has been argued that the Indian state, having failed, should 'retreat' from its expanded spheres of activities. Since it has failed to deliver the goods because of its interventionist policies of the era of economic planning, it should give place to market to perform its legitimate role in economy and to autonomous and voluntary associations of civil society to resolve socio-economic problems. Thus an investigation of the role of the state in India allows one to shed some light on the more general contemporary debates concerning the role of the state in development.

The choice of one country as a special reference point apparently seems to be arbitrary. But there are some points of justification: (a) On any reckoning India is important within the Third World, because of its huge population and the very low level of consumption available to the great majority of them. (b) India is used as a prime example of the alleged failures of interventionist development policies. (c) India has nearly sixty years of development experience and the quality of basic information about India is relatively good by Third World standards (Toye 1993:153-154). (d) India's unique experience in her search for the 'middle path',(Sachs 2000:5), and democratic development planning for forty years along with a one and a half decades of explicit neo-liberal policy is helpful for examining the theories of development at the ground level. (e) The case of India provides a good illustration of resilience of the state with substantial grass-root development under taken. It is a country where the proportion of the poor remained desperately at the same level over the years (Auroi 1992: 3). As India enters into the twenty-first century, the lives of a majority of its

citizens continue to be blighted by endemic poverty, under nutrition, ill health, educational deprivation, environmental degradation and wide ranging social inequalities (Dreze and Sen 2002: vi). In other words, India is badly in need of development. (f) The radical changes in the regulatory framework after 1991 provide another justification. By comparing the period prior to 1991 with the post 1991 period, it is possible to systematically analyze how different theories have shaped development policies and thereby the role of the state. The research does not confine itself, however, to analyzing the Indian case separately. Rather the basic idea is to study Indian experiences within a broader theoretical framework.

The study, thus, deals with an analytic exploratory research problem. The much used idea of development and the idea of state are explicated in order to explore the complex relationship of state, development and theories of development with experiences of the third World countries in general and of India in particular.

### **Objective of the Research Project**

The objectives of the research project are:

- (a) to explicate the idea of development in order to find out its inherent historical, philosophical, and ideological dimensions ;
- (b) to explicate the idea of the state in the third world with a view to shade a light on its development role ;
- (c) to explicate the theories of development with reference to their emergence and basic premises in order to find out their political-economic and ideological positions ;
- (d) to explore the positions of the theories of development with respect to the role they assign to the state in the third world to implement development policies ;
- (e) to explore the praxis of the theories of development vis-à-vis the developmental role played by state in the Third World countries.

### **Main research questions of the study**

The purpose of this study is not to test a set of hypotheses, but rather to develop an exploratory analysis of the role of the state in theories of development. Several questions guided the research. The following are the main:

- (a) How can the idea of development be conceived in the context of its evolution and current debates?
- (b) How can the idea of the state be conceived in the prevailing political economy of the third world?
- (c) How is the emergence of a particular theory of development shaped by the concomitant historical context?
- (d) What exact position do the theories of development take with respect to the role of the state in development?
- (e) What is the actual position of the theories of development vis-à-vis the practice of development in the third world?
- (f) What is the actual role of the state in development with reference to theories and their practice in the third world?
- (g) What is the contribution of the theories of development in exploring the nature of the debate on state–development interface?

### **Research Methodology**

Considering the nature of the research problem an analytical exploratory methodology has been followed. Analysis of reports and other relevant works has been under taken. Two types of literature have been reviewed: (i) the conceptual literature concerning the idea of state in general and in third world in particular, the idea of development and theories development; and (ii) the empirical literature consisting of studies on sector wise or general strategies of development in different countries. The review has been conducted to find out the answers to the research questions posed. Methodologically the important areas of the study are: (a) explication of the ideas of state and development; (b) exploration of the political - economy of the theories of development; (c) exploration of the relationship between developmental role of the state and theories of development; and (d) finding out the political-economy of the debate centred on the state-development interface. From the broader methodological perspectives the study follows the critical one.

### **Overview of Literature**

Development research has attracted social scientists from across disciplines. Historians, sociologists, economists, anthropologists, political scientists and others

have engaged in extensive and in depth studies in this area. Indeed, 'development studies' abounds in a lot of literature. Given the size of the literature which impinges upon such a broad field, it has been necessary to be highly selective. The study is mainly concerned with two types of literature: (a) on the idea of development and the theories development; and (b) on the idea of state and its role in development. Considering the scope of the present research it is almost impossible to have an overview of the vast literature on each of the above mentioned categories. However, some of the major works belonging to each section have been reviewed.

### ***On development and theories of development***

The idea of development is the seed bed of debates in development studies. There is no general agreement. Since the early 1940s, when the idea of development in its current phase evolved, a host of ideas have gained currency and are competing through the early years of the twenty-first century. On each and every idea there are a lot of works. Development as a balanced economic growth was thought in Rosenstein-Rodan's famous article, *Problems of Industrialization of Eastern and south Eastern Europe* (1943). Similar arguments were made by W.A Lewis in his two most cited works, *Economic Development with Unlimited Supply of Labour* (1954) and *The Theory of Economic Growth* (1955). W.W. Rostow in his influential book *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (1960) provided a unilinear stage concept of development. In his version of growth theory each country would have to follow some successive stages of growth.

The idea of economic growth was co-opted in a broad socio-cultural and economic concept of development. Development was conceived as modernization. This idea was based on a tradition-modernity dichotomy. Thus a number of writers dealt with different aspects of this dichotomy and attempted to find out how the Third World countries can achieve modernization. The most important works are Daniel Lerner's *The Passing of Traditional Societies: Modernizing the Middle East* (1958); Alex Inkele's *Making Men Modern: On the Causes and Consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing Countries* (1964), David McClelland's *Business Drive and National Achievement* (1964); David Apter's *The Politics of Modernization* (1965); and James Coleman's *Modernization : Political Aspects* (1968).

As a reaction to the Euro-centric idea of modernization, many thinkers from the Third World, mainly from Latin America, put forward the idea of development as an elimination of structural dependency of the Third World or the unequal exchange in matters of international trade. Raul Prebisch's *The Economic Development of Latin America and its Principal Problems* (1950) is the pioneering work. With a different perspective H. Singer's *The Distribution of Gains between Investing and Borrowing Countries* (1950) puts forward similar views. Two earlier works of Andre Gunder Frank *The Development of Underdevelopment* (1966) and *Latin America: Under Development or Revolution: Essays on the Development and the Immediate Enemy* (1969); Arghiri Emmanuel's *Unequal Exchange: A study of the Imperialism of Trade* (1972) Samir Amin's *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment* (1974) and *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism* (1976) are important contributions to fostering this idea of development.

Modernization and economic growth as development ideas left out the question of redistribution of wealth and assets to those who need them very badly. This was highlighted in an idea of development as redistribution with growth. The work that pioneered the idea was by Hollis Chenery and others *Redistribution with Growth* (1974).

Being frustrated with the failure of the growth and modernization idea different types of ideas of development emerged under the heading of 'Another Development'. The most important contribution entitled *What Now? Another Development* (1975), was made by Dag Hammarskjold Foundation. Another important contribution was by Marc Nerfin, *Another Development: Approaches and Strategies* (1977).

Development as meeting 'basic needs', was gaining currency in the 1970s. In 1970s ILO published two important volumes containing this idea entitled, *Employment, Growth and Basic Needs: A One-World Problem* (1976) and *Popular Participation in Decision making and Basic Needs Approach to Development* (1978). Another work in this area is by Paul Streeten and Mahbub Ul Haq *First Things First: Meeting Basic Human Needs in Developing Countries* (1982).

Inspired by the Brazilian Adult Educator Paulo Freire's work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), some writers went to conceive development as people's participation. David Korten's article, *Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach* (1980) is an important contribution in this context. Moreover, the works of Robert Chambers *Putting the Last First* (1983); Frankley Lisk (ed), *Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs: Concepts, Methods and Practices* (1985); and G. Esteva and M. Prakash *Grassroots Postmodernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures* (1988) are important contributions in this context.

Starting in 1970s, the idea of sustainable development gained currency in the 1980s. It reflected increasing concern for environmental degradation and protection of future generation. The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development entitled *Our Common Future* (1987) dealt with concept and policy implications of sustainable development.

Since 1980s idea of development as market fundamentalism was gaining currency mainly under the leadership of Bretton Woods institutions. The chief actor of development was considered the market, not the State. Two important contributions were by the World Bank. The first is the World Bank Report of 1991 entitled *The Challenges of Development* and the second is the World Bank Report of 1996 entitled *From Plan to Market*.

In the early 1990s a new turn was noticed in development thinking. This was reflected in the idea of human development. Important contributions in this idea are by UNDP Human Development Report of 1990, the work of Paul Streeten entitled *Strategies for Human Development: Global Poverty and Unemployment* (1994) and of Mahbub ul Haq, *Reflections on Human Development* (1995). Another idea that gained currency within this area is the idea of development as human right. *The United Nations Declaration of Right to Development* (1986) is one important contribution. The work of J. Hausermann, *A Human Rights Approach to Development* (1998), *the Human Development Report of 2000* are other contributions. Amartya Sen in one of his important works entitled, *Development as Freedom* (1999) conceived development as achieving individual freedoms beyond the barriers of unfreedom.

Reduction of poverty has formed topmost position in the Millennium Development Goals. Also it was conceived as development of the Third World. The World Bank report of 1990, entitled, *Poverty* and that of 1999/2000 entitled, *Attacking Poverty* are important contributions in this context.

Also development was conceived in terms of North–South dialogue. Two Brandt Commission Reports, *North-South: A Programme for Survival* (1980) and *Common Crisis: North-South Cooperation for World Recovery* (1983) are pioneering contributions in this context. The Report of the South Commission (1990) entitled, *The Challenge to the South* also reviewed development from this perspective. The following South Centre publications, *Facing the Challenge: Responses to the Report of the South Commission* (1993); *Liberalization and Globalization: Drawing Conclusions for Development* (1996); *Foreign Direct Investment, Development and the New Global Economic order: A Policy Brief for the South* (1997); *Financing Development: Key Issues for the South* (1999), *Financing Development Beyond Monterrey: Contributions to a South Agenda* (2002) are important contributions to understanding development from this perspective.

From a complete different perspective development has been conceived as elimination of gender inequality. The classic contribution in this context is that of E. Boserup *Women's Role in Economic Development* (1970). Other contributions are by Caroline Moser *Gender Planning and Development* (1993); Kate Young, *Gender and Development Reader* (1992) and *Planning Development with Women* (1993).

The field of the theories of development is enriched by a vast literature. Since the 1980s the literature in this field has burgeoned. Ronald H. Chilcote and Dale Johnson edited a volume entitled *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* (1983). This volume plunges deeply in to the theoretical and political controversies surrounding dependency and modes of production. Ronald H. Chilcote in his book, *Dependency and Marxism: Toward a Resolution of the Debate* (1982) is another contribution dealing with the Marxist evaluation of the dependency perspective. Again in another volume Ronald H. Chilcote deals with the greater perspectives of the theories of development. It is entitled, *Theories of Development and Underdevelopment* (1984).

Magnus Blomstrom and Bjorn Hettne authored a very important book entitled *Development Theory in Transition: The Dependency Debate and Beyond: Third World Responses* (1984). It presents an elaborate account of the dependency debate in the third world context. It is based on the hypothesis that the traditional and still far from abandoned thinking on development is based on experiences which are specific to Western world and that the claim to universal validity must therefore be repudiated.

Cristobal Kay provides a penetrating analysis of the Latin American theories of development in his book *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment* (1989). He showed in detail the various currents of thought within Latin American development school. He presented the ideas of the many of the less known thinkers who made key contributions to the thinking on underdevelopment and development.

Ronaldo Munck and Denis O'Hearn edited the volume, *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm* (1999). This volume outlines the different critical perspectives in theories of development, for example, ecology, feminism, counter modernism, critical holism, critical modernism etc. It argues that the main stream development thinking experienced a revival of the old modernization theory dressed in the 1990s garb of globalization and neo-liberalism, with a token nod towards issues of gender, ecology, and ethnicity (dressed up as culture). (p. xiv).

John Toye presents what he calls the 'counter revolution in theories of development, in his book *Dilemmas of Development: Reflections on the Counter Revolution in Development Economics* (1993) He analyzed the ideas of the neo-liberals with particular reference to India. While Toye provides an unfavourable judgment towards the neo-liberals, Paul Krugman in his book *Toward a Counter Revolution in Development Theory* (1992) provides justification for the 'Washington Consensus'. Frans J. Schuurman edited one volume entitled, *Beyond the Impasse: New Directions in Development Theory* (1993). The Contributions in the volume discuss different aspects of the impasse in development thinking that emerged in the mid 1980s. However, hopefully they have outlined some new directions in development thinking by the closing of the twentieth century. Schuurman also edited another volume entitled, *Globalization and Development Studies* (2001). Some of the

chapters of the book have a common view of what globalization is supposed to be and what its significance is or could be for development studies. Some reflect more divergent positions and as such represent neatly and heterogeneity of the impact of globalization within the discipline of development studies and what kind of paradigmatic changes loom on the horizon.

Colin Leys in his book *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory* (1996) discusses the decline of development practice and theory in the African context. The main reason of such a position, he argues, is the end of the regulated system of national economics formalized at Bretton Woods, which underlay the whole idea of 'development' as it was conceived from 1950s onwards. Thus to him, a major challenge for development theory is to confront the problem of how it can now re-subordinate 'the market' to a new system of international and national regulation.

Denis Goulet in his book, *The Cruel Choice: A New Concept on the Theory of Development* (1971) provides an ethical framework of thinking to the whole issue of development. D.Simon and A. Norman in their work, *Development Theory and Practice* (1999) provide a general discussion of the different theories and issues of development. R.B.Potter and others contribute to a volume entitled *Geographies of Development* (1999). This has discussed the importance of development geography from the perspective of the Third World.

Bjorn Hettne in his book *Development Theory and Three World: Towards an International Political Economy of Development* (1995) argues that development theory can be seen as a corrective to the static and ethnocentric biases in main stream social sciences. He argues that development theory must draw on the international political economy (IPE) tradition in order to remain relevant in an increasingly globalised political economy. According to him there is a need for continued normative theorizing around the concept of alternative development.

P. W. Preston, in a volume entitled *Making Sense of Development: An Introduction to Classical and Contemporary Theories of Development and there Application to South-East Asia* (1986) surveys the theories of development and examines their praxis in the context of developmental states of East-Asia. In another volume *Development Theory: An Introduction* (1996), Preston sketches the outline of

the theories of development in a broader perspective of social science theorizing. He argues that development theorizing is creative, complex, and problematical exercise rather than a technical one. And that a measure of sensitivity to the inherent difficulties of social theorizing is important for development theorists (p.3).

David E. Apter in his book *Rethinking Development: Modernization, Dependency, and Post Modern Politics* (1987), presents two main perspectives 'for the state' and 'against the state'. In the first he discusses the state centric theories namely modernization and dependency, in the second, the challenges posed by social movements to the state and prevailing theories of development.

J. Brohman presents development from people's perspective. His book *Popular Development, Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Development* (1996) discusses participatory development both in its theoretical and practical perspective. J. Rapley discusses in his book *Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in the Third World* (1996) the critical issues of development within the context of global and local dimensions of Third World countries.

M. P. Cowen and R. Shenton in their book *Doctrines of Development* (1996) present ideological evolution of the idea of development. They argue that an understanding of the contemporary theories and practice of development need to be positioned against the historical evolution of the ideas and theories of development. M. Lowy in his book, *The Politics of Combined and Uneven Development: The Theory of Permanent Revolution* (1978) provides a Marxist critic of development theories.

P. E. Leeson and M. M. Minogue edited a volume entitled *Perspectives in Development: Cross Disciplinary Themes in Development* (1988). It discusses the issues of development in cross disciplinary perspective. It highlights that development can not be understood and achieved in a narrow economic context. Robert N. Gwynne and Cristobal Kay in a volume entitled *Latin America Transformed: Globalization and Modernity* (1999), reviews the Latin American ideas and practice of development within the context globalization in the 1990s. Sing C. Chew and Robert A. Denmark have presented some rethinking on the Latin American theories of development. Their edited volume *The Underdevelopment of Development* (1996) contains as many as

eighteen papers on the focal theme of the contribution on Andre Gunder Frank to the theory of development.

Alvin Y. So in his book, *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World System Theories* (1990), that the theories of development kept themselves alive through cognizance of their critics. They have been revitalized by the researchers who have listened to the strong points made by their critics and have incorporated suggested changes in their recent studies. Thus, So argues that social scientists should judge the merits of these theories by their recent publications rather than by their “classical” empirical studies, published before the early 1970s (p. 8).

Biplab Dasgupta in his book, *Structural Adjustment, Global Trade and the New Political Economy of Development* (1998) provides a comprehensive and critical account of the implications of the neo-liberal policies for the economies of the Third World Countries. Against the theoretical background of neo-liberalism, the book argues that in all respects the neo-liberal policies are not viable. The concluding part of the book focuses on India’s experience with structural adjustment since 1991 in an effort to understand why India seems to have failed where East Asia has succeeded despite following more or less similar policies.

The book by Richard Peet (with Elaine Hartwick) is an important contribution to an overview of the theories of development. Its title is *Theories of Development* (1999). The book is both penetrating and packed with recent ideas. It takes the reader through economic, sociological, Marxist, post-modernity, post-structural and critical realist theories of development. It gives intellectual space for theories of development from a wide range of persuasions. Stuart Corbridge edited a volume, *Development Studies: A Reader* (1995). This is a good compilation of the works belonging to different schools of development. ‘The book is clearly about *development*, but it is also about the study of development: about certain differences (and similarities) in approaches to development issues that have real effects on the formulation of development policies’ (pp xvii-xviii).

Inequalities in incomes, in health and in educational outcomes have long been issues of development in the Third World countries. *The World Development Report*

2006: *Equity and Development* (2006) advocates taking explicit account of equity in determining development priorities: public action should aim to expand the opportunities of those who, in the absence of policy interventions, have the least resources, voice, and capabilities. It makes the case for investing in people, expanding access to justice, land and infrastructure, and promoting fairness in markets. Similarly, the functioning of global markets and the rules that govern them, as well as the complimentary provisions of aid to help poor countries and poor people build greater endowments.

Joseph Stiglitz has provided a penetrating analysis of the essential nature of neo-liberal theory of development through its policy formulation processes at the Bretton Woods Institutions. His book *Globalization and its Discontents* (2002) provides some of the most pressing concerns of current development thinking. He argues that the West has seriously mismanaged the process of privatization, liberalization and stabilization, and that following its advice many Third World Countries are actually worse off now than they were before. In another volume, *The Roaring Nineties: Seeds of Destruction* (2003), Stiglitz presents a scathing analysis of the boom and bust of the 1990s-how and why it happened, how the seeds of destruction were sown in the midst of apparent prosperity. He also provides an alternative framework of thinking.

A number of scholars have contributed to the genesis and growth of a new theoretical framework in development thinking which gained currency in the 1990s. This is known as the post-development theory. M. Rahnema and V. Bawtree edited a volume entitled, *The Post Development Reader* (1997) containing papers from the leading thinkers of this school of thought. Similarly, Wolfgang Sachs edited another volume, *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power* (1992) containing as many as twenty pieces of writing on the most used concepts in development discourse. Each essay examines one concept from a historical bias. The central message of the book is 'The idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape' (p.1).

A. Escobar in his book, *Encountering Development: The Making and unmaking of the Third World* (1995) provides a critique of the idea of development and what it actually does for the Third World countries. J. Crush, edited another volume entitled

*Power of Development* (1995) which highlights almost an ideological acceptance of the discourse of development. Thus, it has executed wider impact on development thinking and practice. R.D. Grillo and R.L. Stirrat edited a volume on a similar theme from anthropological perspective. Its title is *Discourses of Development: Anthropological Perspective* (1997). J. Ferguson in his book, *The Anti-politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho* (1990), argues that development has helped in depoliticizing the activities related to social change. Marshall Wolfe in his book, *Elusive Development* (1996) explores some of the very difficult questions thrown up by the development process. He sees development as a Sisyphean task of trying to impose value oriented rationality on realities that remain permanently recalcitrant to such reality precisely because its key actions can not be assumed to be either benevolent or consistently rational. K. Gardner and D. Lewis also provide similar critique of development in their volume, *Anthropology, Development and Post modern Challenge* (1996). N. Long and A. Long edited a volume, *Battlefields of knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development* (1992). It is a critique of development research and practice from anthropological perspective. T. Spybey in his book *Social Change, Development and Dependency: Modernity, Colonialism and the Development of the West* (1992) presents a critical review of the development discourses from a Third World perspective. D. K. Fieldhouse also provides critique of the current discourse of development in his book *The West and the Third World: Trade, Colonialism, Dependence and Development* (1999).

Gilbert Rist in his book *History of Development: From Western Origin to Global Faith* (1997) provided a scathing attack on the prevailing discourse of development. He tried to show 'development as it is' as against 'development as it should be'. To him, the 'strength of 'development' discourse comes of its power to seduce, in every sense of the term: to charm, to please, to fascinate, to set dreaming, but also to abuse, to turn any from the truth, to deceive (p.1).

### ***On state and role of the state in development***

After several decades of neglect in the twentieth century the state as a conceptual category for theoretical and empirical research started coming back since the 1960s.

The return of the state influenced both the liberal and Marxist social science. The seminal article that argued the importance of state as an analytical concept was J. P Nettle's *The State as a Conceptual Variable* (1968). Another important article that deals with relocating state in social science in general and political science in particular is by *Almond: The Return to the State* (1988). A very important work that attempted to relocate state in social science studies is that of Evans et al (eds) *Bringing the State Back In* (1985a). The book views that the state as an actor although obviously influenced by the society, also shapes social and political processes. It urges to improve conceptualizations of the structures and capacities of the states, to explain how states are formed and organized and explored in many settings, how state affect societies through their interventions. The eleven articles included in the book deal with general ideas and specific cases to establish the above-mentioned objectives. They, however, do not deal with developmental role of state with reference to development theories.

From the Marxist perspective the pioneering works on state return were of Ralp Miliband *The State in Capitalist Society* (1969) and Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes* (1973).

There are some other works that not only asserted the importance of state as an analytical unit but also dealt with the basic idea of state and its nature in different contexts. Eric Nordlinger in his book *On Autonomy of the Democratic State* (1981) emphasized on the individual incumbents who officiate the positions of state in the context of state autonomy. He continued this argument in another article, *Taking State Seriously* (1987). Stephen Krasner in his article *Approaches to the State* (1984) reviewed the different approaches to the state in favour of his argument that the statist perspective is important.

Martin Carnoy in his book *The State in Political Theory* (1984) deals with the increasing importance of politics in shaping social change in the contemporary world. He has focused his attention with reference to the state. He has shown also the relationship between capitalist development and the state. James Caporaso contributed very important ideas in his edited volume *The Elusive State: International and*

*Comparative Perspectives* (1989). The articles compiled in this book deal with states comparatively both in theory and geo-geographic coverage.

The volume edited by Ali Kazancigil, entitled *The State in Global Perspective* (1986) contain as many as fourteen articles which deal with state formation, historical development of state, state's role in third world countries, legitimacy etc.

Mark Neocleous, in his book *Administering Civil Society: Towards a Theory of State Power* (1996) offers a Marxist theory of state. It deals with state power within the context of social power. Its focus has been reviewing capitalist state in Britain.

Leonard Tivey edited a volume entitled *The Nation State: Formation of Modern Politics* (1981). It contains nine articles dealing with subjects like state's origin, role of nationalism in state formation and nation states in different regions of the world, and the future possibilities of nation states.

Bob Jessop contributed an important work in understanding the state from Marxist perspective. Its title is *State Theory: Putting the capitalist State in Its place* (1990). The twelve chapters of the book deal with mainly three themes (1) Marxist theories of law, state and its relative autonomy; (2) political representation, social bases and state forms; and (3) the value form, the capitalist state and hegemonic projects.

Andrew Vincent's book *Theories of the State* (1987) deals with the nature of state in historical perspective. Theoretically it covers the absolutist theory, constitutional theory, the ethical theory, the class theory and the pluralist theory of the state. His main purpose has been to provide an introduction to normative theories of the state. Peter Self in his book *Political Theories of Modern Government: Its Role and Reform* (1985) provides an overview of some leading schools of thought and opinion about the performance of modern democratic states. However, his focus of attention has remained the advanced capitalist countries. Patrick Dunleavy and Brendan O'Leary in their work, *Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy* (1987) advance individual theories of the state in comparative perspective. The main theories dealt with are pluralism, new right, elite theory, Marxism and neo-pluralism.

Gregor McLennan, David Held and Stuart Hall edited a volume containing nine articles. It is entitled *The Idea of the Modern State* (1984). The themes covered are nature of the state, welfarism and state, the state in comparative perspectives, liberal and Marxist views of state and the future prospect of the nation state. Prakash Sarangi in his book *Liberal Theories of the State: Contemporary Perspectives* (1996) tries to explain the notions of state in the writings of a few of the prominent contemporary liberal theorists: John Rawls, Rajni Kothari, F.A Hayek and Robert Nozick.

Erik Olin Wright in his book *Class Crisis and the State* (1979) provided a theory of the state from a Marxist perspective. However, his focus has been to make a comparative study of the states in advanced capitalist societies with the socialist states.

John A. Hall and G. John Ikenberry in their monograph *The State* (1997) discussed the idea of the state from mainly the European perspective. However, some aspects of the third world states have been briefly sketched. The main themes of the book are: (1) capacity of the state (2) role of the state in historical contexts.

Bertrand Badie and Pierre Birn Baum in their work *The Sociology of the State* (1983) discuss the state from sociological approach. There are three main themes (a) the state in sociological theory; (2) social history of the state; (3) power of the modern state vis-à-vis society. They assert 'only a thoroughly new comparative approach can hope to explain the evolution of the state as an actor in the social system' (p. x).

Charles Tilly edited one important volume which has gained the standard of a classic in the areas of state formation. The title of the volume is *The Formation of National States in Europe* (1975). It contains nine well researched articles. They mainly deal with state formation in different perspectives. The book considers 'the historical experience to be more important than contemporary observation in the formulation or verification of some kinds of generalizations about large-scale political changes (p.3). Thus, formation of the state has remained the focus.

Victor M. Perez-Diaz in his book *State, Bureaucracy and Civil Society: A Critical Discussion of the Political Theory of Karl Marx* (1978) presents Marx's theory of the State, the bureaucracy and political system. The purpose has been to make explicit and discuss the political theory that is merely implicit in Marx's works,

focusing on his political analysis rather than on his all-too-familiar general statements (p.1). It seeks to explore some of the tensions between Marx's empirical analysis and generalizations.

David A. Smith, Dorothy J. Solinger and Steren C. Topik edited the volume *States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy* (1999). It contains as many as fourteen papers. Its focus has been to consider issues of state formation and the articulation of state with civil society in the context of global growth of multinational corporations, which appeared ready to challenge the nation states as principal actors in the international political economy. Steeped in the theories of development, including dependency and world system analysis the articles see states as crucial agents of social reform.

Martin van Creveld in his book *The Rise and Decline of the State* (1999) has made an attempt to look into the future of the state by examining its past: that is its history, growth, maturation, and apotheosis, and the way in which it spread all over the world . According to him there are good many reasons to think that many of the individual states will soon no longer be either willing to control and protect the political, military, economic, social and cultural lives of their citizens to the extent that they used to (p. vii).

Bertrand Badie in his book, *The Imported State: The Westernization of the Political Order* (2000) argues that decolonization produced the proliferation and uniformity of states every where in the world. However, this proliferation of the state was based on developmental perspective. But the post developmentalist perspective has made the states to decline. The westernization of the political order has not met the aspiration of the Third World.

James Anderson has edited an important volume entitled *The Rise of the Modern State* (1986). It contains ten papers. The volume as a whole aims to provide an understanding of modern states by tracing how they became 'modern'. It contrasts them with the non modern states from which they evolved or on whose wreckage they were established. It traces changing relationships between state and society, and the institutional development of states of different types. In a rich mix of history and theory, it combines a discussion of political ideas and aspirations with an analysis of

the conditions in which they operated. Also it presents a variety of perspectives on controversial issues which have contemporary as well as historical significance.

The book *The Critique of the State* (2001) by Jens Bartelson is a treatise on political criticism. Its main object of enquiry is the concept of the state and the changes this concept has undergone in political discourse during the past century, largely as a result of the critical attention it has received within political science. It is also an enquiry into the politics of the modern state. Its conclusion has been: the state is dead, long live the state! (p. 187).

The book *Political Theory and Modern State* (1989) by David Held attempts to map out the terms of discourse about the modern state and to offer an initial assessment of them. It examines the notion of modern state, the efficacy of the concept of sovereignty, problem of power and legitimation, sources of political stability and crisis, and the future of democracy. In so doing, it provides an analysis of the central issues of modern politics and political thought.

Boris Frankel, in his book *Beyond the State? Dominant Theories and Socialist Strategies* (1983) attempted to develop a set of categories which go beyond 'economism' ideologism and the reduction of state institutions to mere political/administrative 'super structures'. He argues that no adequate understanding of current crises can be acquired or radical strategies developed, unless the complex roles of the state institutions are recognized.

Yoram Barzel, in his book *A Theory of the State: Economic Rights, Legal Rights and the Scope of the State* (2002), reviews the contemporary state with reference to more practical issues. The book is concerned with agreements, their enforcement, and control of the force using enforcer. In a sense the book examines the modern states in a non-conventional way.

Roger King in his book *The State in Modern Society: New Directions in Political Sociology* (1986) provides an explanation of the nature of the state from the perspective of political sociology. He presents the evolution of the state with reference to its theories. The position of the state in the thought of the major sociologists has been found out. Moreover, liberalism, collectivism, and state socialism have been discussed to present the state in its myriad roles it performs vis-à-vis society.

Peter Taylor- Gooby edited a volume entitled *Welfare States Under Pressure* (2001). It examines welfare policy making in detail in seven key European countries – Finland, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK. The volume focuses on the welfare politics and on the policy making frame work in each country. It builds on the evidence of both the recent development of policy and changes in the roles and opportunities open to various political actors to construct an account of the factors likely to influence policy in future. Thus this volume is an important source to make a comparative study between the development policies of the Third World countries and the welfare policies of the advanced capitalist countries.

In a similar work Duane Swank deals with the developed welfare states. It is a book entitled *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States* (2002). The book examines ‘the theory of diminished democracy’ with reference to systematic empirical analysis. It attempts to develop and assess an alternative theory of how globalization has shaped contemporary welfare state changes. Its alternative arguments bring political interests and institutions centre-stage to argue that democratic process and national institutions are fundamentally important to determining how internationalization affects domestic policy change.

Anthony David Smith, in his book *State and Nation in the Third World* (1983) deals with the problems of the third world states vis-à-vis nation building with special focus on Africa. The Third world states have also been dealt with in the edited volume entitled *The Study of the State* (1981) by Henri J. M. Classen and Peter Skalnik. The articles in this volume examine the nature of state in the Third World settings with reference to evolution of states in the peripheral societies. Yeon-Ho Lee in his book *The State, Society and Big Business in South Korea* (1997) provides the practical problem of development states with reference to big business.

There are some works which exclusively deal with the nature of the Indian state. The book by Ashis Nandy entitled *Romance of the State* (2003) examines the nature of the Indian state within cultural settings in India especially politics of culture. J.D. Sethi in his monograph *Character of the Indian State: A Non-Marxist view* (1992) provides different explanations of the nature of Indian state with reference to the crises it passed through. He asserts ‘The model of the strong Indian state, sold to the

people of India in 1949 through a new constitution and by a popular leadership, has ended up in giving us a very soft and corrupt state in spite of the enormous instruments of coercion at its disposal.

Romila Thapar in her book *From Lineage to State* (1984) provides a penetrating analysis of state formation in India. She concludes that an 'analysis of state formation in early Indian history can be seen as a progress of change from social formations which may broadly be classified as lineage systems to those dominated by a state system, but the nature of the domination does not fall easily into any of the existing models and its dynamics require a fresh reworking' Like wise Ramendra Nath Nandi in his book *State Formation, Agrarian Growth and Social Change in Feudal South India* (2000) deals with state formation in India with reference to power structure in agrarian settings of south India. Ram Sharan Sharma in his book *The State and Varna Formation in Mid Ganga Plain: An Ethnoarcheological View* (2001) argues that indication of some kind of chieftainship and social differentiation can be inferred from the neolithic chalcolithic phase. But the real transformation took place in the second stage of the use of iron which acted as a catalyst in material life.

Pardeep Sahni and Uma Medury edited a volume entitled *Governance for Development: Issues and Strategies* (2003) present as many as sixteen articles. As a whole the volume deals with the problems of governance in India with reference to globalization and other developmental issues.

The area of state-development interface is well cultivated. One important book dealing with developmental role of the state is that of Kohli (ed.): *The State and Development in the Third World* (1986). The essays compiled in this volume were published in *World Politics* between 1976 and 1984. The essays share three characteristics: (a) they tend to treat political structures and processes as significant independent forces: (b) they eschew grand theory for middle-level theory and for greater historical specificity and (c) while conceiving the state's role in the developing countries, the essays left out dichotomous position between liberalism and Marxism. The common concern with the autonomy of the political gives this volume a degree of analytical unity. Out of ten essays, five deal with conceptual issues and the others deal

with empirical cases. Another related book by Kohli is: *The State and poverty in India: The Politics of Reform (1987)*.

A special issue of IDS Bulletin (Vol. 21, No. 4) edited by Manor entitled: *Reassessing Third World Politics (1990)*, is an important contribution in this context. Out of six articles two deal with theoretical issues of state's role in development and the remaining four presented four important case studies of India, China, Ghana and Ethiopia.

An important contribution in the study of the role of the state in development is by Martinussen (ed) *Development theory and the Role of the State in Third World Countries (1991)*. It is a compilation of six important articles presented in a research course organized by International Development studies, Roskilde University Centre. The focal point of the essays is the state and its role in societal development. The essays, however, do not deal with the role of state with reference to development theories.

The World Development Reports of the 1990s have been of special significance both in theory and practice in the area of the role of the state in development. The Reports of 1991, 1996, and 1997 have been of particular interest.

*The World Development Report of 1991: The Challenges of Development* is an important document so far as the reconceptualisation of the role of state in favour of market forces is concerned. The report describes a market friendly approach in which state allows market to function well and in which state concentrates its interventions in areas in which market proves inadequate.

*The 1996 World Development Report: From Plan to Market*, went beyond a consideration of appropriate strategies of transition to market economy to set out in a comprehensive manner the essential institution of a market economy. Conceptualizing transition as 'a passage from one mode of economic organization to a thoroughly different one' (p. 3), it moved from reinforcing the lesson of previous reports – 'the utter necessity of both liberalizing economic through opening trade and market opportunities and stabilizing them through reducing inflation and practicing financial discipline' – to 'discussing the institutions that make market based economies work (p. iii).

*The 1997 World Development Report* entitled, *The State in a Changing World* outlined the latest World Bank vision of the good a state in a fair detail, and buttressed it with much anecdotal and some research material. The major premises and prescription of the World Bank articulated in this report were many: An effective state is vital of the provision of goods and services as well as the rules and institutions that permit markets to flourish. Without it sustainable development, both economic and social, may be impossible. For economic and social development, the state should not be a direct provider of growth but be a partner catalyst, and facilitator. It rules out centralized and comprehensive direction of economic activity characteristic of statist economies. On the one hand there is need to narrow the gape between demand on the state and its capabilities to meet these demands, on the other the state offload the rest, and involve citizen and communities in the delivery of basic public goods and services. It requires the enhancement of state capability, by providing incentives for public official to perform better while keeping arbitrary action in check by subjecting the state services to increased competition. Devolution of authority from the central government to regional and local government can be yet another affective route.

Appelbaum and Henderson edited one important volume entitled: *States and Development in the Asia Pacific Rim (1992)*. It is a compilation of eleven articles presented at a conference held at the University of California in March 1990. Having assessed the various determinants that have been advanced to explain economic transformation in East Asia, the papers describe the relationship between the state policy and economic development in the NICS in the region. However, this has not been dealt with in the context of development theories.

Another important contribution in the study area is that of Auroi (ed) *The Role of the State in Development Process (1992)*. It is a compilation of nineteen articles presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> ICCDA Conference in Paris 1990. The papers briefly recall the theories, which marked the advent of the notion of the state. They also touch upon the problematique of the role of the state in relation to the emergence of civil society and the loss of institutional legitimacy. Some papers treat the effects of reforms such as structural adjustment programme.

An important assessment of neo-liberalism with reference to different policy perspective is an edited volume by Colclough and Manor: *States or Markets: Neo-liberalism and the Development Policy Debate* (1993). The papers provide an interdisciplinary analysis of the achievements and limitations of neo-liberalism.

The book by Leftwich (ed) *Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice* (1996), lays the emphasis of primacy of politics in the Third World development and democratisation. Another important contribution by Leftwich is an article: *Bringing Politics Back in: Towards a Model of Developmental States*, published in the *Journal of Development Studies* (Vol. 31 No. 3, 1995). It argues that rapid development in some Third World countries has been possible by the special character of their states, understood as developmental states. The article outlines the common characteristics of these states.

One special issue of *Third World Quarterly: Journal of Emerging Areas* (Vol. 17, No. 4 1996), edited by Gills et al, entitled: *The Developmental State? Democracy, Reform and Economic Prosperity in the Third World in the Nineties*, challenged the neo-liberal ideas of 'Washington Consensus'. The first three essays discuss the general issues of state-development interface while the remaining thirteen essays present specific case studies.

Another very important contribution in the area of study is by Martinussen: *Society, State and Market: A Guide to Competing Development Theories* (1997). In this volume Martinussen presented a comprehensive introduction to development theories and international debates on development, mal-development and under-development in Asia, Africa and Latin America. As many as twenty five chapters of the book cover from the nature of development research to theories of development, the nature of Third World state and politics, role of state in socio-economic development including the role of civil society in development process. While the book is very comprehensive in nature it does not deal especially with role of the state in development vis-à-vis the development theories.

Tornquist contributes an important volume to this area of study. This is entitled: *Politics and Development: A Critical Introduction* (1999). The main concern of the author is to present symbiotic relationship between the political and economic

spheres in Third World development. This is done with reference to the nature of politics and development, the main schools in the area, and the process of democratization in Third World.

One very recent addition to this area of study is an issue of *International Social Science Journal* (Vol. LII, No. 1, 2000), entitled *Changing Roles of the State*. The common ideas of the nine articles of this issue are: (a) models of governance from one nation cannot be applied cavalierly in another. Therefore, strategies of reforms must be tailored to the economic characteristics, the history and the values of each nation. (b) Strong national states remain highly important at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Setting and enforcing the rules of market competition, providing the infrastructure essential to the private sector, encouraging education and technology and assuring a social safety net for those incapable of caring for themselves – these abide as crucial roles for the state. (3) Political decisions take precedence over economic processes. (4) The prevailing market economies lead to the inequality of social resources, so that in fact citizens are not equal politically. (5) States are losing power around the world at the same time that their citizens are becoming more demanding.

*The State and the Crisis in Africa: In Search of a Second Liberation* (1992) is a conference report by Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. The report examines the almost constant decline of many of the African states since 1970s. It argues that the causes of such decline are both internal and external. Among the internal factors are: the absence of political stability, due primarily to the intervention of the military or bad leadership and others. External factors have been manifest in the ex-colonial powers' tendency to continue to dominate their former colonies by manipulating internal differences and using economic levers in order to demand concessions and, at worst, to foment discontent and *coups d'etat*. The report called for restructuring of the state in Africa.

In *State Strategy in the Global Political Economy* (1999) Palan, Abbott and Deans argue that the state is not about to decline or 'wither away', but must restructure and evolve in response to the forces of transnationalization. The state may be besieged but it can fight back and reorganize itself. The nature of this

reorganization , the alleged shift from the welfare State to the ‘competition state’ is as much a response to changing global circumstances as it is an instrument of further change. The author examine the plethora of competitive strategies of most powerful state to the parasitical strategies of the weak state serve as tax havens flags of convenience; from the egalitarianism of the welfare polices of the shielders to the repressed and exploited labour forces of downwardly mobile Third World States; from the emerging continental economies of NAFTA and the EU to the utter despair of collapsed states structurally unable to compete in the world economy. By investigating these strategic responses, the authors present a comprehensive study of the tactics and strategies employed by states to achieve greater stability and strength within the global political economy.

The role of the state is generally weighed vis-à-vis the market and the private sector. Claes Lindhal offers a penetrating analysis of the possibilities of development through market and private sector in his work *Wealth of the Poor: Eliminating Poverty through Market and Private Sector Development* (2005). He discusses key factors behind successful pro-poor market and private sector development which include equitable distribution, gender equality, human rights, and environmental considerations. He places market in a historical context and observes ‘there seems to be a movement in the donor community towards a mixed economy with a stronger view of the role of the state, and greater concern for distribution, similar to what might be called a “Scandinavian model”’.

James M. Buchanan in his book, *Liberty, Market and The State: Political Economy in the 1980s* (1986), presented the picture of a neo-liberal state. He shows that minimum government and unfettered market follow from the moral argument that liberty has priority over all other values. Since only free markets, run by atomistic, profit maximizing economic agents, preserve individual liberty, such arrangements are superior to any involuntary arrangements reached through the government.

*The Companion to Development Studies* (2002) edited by Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter is an important contribution to development studies. More than one hundred articles compiled are divided into ten principal sections, dealing respectively with: the nature of development and development studies; theories and strategies of

development; rural development; industrialization and employment; urbanization; the environment; gender, population, and development; health and education; the political economy of violence and security; and agents of development. Some contributions deal with the issues related to the inter-face between the state and development. This has been done from the perspective of development theory and practice.

Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue have edited an important volume entitled *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives* (2002) which provides a critical challenge to the prevailing neo-liberal orthodoxy in such areas as globalization, governance, social development, participation, feminism and post colonialism, civil society and the environment. The volume examines alternative ways of conceptualizing development with reference to theories of development.

The idea of social capital is thought to be 'the missing link' in international development. This is posited as against the developmental role of the state and in exclusive favour of the civil society. John Harriss in his book *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital* (2001). He asserts that the idea of social capital has come to play a significant part 'in the anti-politics machine' which is an important strategy of anti-state discourse.

John Degnbol-Martinussen edited a volume entitled *External and Internal Constraints on Policy Making: How Autonomous are the State?* (1999), containing nine articles. This volume revisited theories which focus on state formation, embedded autonomy of the state and the constraining influences on decision making and policy implementation. It has particularly focused on the impact of increased economic globalization and the pressure of Third World state to conform to common international standards for economic transactions and state interference with such transactions.

Martinussen along with Laurids S. Lauridsen edited another volume entitled *Changing Global and Regional Condition for Development in the Third World* (2001), which nine articles. The papers deal with Global and regional conditions and how they have impacted upon development in the Third World countries. They highlight some important issues relating to state development inter-face.

*The Poverty of the State: Reconsidering the Role of the State in the Struggle Against Global Poverty* (2005) is an important volume in understanding the role of the state in development with reference to the most fundamental development problem – poverty, edited by Alberto Cimadamore et al. The chapters found out in different ways factors impeding the widely accepted development Goal of poverty alleviation. The general conclusion is that ‘a substantial part of the explanation may lie with one of the most important, but problematic, structures of the modern world: namely the state’ (p.11). The book seeks to address both ‘anti-globalization’ and ‘anti-statism’ at each of three different levels of analysis –the international, the national and the sub-national–generating six interlocking sub-themes that go together, provide an extensive framework or debate.

Ha-Joon Chang in his work *Kicking Away the Ladder- Development Strategy in Historical Perspective* (2002) provides the historical experience of the developed countries during their early days of development and reject the widely held perception that most of these countries developed on the basis of free-market, free-trade policies. He edited along with B. Rowthorn another volume entitled *The Role of the State in Economic Change* (1995), exposing similar arguments. P. Deane’s book entitled *The State and Economic System* (1989) also deals with state’s role in economic development. In this area another important contribution is by Linda Weiss and J. Hobson entitled *State and Economic Development* (1995).

Linda Weiss asserts that the powerlessness of the state is a myth that needs to be debunked. Her work, *The Myth of Powerless State: Governing the Economy in the Global Era* (1998) is a proof to such a claim. According to her, ‘states are rendered far from powerless and passive as they confront global market forces’ (p. xi). In another edited volume *States in Global Economy: Bringing Domestic Institutions Back In* (2003) she compiled fifteen articles which seek to examine whether in a world of highly mobile capital, states, as territorially centered authorities, are still vital to the social and economic well being of their citizens.

The neo-liberal ideas set on in practice in its current form of state policies in Britain. Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright edited an important volume entitled *Re-Stating the State?* (2004), which implies the hollowness of neo-liberal

recommendations for the Third World countries. The papers are go that the state has not expanded, but neither has it contracted. 'Despite rhetoric of 'rolling back of the state' in the Thatcher years, and New Right dreams of a return to the minimal state of Victorian times, the actual size of the state has remained remarkably constant'.

Atul Kohli, Chung-in Moon and Georg Sorensen edited a volume entitled, *States, Markets, and Just Growth: Development in the Twenty-first Century* (2003). It explores the common concerns of Third World countries seeking just and fair growth. The contributors review the pressing, shared imperatives of globalization, democracy, poverty, and inequality. They analyze the records of different regions and countries in achieving just growth. As a whole the volume advances the proposition that well organized states that systematically incorporate popular concerns will continue to be fundamental to the pursuit of just growth in the twenty-first century.

The volume, *Globalization and Development Studies: Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2001), edited by Frans J. Schuurman provides a comprehensive introduction to the concept of globalization and it challenges to the contemporary development in Third World countries. A key underlying theme is whether a seeming transition from development studies to global studies is offering anything new for reconsidering the role of the state in the context of environment, gender, human rights, multinationals or urban development. Another edited volume entitled *Globalization and the South Asian State* (1998) discussed the role of state with reference to globalization especially in South Asia. The work has been edited by B. Ramesh Babu, containing eleven articles. . The volume discusses how the autonomy of the nation state has been circumscribed by both internal and external forces long before the cotemporary era of globalization. The work argues: 'Critics of globalization must refrain from pointing a nostalgic portrait of national autonomy in the past, for de facto sovereignty has never been cent per cent'. This has been examined in different ways in South Asian context.

Pradip N. Khandwalla probes the reasons for the decline of the contemporary state in his book *Revitalizing the State: A Menu of Options* (1999). The book presents a number of options for revitalizing the state so as to make the state more responsive to the needs of the people. It has outlined four principal models of the state that have gained currency in the twentieth century: the interventionist welfare state; the

'reinvented' entrepreneurial state; the developmental state; and the World Bank model of the humane market friendly state. Exploring the reasons of decline of the state, it leads to a menu of options for revitalizing the state includes: (a) fragmenting the state in to more or less autonomous units to enhance the innovativeness and effectiveness of its parts and their public accountability; (b) sliming the state through selective privatization, contracting out of services and deregulation; (c) strengthening the state by promoting mechanism of self regulation, associative and direct democracy, fair representation, and government stability and by guaranteeing civil rights; and (d) strengthening political management by ensuring the competence, probity and accountability of political executives. The book also illustrates the relevance of these possibilities by applying them to India in an international and comparative frame work. However the approach of the options remains largely neo-liberal.

Recently some attempts have been made to examine the role of the state vis-à-vis the civil society. One such work is *Does Civil Society Matter?* (2003). It is edited by Rajesh Tandon and Ranjita Mohanty. This volume explores and analyses civil society initiatives which address and impact on issues of good governance. It makes cogent case for broadening the conceptualization of governance so as to rescue it from the widely prevalent view that governance the sole responsibility of the state. The contribution argues that the people must be given space to decide what is good for them and for defining their version of governance. The volume edited by Deborah Eade and Ernst Ligteringen under the title, *Debating Development: NGOs and the Future* (2001) is another important contribution in this context. Contributors to this volume reflect on what kind of development will eradicate poverty, and what types of agency are best suited for the task. They share the view that 'globalization 'from above' is not the only way in which the world can be organised' (p.18). Rajesh Gill edited a similar volume entitled, *State, Market, and Civil Society: Issues and Interface* (2005). This volume examines the all pervasive role of market overshadowing both the state and civil society. The failure of civil society has aggravated the development problems. The state should play its part to overcome the uncertain future and anxieties of the excluded and marginalized.

Manoranjan Mohanty, Partha Nath Mukherji, and Olle Tornquist edited a volume entitled *People's Rights: Social Movements and the State in the Third World* (1998). The volume articulates the issues raised by the social movements as a democratic assertion of people's rights. The case studies from Asia and Africa of the successful and unsuccessful movements illustrate the nature of the dilemmas faced by them while problematising the dichotomy between class politics and social movements. In the process the contributions not only critique the dominant Western notions of rights, nationhood and civil society and citizenship but present original and alternative formulations in democratic theory, transformation of the post colonial state through liberation from new forms of bondage in order to affirm freedom and people's rights and to create a more decentralized, responsive and participatory state.

Social development forms an important component of development which is often neglected in narrow economic view of development. This is the area where state intervention is very crucial. This issue has been addressed by the Council for Social Development in its report: *India: Social Development Report* (2006). The Report argues the need to harness the energy of Indian nation to ensure the effective implementation of social policy measures by the state. It highlights in this context a number of highly important and far reaching social policy measures: the Right to Information Act; Rural Employment Guarantee Act; the Rural Health Mission; the National Literacy Mission; the Sarvashiksha Mission etc. It identifies key concerns and proposes measures of possible intervention.

The book entitled *The Market That Failed: A Decade of Neo-liberal Reforms in India* (2002) by C. P. Chandrasekhar and Jayati Ghosh surveys the actual experience of the neo-liberal reforms in India during the last decade and argues that this strategy has not just failed to deliver sustained growth, but has had damaging consequences from the point of view of employment, poverty alleviation and equity. It covers a wide range of areas, including fiscal and monetary policy, privatization, and the experience of foreign direct investment, and analyses the political economy of the reform process.

Shalendra D. Sharma in his work *Development and Democracy in India* (1999), presented a detailed analysis of the causes of the declining 'stateness' of the Indian state with reference to development. He, however, analyzed the issue within

the context of democratic process in India. He challenged the conventional 'economic' assumption that it is only through economic growth that India will be able to reduce poverty. His study, in high lighting the mutually conditioned, interactions among the multilayered structures that make up the 'state' and 'society', illustrates how India's rural development experiment and, in particular, the failure to reconcile economic growth with distribution, have been fundamentally shaped by the exigencies of state-society interactions

*Politics, Institutions and Industrial Development: Coping with Liberalization and International Competition in India* (2001) by John Degenbol-Martinussen is an important contribution within the Indian context. The overriding objective of the work has been to contribute to acquiring a better and more systematic understanding of the interaction between policies, institution, and industrial development. The basic idea has been to study Indian experiences within a broader comparative and theoretical frame work. The work contributes to the understanding of the intricate issues of state's role in development with reference to industrial development to India.

Terence J. Byres in an article entitled, *State, Class and Development Planning in India* (1998) discusses the role of the state in India in the context of development planning in post 1947 India from a Marxist political economy perspective. It presents those contradictions that were inherent in Indian development planning at its inception, which centred on state and class: contradictions which deepened as planning proceeded. In another article entitled *Development Planning and the Indian State* (1998) Partha Chatterjee exposed the problematical role the Indian state has been playing in development. He deals with the 'stateness' of the Indian state within greater borderlines of Indian planning.

Kuldeep Mathur's edited volume *Development Policy and Administration* (1996) brings together a set of twelve essays that combine policy perspectives with analysis of the implementation of development plans in India and of institutional performance. It covers a wide range of relevant and important issues including the state and development planning, the bureaucracy and the policy apparatus.

The book, *The State Political Processes and Identity: Reflections on Modern India* (1989) has been edited by Zoya Hasan, S. N. Jha and Rasheeduddin Khan. The

seventeen essays that comprise the book focus attention on state powers, and on the ways in which state intervention has affected the relationship between more modern institutions and caste, community identities. Another edited volume, *Politics and the state in India* (2000) by Zoya Hasan deals specifically with the Indian state. Among others, the book explores the social and political dynamics of the state and the major developments influencing the formation and transformation of the state in independent India. The other issues of focus are: the historical trajectory of modern state and its role as the central actor on economic development; the relationship between class and state power, the constraints on state intervention, and the challenges to the state from liberalization and globalization; the political culture of the state, particularly the ineffectiveness of government control etc.

Terence J. Byres edited a volume entitled, *The State, Development Planning and Liberalisation in India* (1998) provides an analysis of India's experience with development planning till the 1980s. The essays in the volume constitute a base from which a historically informed opinion can be formed. The volume ranges from a treatment of plan formulation and implementation to the role and significance of the public sector, regional disparities, and dynamics of class formation.

Francine R. Frankel in her book, *India's Political Economy 1947- 2004* (2005), argues that India's poverty and other development problems cannot be overcome solely through evolutionary growth models. Neither does she endorse that revolutionary social transformation is a necessary, realistic precondition for breaking down the social barriers of development. The book traces the relationship between the economic and political development strategies devised by the nationalist leaders on the premise that the advent of political democracy offered an alternative to revolutionary class struggle in equalizing society. This revised also examines the results of introducing macro economic reforms without the long promised redistributive changes. This has resulted in further aggravation of the gap between two economies in India: The one is the high productivity, knowledge based organized sector, which accounts for less than ten percent employment. The other is the agriculture. This is vastly the larger economy on which about seventy percent of the population depends for their livelihood.

The book, *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another* (2001), by Joel S. Migdal attempts to view the state from 'state-in-society' perspective. The focal theme of the book is that despite the triumph of the concept of the state in social literature, actual states have demonstrated less coherence than their theoretical counterparts. Despite their apparent resources, states have had great difficulty in transforming public policies into successful socio-economic development. It argues that states are both fragmented and face a multitudes of social organizations – families, clans, multinational corporations, domestic business, tribes, political parties etc. which maintain and vie for the power to set the rules guiding people's behaviour. These on going and overlapping struggles shape both the state and society. Thus, the book argues that in the real world there actually exists a 'limited state'.

*The Indian State after Independence* (2000) by C. P. Bhambhri deals with the nature of the Indian state. The Indian has been projected as a capitalist state. The recent pressures on the Indian state from religious fundamentalism and globalization have also been dealt with among other issues on the basis of Marxist theoretical framework.

John Echeverri-Gent in his book, *The State and the Poor: Public Policy and Political Development in India and the United States* (1995), investigates the rural poverty programmes by rural development agencies in Maharashtra and West Bengal and by the Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration during the American New Deal. By balancing the top-down perspective with a bottom-up approach, the author illuminates new concepts of state autonomy and capacity.

The widely cited book of Pranab Bardhan, *The Political Economy of Development in India* (1984) examines the political and economic constraints in Indian development and in the process, highlights the nature of the relationship between the government and different interest groups, and the impact of conflicting pressures for patronage and subsidies on the functioning of both the economy and polity.

*In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The political Economy of the Indian State* (1987) by Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph provide a comprehensive analysis of

India's political economy. According to these eminent writers India occupies a paradoxical place among nation states: it is both poor and rich. The Indian state is both strong and weak. They argue that private capital and organized labour in India face a 'third sector' – the state. The dominance of the state makes class politics marginal. The state itself is an element in the creation of the centrist – oriented social pluralism that has characterized Indian politics since independence.

*Democracy and State: Welfare, Secularism and Development in Contemporary India* (1999) by Niraja Gopal Jayal examines the relationship between state capacity and democracy in India especially during 1980s. It explores the recent careers of three goals that were preeminent in state's agenda at independence, and continue to inform contemporary debates on Indian politics and society: welfare, secularism, and development. These goals are illuminated through detailed case studies. Thus the book provides a narrative which bridges the gap between political theory and empirical political analysis.

The volume entitled, *Democratic Governance in India: Challenges of Poverty, Development and Identity* (2001), edited by Niraja Gopal Jayal and Sudha Pai examines the challenges of development in India under pressures of globalization. From various disciplinary perspectives the nine chapters in this book volume reflect upon the challenges posed by liberalization, globalization and assertions of backward classes.

*Development, Politics and Social Theory: Essays in Honour of Prof. S. P. Verma* (1989), edited by Iqbal Narain brings out the interactive pattern that informs development, politics, and social theory in a Third World country like India. It contains as many as twenty- one papers in three sections. Section one deals basically with theories of development. Section two highlights the main rubrics of politics in India in the context of major thrusts of its domestic and foreign policies. Section three focuses on some basic theoretical issues that the politics of development in India highlights. The cardinal question discussed here is whether social theory today provides enough light to illuminate the path of development in India.

The volume edited by G. Balachandran entitled *India and the World Economy 1850-1950* (2003), presents major debates on the subject of India's engagement with

world economy, and the ways in which it was transformed and deepened during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Thus, the volume facilitates a better understanding of India's past with the 'globalised' present.

The book, *India: Macroeconomics and Political Economy 1964-1991* (1994), by Vijay Joshi and I.M.D. Little is an analytic macroeconomic history of India from 1964 to 1991. Moulded by economic theory, the volume pays particular attention to the policies pursued, assesses their successes and failures both from the point of view of stabilization and of growth and considers the lessons that can be drawn. These authors in another volume, *India's Economic Reforms 1991-2001* (1996), review the problems and prospects of reform measures in India's economy since 1991.

*India Working: Essays on Society and Economy* (2003) by Barbara Harris-White discusses among others the state development interaction at the local level or where the state actually exists. Of the ten chapters, the introductory chapter delineates the character of the Indian economy and the nature of Indian development. Some other chapters deal with the local state and informal economy, development and intermediate classes, gender and development etc. In all, the book provides the nature of development in India from a political economy perspective.

Bimal Jalan's book, *India's Economic Crisis: The Way Ahead* (1991), attempts to find some practical answers to the problems of macro economic policy and strategy with the constraints of a multi-party parliamentary democracy of the type which prevails in India. Of the five chapters (excluding introduction) chapters one and three have dealt with the state development interface in the Indian perspective.

*India's Political Economy: Governance and Reform* (1995) by John P. Lewis examines the political economy of development in India. The twelve chapters divided in four parts offer a penetrating analysis of decline experience since 1950s through the 1990s of a 'giant size' country like India. Especially the book focuses on the international pressures on the economy during 1960s.

The volume edited by Amiya Kumar Bagchi, entitled *Economy and Organisation: Indian Institutions under the Neo-liberal Regime* (1999) argues that good institutions are necessary to upgrade the condition of the working population, the majority of whom in India are engaged in informal sectors that form the micro

foundations of Indian capitalism. Thus the book provides an important narrative of political economy in India. Because, 'micro processes and macro outcomes are intimately linked' (p. 61).

Rob Jenkins in his book, *Democratic Politics and Economic Reform in India* (1999) seeks to account for the capacity of the Indian political system to sustain policy reform over an extended period of time in the face of formidable political obstacles. It argues that the Indian state is more capable of producing system maintaining change. The contrary view, it goes on to argue, most visibly put forward as part of the good government agenda, is marred by inconsistencies, naivety, and an overly schematic view of democratic institutions.

Baldev Raj Nayar in his book, *Globalization and Nationalism: The Changing Balance in India's Economic Policy, 1950-2000* (2001), focuses on the interaction between economic globalization and economic nationalism in a larger historical canvas. It examines the successive attempts over the half-century from 1950 to 2000 to change the role of the state and market in the management of the Indian economy. It looks at economic policy reform against the backdrop of economic nationalism vis-à-vis globalization. The Indian state, society and the international system constitute the basic explanatory framework for the study.

Jagdish Bhagwati in his book, *India in Transition: Freeing the Economy* (1993) provides a neo-liberal explanation of the failures of the interventionist development strategy that India followed since 1950s. His book glanced back at what went wrong and attempted to reflect on the steps to be taken for the roadmap of the future.

Subrata Roy and William E. James edited the volume, *Foundations of India's Political Economy: Towards an Agenda for the 1990s* (1992). The ten chapters that constitute the corpus of the volume deal with awakening, decay and regeneration of economic development in India. In the process they explain the foundations of political economy in India in the light of the liberalization programmes of the 1990s.

The book, *Poverty, Agrarian Structure, and Political Economy in India: Selected Essays* (2003) by Pranab Bardhan deals with some key elements in Indian political economy. The most prominent is the state-society interface in the light of decentralized development.

The volume, *Capitalist Development: Critical Essays* (1990) is an important contribution to the understanding of nature of capitalist development in India. It is a felicitation volume in honour of Prof. A. R. Desai edited by Ghanashyam Shah containing as many as twenty-one articles. The central theme of the book, as that of the writings of Prof. Desai, is the nature of capitalist development in India. Some of the contributions deal with the Indian state and its role in socio-economic development. There is a broad consensus among the contributors of this volume is that India is following a capitalist path of development. Differences of opinion, however, do prevail regarding the nature of capitalism.

This brief overview shows that research has been conducted in the areas of development, development theories and states from different perspectives and approaches. The relationship between the notion of development and the nature of development theories vis-à-vis the state as an agent in development in the Third World countries has been rarely touched. The research questions posed by the study have hardly been met out. The exact position of the state in theories of development has not been explicitly dealt with.

### **Significance of the Study**

State - development interface in the Third World is an area of study where there is no dearth of research of good quality. Despite, the present study attempts to deal with some aspects which are comparatively less focused. The preceding overview of literature bears the testimony of such a claim. Considering the current debate over the role of the state, an exploration of the political economy of the debate may be of immense use to a critical understanding of the inherent issues. Further more, the general and holistic nature of the study helps to understand the debate in proper contexts. Commenting on the prevailing fragmentation in development research Skarstein (1999:1) deplores: 'There is an increasing fragmentation of the whole field and a corresponding specialization among researchers. Study of tiny details, often formally quite sophisticated ones, which do not clarify their relevance to the problems of development as a long-term process involving society as a whole, have become increasingly more fashionable. This trend seems to have resulted in a loss of sense of direction, ..... 'The present study humbly submits to have a direction.

### ***Limitations of the study***

The work is basically exploratory in nature. It does not deal with primary materials. The works already available in this area of study provide the basis of this research. The analytical framework of the research has been built on the analysis of the literature consulted for the work. Moreover, the literature review for the study has remained limited considering the vast literature produced in this field of study. Though the Indian perspective has been focused, the general character of the study may seem too much abstract. Even the field of development in India demands sectoral study. As the research proceeded it was felt quite clearly that policy oriented studies are more helpful to expose the state's role in development. The theories of development get translated in specific policy areas. Again the theories of development are some times camouflaged by 'eclecticism' making it very difficult to give a clear judgment. Thus the conclusions of the study are general in character. Finally, 'development studies' is a multidisciplinary field. With the researcher's background in Political Science, the research could not do justice in concerned areas requiring a very good training in Economics and Sociology.

## Notes

1. The contours of this impasse were sketched for the first time in a seminal article by David Booth (1985). According to Schuurman (2002:13) three reasons can be held responsible for this theoretical impasse. They are (chronologically): (1) the failure of development in the south and the growing diversity of (under)development experiences (2) the postmodernist critique of the social sciences and the normative characteristics of development studies in particular and (3) the rise of globalization in its discursive as well as in its ontological appearance. These three factors that cause the impasse, have also challenged the three post-war developmental paradigms (a) the essentialization of Third World and its inhabitants as homogeneous entities; (b) the unconditional belief in the enlightenment concepts of 'progress' and the 'makeability' of society; and (c) the importance of nation state as an analytical frame of reference and a political and scientific confidence in the state to realize progress (ibid).
2. Flynn (1999) argues, however, that this delicate balance rested more on public –private understandings than on transparent systems of democratic accountability and regulation. While these arrangements were adequate for the management of relatively closed economies, they could not cope with rapid financial and capital market liberalization in the 1990s.
3. J.P. Nettl (1968) first demonstrated the usefulness of 'stateness' as a conceptual variable in comparative politics. He noted that 'stateness' could be developed if a politically supported regime is able to transpose its own norms across the high threshold of time. 'Stateness' refers to the *idea* of the state and should not be confused with 'state', as it is used to refer to institutions with public authority. From this view point, R.Sudarshan (2002:162,176) asserts that when Gunnar Myrdal (1968) described India as a 'weak state', he implied that the idea of state was weak in India, resulting in the inability of the state to enforce its laws and proclivity among influential people to ignore rules and laws with impunity. He did not mean that India was a state that was incapable of coming down on people, or of being a 'hard state' in that sense. Instead, it is want of required degree of 'stateness' that results in state lawlessness.

## References

- Alavi, Hamza. 1982.** 'State and Class Under Peripheral Capitalism' in Hamza Alavi and Theodor Shanin (eds). *Introduction to the Sociology of Developing Societies*. London: Macmillan. pp. 289-331.
- Alechina, Iraida. 1982.** 'The Contribution of the United Nations System to Formulating Development Concepts' in Unesco. *Different Theories and Practices of Development*. Paris: Unesco. pp. 9-68
- Almond, Gabriel. 1988.** 'The Return to the State' *American Political Science Review* vol. 82. No. 3.
- Amin, Samir. 1974.** *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, Samir. 1976.** *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formation of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Anderson, James. 1986.** *The Rise of the Modern State*. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books.
- Applebaum, Richard P. and J. Henderson. 1992.** *State and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Apter, David. 1965.** *The Politics of Modernization*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Apter, David. 1987.** *Rethinking Development: Modernization Dependency and Post Modern Politics*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Auroi, Claude. 1992.** 'Introduction' in Cluude Auroi (ed) *The Role of the State in Development Process*. London: Frank Cass pp. 1-4
- Auroi, Cluude (ed). 1992.** *The Role of the State in Development Process*. London: Frank Cass
- Babu, B. Ramesh (ed). 1999.** *Globalization and the South Asian State*, New Delhi South Asian Publishers.
- Badie, Bertrand and Pierre Birnbaum. 1983.** *The Sociology of the State*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Badie, Bertrand. 2000.** The Imported State. The Westernization of the Political Order. Stanford, Co: Stanford University Press.
- Baeck, Louis. 1993.** Post-war Development Theories and Practice. Paris: The International Social Science Council.
- Bagchi, Amiya Kumar (ed). 1999.** Economy and Organization: Indian Institutions under the Neo-liberal Regime. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bala Chandran, G. (ed). 2003.** India and the World Economy 1850 – 1950. New Delhi: Oxford.
- Balassa, Bela. 1982.** Development Strategies in Semi-Industrial Economics. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baran, P. A. 1952.** On the Political Economy of Backwardness' The Manchester School vol. 20. No. 1. Reprinted in A. N. Agarwala and S. P. Singh (eds.). 1958. The Economics of Underdevelopment. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 1984.** The Political Economy of Development in India. New Delhi: Oxford.
- Bardhan, Pranab. 2003.** Poverty, Agrarian Structure, and Political Economy in India. New Delhi: Oxford.
- Bartelson, Jens. 2001.** The Critique of the State. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.
- Bartoli, Henri. 2000.** Rethinking Development: Putting An End to Poverty. Paris: Unesco.
- Barzel, Yoram. 2002.** A Theory of the State: Economic Rights, and the Scope of the State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bately, Richard. 2002.** 'The Changing Role of the State in Development' in Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter (eds) The Companion to Development Studies. London: Arnold, pp. 135-139
- Bates, Robert H. 1981.** Markets and States in Tropical Africa. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bellah, Robert N. 1957.** Tokugawa Religion. Boston: Beacon.
- Bernstein, Henry. 1990.** 'Agricultural "Modernization" and the Era of Structural Adjustment: Observations on Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of Peasant Studies, October, vol. 18, no. 1

- Bhagwati, J. N. 1982.** 'Directly Unproductive Profit - Seeking (DUP) Activities'. Journal of Political Economy, 90, October.
- Bhagwati, J. N. 1993.** India in Transition: Freeing the Economy. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bhambhri, C. P. 2000.** The Indian State After Independence. Delhi: Shipra Publications.
- Blomstrom, Magnus and Bjorn Hettne. 1984.** Development Theory in Transition. The Dependency Debate and Beyond: Third World Responses. London: Zed Books.
- Booth, David(ed). 1994a.** Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Booth, David. 1994b.** "Rethinking Social Development: An Overview" in David Booth (ed.) Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Boserup, E. 1970.** Women's Role in Economic Development. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Brandt Commission. 1980.** North-South: A Programme for Survival. London: Pan Books.
- Brandt Commission. 1983.** Common Crisis: North-South Cooperation for World Recovery. London: Pan Books.
- Brohman, J. 1996.** Popular Development. Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Development. Oxford: Blackwell Publication.
- Byres, T. J. 1998.** State, Class and Development Planning in India' in T. J. Byres (ed). The State, Development Planning and Liberalization in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Byres, T. J. (ed). 1998.** The State, Development Planning and Liberalization in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Buchanan, James M. 1986.** Liberty, Market and State: Political Economy in 1980s. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books
- Caporaso, James A. (ed) 1989.** The Elusive State: International and Comparative Perspectives. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.

- Cardoso, F. M. 1973.** Associated-dependent Development: Theoretical and Practical Implications' in A. Stephen (ed). *Authoritarian Brazil: Origins, Policies and Future*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Carnoy, Martin. 1984.** *The State in Political Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chakravarty, S. 1987.** *Development Planning - the Indian Experience*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chambers, Robert. 1983.** *Rural Development. Putting the Last First*. New York: John Wiley.
- Chambers, Robert. 2005.** *Ideas for Development*. London: Earth scan.
- Chandrashekar, C. P. and Jayati Ghosh. 2002.** *The Market that Failed: A decade of New Liberal Reforms in India*. New Delhi: Left World.
- Chang, Ha-Joon. 2002.** *Kicking Away the Ladder*. London Anthem Press.
- Chang, Ha-Joon and Robert Rowthorn (eds). 1995.** *The Role of the State in Economic Change*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chatterjee, P. 1998.** Development Planning and the Indian State' in T. J. Byres (ed) *State, Class and Development Planning in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chenery, Hollis et al. 1974.** *Redistribution with Growth*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chew, Sing C. and Robert E. Denemark (eds).1996.** *The Underdevelopment of Development* Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Chilcote, R. H. 1982.** *Dependency and Marxism: Toward a Resolution of the Debate*. Boulder. Co: West view Press.
- Chilcote, R. H. 1984.** *Theories of Development and Underdevelopment* Boulder. Co: West view Press.
- Chilcote, R. H. and Dale Johnson (eds) 1983.** *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Cimadamora, et al (eds). 2005.** *The Poverty of the State: Reconsidering the Role of the State in the Struggle Against Global Poverty*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

- Classen, Henri J. M. and Peter Skalnik (ed). 1981.** The Study of the State. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Colclough, C. and J. Manor (ed). 1993.** States or States markets? Neo - Liberalism and the Development Policy Debate Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, James S. 1968.** 'Modernization: Political Aspects' in David L. Sills (ed). International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (vol. 10). New York: Macmillan.
- Corbridge, S. (ed) 1995.** Development Studies: A Reader. London: Edward Arnold.
- Council for Social Development. 2006.** India: Social Development Report. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Cowen, M.P. and R. Shenton. 1996.** Doctrines of Development. London: Rutledge.
- Crush, J. (ed). 1995.** Power of Development. London: Rutledge
- Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. 1975.** What Now? Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation. 1992.** The State and the Crisis in Africa: In Search of a Second Liberation. Report of the Mweya Conference in Uganda, May 12-17, 1990.
- Dasgupta, Biplab. 1998.** Structural Adjustment, Global Trade and the New Political Economy of Development. New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Deane, P. 1989.** The State in Economic Change. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Desai, Vandana and Robert B. Potter (eds). 2002.** The Companion to Development Studies. London: Arnold.
- Dreze, Jean and Amartya Sen. 2002.** India: Development and Participation New Delhi: Oxford.
- Dunleavy, P. and B. O' Leary. 1987.** Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy. London: The Macmillan Press
- Eade, Deborah and Ernst Ligteringen (eds). 2001.** Debating Development; NGOs and the Future. London: Oxfam.
- Echeverri-Gent, John. 1995.** The State and the poor: Public Policy and Political Development in India and the United States. New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.

- Edward, Michael. 1989.** "The Irrelevance of Development Studies" *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 11. No. 1.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri. 1972.** *Unequal Exchange. A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Escobar, A. 1995.** *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Esman, M.J.1988.** 'The Maturing of Development Administration' *Public Administration and Development* vol. 8 no. 2 pp. 125-134
- Esteva, G. and M. Prakash. 1998.** *Grassroots Post-modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures*. London: Zed Books.
- Evans, P. 1979.** *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton university Press.
- Evans P. and J. B. Stephens. 1988.** 'Development and World Economy' in Neil Smelser (ed.) *Hand Book of Sociology* Newbury Park, CA: Sage pp. 739-773
- Evans, P. 1995.** *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P. et al (eds.) 1985 a.** *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, P. et al. (eds.). 1985 b.** *States Versus Markets in the World System*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, J. 1990.** *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depolarization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fieldhouse, D. K. 1999.** *The West and the Third World: Trade, Colonialism, Dependence and Development*. London: Blackwell Publishers
- Flynn, N. 1999.** *Miracle to Meltdown in Asia: Business, Government and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, A. G. 1966.** 'The Development of underdevelopment'. *Monthly Review* Vol. 18. No. 4.
- Frank, A. G. 1969.** *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution: Essays on the Development and the Immediate Enemy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

- Frankel, Boris. 1983.** Beyond the State? Dominant Theories and Socialist Strategies. London: Macmillan Press.
- Frankel, Francine R. 2005.** India's Political Economy 1947-2004. (Revised edition). New Delhi: Oxford.
- Freire, Paulo. 1970.** Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.
- Friedman, John. 1992** Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Friedman. M. 1962.** Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Furtado, C. 1964.** Development and Underdevelopment: A Structural View of the Problems of Developed and Underdeveloped Countries. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gamble, Andrew and Tony Wright (eds). 2004.** Re-stating the State? Oxford: Blackwell
- Gardner, K. and Lewis, D. 1996.** Anthropology, Development and the Postmodern Challenge. London: Pluto Press.
- Gills, Barry et al (eds.). 1996.** The Development States? Democracy, Reform and Economic Prosperity in the Third World in the Nineties'. Third World Quarterly vol. 17. no. 4.
- Gill, Rajesh (ed). 2005.** State, Market and Civil Society: Issues and Interface. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- Goulet, 1971.** The Cruel Choice: A New Concept on the Theory of Development. New York: Athenaeum.
- Griesgraber, M. and B. G. Gunter (eds.) 1996.** Development: New Paradigms and Principles. London: Pluto Press.
- Grillo, R. D. and R. L. Stirrat (eds.) 1997.** Discourses of Development: Anthropological Perspectives. Oxford: Berg.
- Gwynne, Robert N. and Cristobal kay. 1999.** Latin America Transformed: Globalization and Modernity.
- Hall, J. A. And G. J. Ikennberry. 1997.** The State. Delhi: World View.

- Hamner, L. et al. 1997.** *Social Development: Past Trends and Future Scenarios.* Stockholm: SIDA.
- Hamilton, Nora. 1982.** *The Limits of State Autonomy: Post-Revolutionary Mexico.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haq, Mahbub ul. 1995.** *Reflections on Human Development.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, John. 2001.** *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital.* New Delhi: Left World.
- Harris, John, Kristian Stokke, Olle Tornquist. 2004.** 'Introduction: The New Local Politics of Democratization' in John Harris et al (eds.). *Politicizing Democracy: Local Politics and Democratization in Developing Countries.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Harris, Nigel. 1992.** 'States, Economic Development and the Asian Pacific Rim' in R. P. Appelbaum and J. Henderson (eds.). *States and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim.* London: Sage Publications.
- Harris-White, Barbara. 2003.** *India Working: Essays on Society and Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasan, Zoya et al (eds). 1989.** *The State, Political Processes, and Identity: Reflections on Modern India.* New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Hasan, Zoya (ed). 2000.** *Politics and State in India.* New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Hauser Mann, J. 1998.** *A Human Rights Approach to Development.* London: Rights and Humanity.
- Held, David. 1989.** *Political Theory and Modern State.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Helm, Dieter (ed). 1989.** *The Economic Borders of the State.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, J. and Richard P. Appelbaum. 1992.** 'Situating the State in East Asian Development Process' in Richard P. Appelbaum and J. Henderson (eds). *States and Development in the Asian Pacific Rim.* Newbury Park: Sage.
- Hettne, B. 1995.** *Development Theory and the Three Worlds: Towards an International Political Economy of Development (Second edition)* Harlow: Longman.

- Hirschman, Albert O. 1958.** The Strategy of Economic Development. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press
- Hirschman, A 1963.** Journeys Towards Progress. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Hirschman, A. 1961.** The Strategy of Economic Development. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hunt, Dianna. 1989.** Economic Theories of Development: An Analysis of Competing Paradigms. New York: Harvester Wheat sheaf.
- Hyden, Goran. 1983.** No Shortcuts to Progress : African Development Management in Perspective London : Heinemann
- Hyden, Goran. 1994.** 'The Role of Social Capital in African Development - Illustrations from Tanzania' in Henrik Secher Marcussen (ed) Improved Natural Resource Management. The Role of the State versus That of the Local Community' Occasional Paper No. 12. (Second Revised Edition). Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University.
- ILO. 1976.** Employment, Growth and Basic Needs: A One-World Problem. Geneva: ILO.
- ILO. 1978.** Popular Participation in Decision-making and Basic Needs Approach to Development. Geneva: ILO.
- Inkeles, Alex. 1964.** 'Making Men Modern : On the Causes and consequences of Individual Change in Six Developing countries in Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni (eds.) Social Change. New York: Basic Books.
- Jalan, Bimal. 1991.** India's Economic Crisis: The Way Ahead. Delhi: Oxford.
- Jayal, Niraja Gopal. 1999.** Democracy and the State: Welfare, Secularism and Development in Contemporary India. Delhi: Oxford.
- Jayal, Niraja Gopal and Sudha Pai (eds). 2001.** Democratic Governance in India: Challenges of Poverty, Development and Identity. New Delhi: Sage.
- Jenkins, Rob. 1999.** Democratic Politics and Economic Reform in India. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jessop, Bob. 1990.** Putting the Capitalist State In its Place. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Joshi, Vijay and I. M. D. Little. 1994.** India: Macro Economic and Political Economy 1964 – 1991. New York: Oxford.

- Joshi, Vijay and I. M. D. Little. 1996.** India's Economic Reforms. 1991 – 2001. New Delhi: Oxford.
- Julius, De Anne. 1990.** Global Companies and Public Policy: The Growing Challenge of Foreign Direct Investment. London: Pinter.
- Kay, Cristobal. 1989.** Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment. London: Routledge.
- Kay, Cristobal. 1994.** 'Back to the Future: The Latin American Development School and Neo-liberalism' in Fiona Wilson and Finn Stepputat (eds.) People in Politics: Debating Democracy in Latin America, Copenhagen: Centre for Development Research pp. 9-23.
- Kazancigil, Ali (ed) 1986.** The State in Global Perspective. Paris: Unesco Publishing.
- Khandwalla, Pradip N.1999.** Revitalizing the State: A Menu of Options New Delhi: Sage
- King, Roger, 1986.** The State in Modern Society. New Directions in Political Sociology. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Kohli, A. 1986.** 'Introduction' in A. Kohli (ed) The State and Development in the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kohli, A. (ed). 1986.** The State and Development in the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kohli, A. 1987.** The State and Poverty in India: The Politics of Reform. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohli, Atul. 1991.** Democracy and Discontent: India's Growing Crisis of Governability. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohli, Atul et al (eds). 2004.** States, Markets and Just Growth: Development in the Twenty-first Century. Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Korten, David C. 1980.** 'Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach'. Public Administration Review Vol. 40. No. 5.
- Kothari, Uma and Martin Minogue. 2002.** 'Critical Perspectives on Development: An Introduction' in Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue (eds.). Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.

- Kothari, Uma and Martin Minogue. 2002.** Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives. Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Krasner, Stephen. 1984.** 'Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics'. Comparative Politics vol. 16.
- Krugman, Paul. 1992.** Toward a Counter Counter-revolution in Development Theory. Washington: World Bank.
- Kuznets, S. 1966.** Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure and Spread. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lal, Deepak. 1983.** The Poverty of Development Economics. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Lea, David A. M. and D. P. Chaudhri 1983.** Rural Development and the State. London: Methuen.
- Lee, Yeon-Ho. 1997.** The State, Society and Big Business in South Korea London: Routledge.
- Leeson, P. E. and M. M. Minogue (eds.). 1988.** Perspectives in Development: Cross Disciplinary Themes in Development. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Leftwich, A (ed). 1996.** Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Leftwich, A. 1995.** 'Bringing Politics Back In: Towards a Model of Developmental State'. Journal of Development Studies. Vol. 31, No. 3.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1958.** The Passing of Traditional Societies: Modernizing the Middle East. New York: The Free Press.
- Levy, Marion J. Jr. 1967.** 'Social Patterns (Structures) and Problems of Modernization' in Wilbert Moore and Robert M. Cook (eds.). Readings on Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice - Hall.
- Lewis, Arthur 1955.** The Theory of Economic Growth. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Lewis, Arthur. 1954.** 'Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour' Manchester School of Economic and social Science Vol. 22, No. 2.
- Lewis, John P. 1995.** India's Political Economy: Governance and Reform. New Delhi: Oxford.

- Leys, C. 1996.** The Rise and Fall of Development Theory. Oxford: James Currey.
- Lindhal, Claes. 2005.** Wealth of the Poor: Eliminating Poverty Through Market and Private Sector Development. Stockholm: Sida.
- Lipset, S. M. 1963.** 'Economic Development and Democracy' in S. M. Lipset. Political Man. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Lisk, Frankley (ed). 1985.** Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs: Concepts, Methods and Practices. Aldershot: Gower.
- Little, I. M. D. 1982.** Economic Development: Theory, Policy and International Relations. New York: Basic Books.
- Long, N. and A. Long (eds) 1992.** Battlefields of knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development. London: Rout ledge.
- Lowy, M. 1978.** The Politics of Combined and Uneven Development: The Theory of Permanent Revolution. London: New Left Books.
- Makinson, David (ed). 2000.** Changing Role of the State. International Social Science Journal. Vol. LII, No. 1.
- Manor, J. (ed). 1990.** Reassessing Third World Politics. IDS Bulletin. Vol. 21. No. 4.
- Martinussen. J. (ed). 1991.** Development Theory and the Role of the State in Third World Countries. Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University.
- Martinussen, John. 1997.** Society, State and Market: A Guide to Competing Theories of Development. London: Zed Books.
- Martinussen, John D. (ed).1999.** External and Internal Constraints on Policy Making: How Autonomous are the States? Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University
- Martinussen, John D. 1999.** 'External and Internal constraints on Policymaking in Developing Countries' in John Degnol Martinussen (ed) External and Internal Constraints on Policymaking: How Autonomous are States? Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University.
- Martinussen, John D and Laurids S. Lauridsen (eds). 2001.** Changing Global and Regional Condition for Development in the Third World Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University.
- Martinussen, John D. 2001.** Politics, Institutions and Industrial Development: Coping with Liberalization and International Competition in India. New Delhi: Sage.

- Mathur, Kuldeep (ed). 1996.** Development Policy and Administration. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- McClelland, David. 1964.** 'Business Drive and National Achievement.' in Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni (eds.). Social Change. New York: Basic Books.
- McLennan, G. et al (eds.) 1984.** The Idea of the Modern State. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Meadows, D. H. et al. 1972.** The Limits to growth. London: Pan Books.
- Migdal, Joel S. 1988.** Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relation and State Capabilities in the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Migdal, Joel S. 2001.** State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miliband, R. 1969.** The State in Capitalist Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Mittleman, J. H (ed) 1996.** Globalization: Critical Reflections. Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Mohanty, Manoranjan et al (eds) 1998.** People's Rights: Social Movements and the State in the Third World. New Delhi: Sage.
- Moser, Caroline. 1993.** Gender Planning and Development London: Routledge.
- Mouzelis, Nicos. 1994.** 'The State in Late Development: Historical and Comparative Perspectives; in David Booth(ed) Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice, Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Munck, Ronaldo and O' Hearn Denis (eds.) 1999.** Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm. London: Zed Books.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. 1968.** Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Nagel, Stuart S. (ed) 2000.** India's Development and Public Policy. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Nandi, Remendra Nath. 2000** State Formation, Agrarian Growth and Social Change in Feudal South India. New Delhi: Monohar.
- Nandy, Ashis. 2003.** Romance of the State and the Fate of Dissent in the Tropics. New Delhi: Oxford.

- Naqvi, Syed Nawab Haider. 1993.** Development Economics: A New Paradigm  
New Delhi: Sage
- Narain, Iqbal (ed). 1989.** Development, Politics and Social Theory: Essays in Honour of Prof. S. P. Verma. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Nayar, Baldev Raj. 2001.** Globalization and Nationalism: The Changing Balance in India's Economic Policy, 1950 – 2000. New Delhi: Sage.
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2001.** Development Theory: Deconstructions / Reconstruction. London: Sage Publications.
- Neocleous, Mark. 1996.** Administering Civil Society. Towards a Theory of State Power. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Nerfin, Marc (ed) 1977.** Another Development: Approaches and Strategies. Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Nerfin. Marc. 1987.** 'Neither Prince nor Merchant: Citizen - An Introduction to the Third System. Development Dialogue No. 1.
- Nettle, J. P. 1968.** 'The State as a Conceptual Variable' World Politics vol. 20.
- Nordlinger, Eric. 1981.** On the Autonomy of the Democratic State. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nordlinger, Eric. 1987.** 'Taking the State Seriously' in Myron Weiner and S. P. Huntington (eds.) Understanding Political Development. Boston: Little Brown.
- Nurkse, Ragnar. 1953.** Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped country. Oxford: Black Well Publishers.
- Palan, Romen et al. 1999.** State Strategy in the Global Political Economy London: Pinter.
- Peet Richard (with Elaine Hartwick). 1999.** Theories of Development. New York, NY: Guildford Press
- Perez -Diaz, Victor M. 1978.** State, Bureaucracy and Civil Society. A Critical Discussion of the Political Theory of Karl Marx. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Pettman, Ralph. 1979.** State and Class: A Sociology of International Relations. London: Croom helm Limited.
- Potter, R. B. and S. Lloyd. Evans. 1998.** The City in the Developing World. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

- Potter, R. B. et al. 1999.** Geographies of Development. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973.** Political Power and Social Classes. London: New Left Review.
- Prebisch, R. 1950.** The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems. New York: United Nations.
- Preston, P. W. 1986.** Making Sense of Development: An Introduction to Classical and Contemporary Theories of Development and their Application to Southeast Asia. London: Routledge.
- Preston, P. W. 1987.** Rethinking Development. London: Routledge.
- Preston, P. W. 1996.** Development Theory: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Pye, Lucien W. 1966.** Aspects of Political Development. Boston, MA: Little Brown and Co.
- Rahnema, M. and V. Bawtree (eds). 1997.** The Post-Development Reader. London: Zed Books.
- Rapley, J. 1996.** Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in the Third World. London: UCL Press.
- Redcliff, M. R. 1987.** Sustainable Development: Exploring the Contradictions, London: Routledge.
- Rist, G. 1997.** The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith. London: Zed Books.
- Rosenstein - Rodan, Paul. 1964.** Capital Formation and Economic Development. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Rosenstein - Rodan, Paul. 1943.** 'Problems of Industrialization of Eastern and South - Eastern Europe' Economic Journal, June - Sept. in Gerald M. Meir and Dudley Seers (eds.) 1984. Pioneers in Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenstein - Rodan, Paul. 1957.** 'Notes on the Big Push' in Gerald M. Meir and Dudley Seers (eds.). 1984. Pioneers in Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rostow, W.W. 1960.** The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Roxborough, I. 1979.** Theories of Underdevelopment. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Roy, Subrata and William E. James (eds). 1992.** Foundations of India's Political Economy: Towards an Agenda for the 1990s. New Delhi: Sage.
- Rudolph, L. I. and S. H. Rudolph. 1987.** In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The Political Economy of the Indian State. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sachs, Wolfgang(ed). 1992.** The development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power. London: Zed Books.
- Sachs, Ignacy. 2000.** Understanding Development: People, Market and the state in Mixed Economics. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sahni, Pardeep and Uma Medury. 2003.** Governance for Development: Issues and Strategies. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.
- Saranghi, Prakash. 1996.** Liberal Theories of State: Contemporary Perspectives. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- Schuurman, F. J. (ed). 2001.** Globalization and Development Studies: Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Schurman, Fran. J. (ed.). 1993.** Beyond the Impasse: New Directions in Development Theory. London: Zed Books.
- Schuurman, Frans J. 2000.** 'Paradigms Lost, Paradigms Regained? Development Studies in the Twenty-first Century'. Third World Quarterly Vol. 21. No. 1. pp. 7-20.
- Schuurman, Frans J. 2002.** 'The Impasse in Development Studies in Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter (eds). The Companion to Development Studies. London: Arnold. pp. 12-15.
- Self, Peter. 1985.** Political Theories of Modern Government: Its Role and Reform. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Sen, A. 1981.** Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Sen, A. 1999.** Development As Freedom. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sethi, J. D. 1992.** Character of the India State. A Non Marxist Idea. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

- Shah, Ghanashyam (ed). 1990.** Capitalist Development: Critical Essays Bombay : Popular Prkashan
- Sharma, Ram Sharan. 2001.** The State and Varna Formation in Mid Ganga Plains: An Ethnoarcheological View. New Delhi: Monohar.
- Sharma, Shalendra D. 1999.** Development and Democracy in India Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publications.
- Sinon, D. and A. Norman. 1999.** Development as theory and Practice. Harlow: Longman.
- Simon, David. 2002.** 'Neo-liberalism, Structural Adjustment and Poverty Reduction Strategies' in Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter (eds).The Companion to Development Studies. London: Arnold pp.86-92.
- Singer, Hass W. 1950.** 'The Distribution of Gains between Investing and Borrowing Countries' The American Economic Review vol. 40 no. 2. pp. 473-485.
- Skarstein, Rune. 1999.** Development Theory: A Guide to Some Unfashionable Perspectives. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sklair, Leslie (ed). 1994.** Capitalism and Development. London: Rout ledge.
- Sklair, Leslie. 1991.** Sociology of the Global System. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smelser, Neil. 1964.** 'Toward a Theory of Modernization' in Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni (eds.). Social Change. New York: Basic Books.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1983.** State and Nation in the Third World: The Western State and African Nationalism. Brighton, Sussex: Wheat sheaf Books.
- Smith, B. C. 1996.** Understanding Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change and Development.
- Smith, David A. et al (eds.) 1999.** States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy. London: Rout ledge
- So, Alvin Y. 1990.** Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Soros, George. 1998.** The Crisis of Global Capitalism. New York: Public Affairs.
- South Centre. 1993.** Facing the Challenge: Responses to the Report of the South Commission. London: Zed Books.

- South Centre. 1996.** Liberalization and Globalization: Drawing Conclusions for Development. Geneva: The South Centre.
- South Centre. 1997.** Foreign Direct Investment, Development and the New Global Economic order: A Policy Brief for the South. Geneva: The South Centre.
- South Centre. 1999.** Financing Development Key Issues for the South. Geneva: The South Centre.
- South Centre. 2002.** Financing Development Beyond Monterrey: Contributions to a South Agenda. Geneva: The South Centre.
- South Commission. 1990.** The Challenge to the South. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spybey, T. 1992.** Social Change Development and Dependency: Modernity Colonialism and the Development of the West. London: Polity Press.
- Stephan, Alfred. 1978.** The State and Society: Peru in Comparative Perspective. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002.** Globalization and Its Discontents. London: Penguin Books.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. 2003.** The Roaring Nineties: Seeds of Destructions. London: Allen Lane.
- Streeten, P. 1995.** Thinking About Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Streeten, Paul P. and Mahbub ul Haq (ed) 1982.** First Things First: Meeting Basic Human Needs in Developing Countries. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Streeten, Paul P. 1994.** Strategies for Human Development: Global Poverty and Unemployment. Copenhagen: Munksgaard International Publishers.
- Sudershan, R. 2002.** “Stateness’ and Democracy in India’s Constitutions’ in Zoya Hasan et al (eds). India’s Living Constitution: Ideas, Practices, Controversies. Delhi: Permanent Black. pp. 159-178.
- Swank, Duane. 2002.** Global Capital, Political Institutions and Political Change in Developed Welfare State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter. 2001.** Welfare States Under Pressure: London: Sage.
- Tandon, Rajesh and Ranjita Mohanty. 2003.** Does Civil Society Matter? Governance in Contemporary India. New Delhi: Sage

- Thapar, Romila. 1984.** From Lineage to State. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Tilly, Charles (ed). 1975.** The Formation of National State in Western Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tivey, Leonard (ed) 1981.** The Nation State: The Formation of Modern Politics. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Todaro, Michael. 1994.** Economic Development (5<sup>th</sup> edition) London: Longman.
- Tornquist, Olle. 1999.** Politics and Development: A Critical Introduction. London: Sage.
- Toye, John. 1993.** Dilemmas of Development. Reflections on the Counter Revolution in Development Economics (second edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Trimberger, Ellen Kay. 1978.** Revolution from Above: Military Bureaucrats and Development in Japan, Turkey, Egypt and Peru. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Unesco, 1988.** Goals of Development. Paris Unesco.
- UNDP, 1990.** Human Development Report. Concept of Measurement of Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP, 1993.** Human Development Report. People's Participation. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. 1997.** Human Development Report. Human Development to Eradicate Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. 1998.** Human Development Report. Consumption for Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. 1998.** Integrating Human Right with Sustainable Human Development. New York: UNDP.
- UNDP, 2000.** Human Development Report. Human Rights and Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. 2003.** Human Development Report. Millennium Development Goals: A Compact Among Nations to End Human Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press.

- United Nations. 1986.** Declaration on the Right to Development. (Adopted by General Assembly Resolution 41/128 of December 4, 1986).
- Van Creveld, Martin. 1999.** The Rise and Decline of the State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vincent, Andrew 1987.** Theories of the State: Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wallerstein, I. 1978.** 'World System Analysis: Theoretical and Imperative Issues' in B. B. Caplan (ed) Social Change in Capitalist World Economy. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage pp. 219-235.
- Wallerstein, I. 1979.** The Capitalist World Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1994.** Development: Lodestar or Illusion?' in Leslie Sklair (ed). Capitalism and Development. London: Routledge.
- Waterbury, John. 1983.** The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat: The Political Economy of two Regimes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weiss, Linda and J. Hobson. 1995.** State and Economic Development. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Weiss, Linda. 1998.** The Myth of Powerless State: Governing the Economy the Global Era. Cambridge Polity Press.
- Weiss, Linda. 2001.** 'Globalization and State Power' in John Degenbol-Matinussen and Laurids S. Lauridsen (eds). Changing Global and Regional Conditions for Development in the Third World. Roskilde: IDS, Roskilde University. pp. 5-19.
- Weiss, Linda(ed).2003.** States in the Global Economy: Bringing Domestic Institutions Back in. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, John. 1990.** What Washington Means by Policy Reform' in J. Williamson (ed). Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened? Washington: Institute for International Economics.
- Wilson, Fiona. 1994.** 'Introduction: Development Debates for the 1990s' in Fiona Wilson and Finn Stepputat (eds.) People in Politics: Debating Democracy in Latin America, Kopenhagen: Centre for Development Research pp. 5-8
- Wolfe, M. 1996.** Elusive Development. London: Zed Books.
- World Bank. 1990.** World Development Report: Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press.

- World Bank. 1991.** World Development Report: The Challenge of Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank: 1996.** World Development Report: From Plan to Market. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. 1997.** World Bank Report 1997: The State in a Changing World New York: Oxford.
- World Bank. 2000.** World Development Report 2000-2001: Attacking Poverty. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank: 2006.** World Development Report 2006: Equity and Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World commission on Environment and Development. 1987.** Our Common Future. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, Erik Olin. 1979.** Class, Crisis and the State. London: Verso.
- Young, Kate. 1992.** Gender and Development Reader. Ottawa: Canadian Council for International Co-operation.
- Young, Kate. 1993.** Planning Development with Women. New York: St. Martin's Press
- Zammit, Ann. 2003.** Development At Risk: Rethinking UN-Business Partnership. Geneva: The South Centre.