

DOKUZ EYLÜL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
MASTER’S THESIS

EUROCENTRISM IN DEVELOPMENT DEBATE: CRITIQUE OF
EUROCENTRISM IN IR

Yağız Çağın ULUSKAN

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif ÜZGÖREN

İZMİR-2020

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this master's thesis titled as "Eurocentrism in Development Debate: Critique of Eurocentrism in IR" has been written by myself in accordance with the academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that all materials benefited in this thesis consist of the mentioned resources in the reference list. I verify all these with my honor.

11/08/2020

Yağız Çağın ULUSKAN

ABSTRACT

Master's Thesis

Eurocentrism in Development Debate: Critique of Eurocentrism in IR

Yağız Çağın ULUSKAN

Dokuz Eylül University

Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of International Relations

International Relations Program

This research aims to critically examine how Eurocentrism has taken place in the IR literature and especially in the development debate. Besides, it has been discussed what kind of alternative understandings have been developed and what suggestions they offer to mainstream ideas. Nevertheless, the post-development understanding that started to develop in the mid-1990s and the need to reconstruct a new concept by deconstructing the term development have been brought forward. In the light of these developments, the main question of the thesis is that are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding. Accordingly, this study made a historical analysis of the development debates. It then examined the effects of the Eurocentric perspective in the IR literature and analyzed insights on how this one-way thinking could be improved. Finally, the transformation of Eurocentrism in the development field, the emergence of local-based alternatives to development thinking, the post-development perspective in this debate, and the criticisms of the post-development understanding were examined.

This study has gathered the separate subjects in literature together, made a criticism of Eurocentrism in the IR literature and the development field, and was also critical about how feasible the alternative ideas presented against them. Therefore, this study concludes on two main arguments. Firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it

stays on the same Eurocentric path. Secondly, the second argument is that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project.

Keywords: Eurocentrism, Development Debate, Universalization, Alternative Visions, Indigenization, Post-Development Theory.



ÖZET

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Kalkınma Tartışmasında Avrupa-Merkezcilik: Uluslararası İlişkiler’de

Avrupa-Merkezcilik Eleştirisi

Yağız Çağın ULUSKAN

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uluslararası İlişkiler Anabilim Dalı

İngilizce Uluslararası İlişkiler Programı

Bu çalışma, Avrupa-Merkezciliğin Uluslararası İlişkiler literatüründe ve özellikle kalkınma tartışmasında nasıl bir yer edindiğini eleştirel yönden incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, ne gibi alternatif anlayışlar geliştiğini ve bunların ana akım düşüncelere ne gibi öneriler sunduğu tartışılmıştır. Bununla beraber, 1990’lar ortasında gelişmeye başlayan post-kalkınmacı anlayış ve bu anlayışın yarattığı kalkınma kavramının tamamen ortadan kaldırılıp yeni bir konsept kullanma ihtiyacı tartışmaya açılmıştır. Bu gelişmeler ışığında, tezin ana sorusu; post-kalkınmacı veya kalkınmaya alternatif anlayışların ana akım kalkınma düşüncesini ortadan kaldırabilecek kadar güçlü olup olmadığıdır. Bu soruya cevap verebilmek için, bu çalışma, önce kalkınma tartışmalarının kısa bir tarihsel analizini yapmıştır. Daha sonra Uluslararası İlişkiler literatüründe Avrupa-Merkezci bakış açısının etkilerini incelemiş ve bu tek yönlü düşüncenin nasıl iyileştirebileceği yönündeki anlayışları analiz etmiştir. Son olarak, kalkınma alanında Avrupa-Merkezci düşüncenin nasıl geliştiği, buna karşılık yerel bazlı kalkınmaya alternatif düşüncelerin ortaya çıkması, post-kalkınmacı bakış açısının bu tartışmadaki yeri ve post-kalkınmacı anlayışa yönelik eleştiriler incelenmiştir.

Bu çalışma literatürde ayrı ayrı yer alan konuları bir araya toplayıp hem Uluslararası İlişkiler literatüründe ve kalkınma alanında Avrupa-Merkezcilik eleştirisi yapmış hem de bunlara karşı sunulan alternatif düşüncelerin ne kadar

uygulanabilir olduđu konusunda eleştirel olabilmıştır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma, iki ana argüman üzerinde sonuca varmıştır. Birincisi; kalkınma tartışmaları tarihsel olarak ne kadar farklı dönüşüme uğramış olursa olsun Avrupa-Merkezci düşünce yapısından kopamamıştır. İkinci olarak; Küresel Güney'in en zayıf noktası, ana akım kalkınma projesine karşı güçlü bir alternative vizyon ya da vizyonlar sunamamasıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa-Merkezcilik, Kalkınma Tartışması, Evrenselleştirme, Alternatif Vizyonlar, Yerelleşme, Post-Kalkınma Teorisi.



EUROCENTRISM IN DEVELOPMENT DEBATE: CRITIQUE OF EUROCENTRISM IN IR

CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	ii
DECLARATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZET	vi
CONTENTS	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	x

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------	---

CHAPTER ONE

WHAT IS EUROCENTRISM? HOW IS EUROCENTRISM IN IR STUDIED IN THE LITERATURE?

1.1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF EUROCENTRISM	9
1.2. EFFECTS OF EUROCENTRISM IN IR LITERATURE	15
1.3. POSSIBLE REMEDIES TO DECONSTRUCT EUROCENTRIC DISCOURSE IN IR	21
1.4. CONCLUSION	27

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT DEBATE

2.1. REBIRTH OF DEVELOPMENT UNDERSTANDING AND MODERNIZATION THEORY IN THE 1950S	31
2.2. DEPENDENCY THEORY	37
2.3. DEVELOPMENT DEBATE AFTER THE 1980S	41
2.3.1. Mainstream Development Transformations after the 1980s	46
2.3.2. Critical Development Transformations after the 1980s	52
2.4. CONCLUSION	61

CHAPTER THREE
HOW EURO-CENTRIC IS DEVELOPMENT THEORY?

3.1. TRANSITION TO EUROCENTRIC DEVELOPMENT DEBATE	64
3.2. ALTERNATIVES TO EUROCENTRIC DEVELOPMENT DEBATE	70
3.3. POST-DEVELOPMENT RESPONSES TO THE PROBLEMS OF THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES	82
3.4. CRITICISMS TO POST-DEVELOPMENT THEORY	89
3.5. CONCLUSION	94
CONCLUSION	97
REFERENCES	104

ABBREVIATIONS

IR	International Relations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UN	United Nations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
US	United States
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
WTO	World Trade Organization
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
GNH	Gross National Happiness

INTRODUCTION

The thesis aims to answer the question of are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding. The main aim of this study is to analyze the historical transformation of development debate, the place of Eurocentrism in International Relations (IR) literature, and Eurocentrism in the development debate with highlighting alternatives to development and post-development initiatives. The research has three main objectives: Firstly, to understand the stages of development debate since the 1950s. Secondly, to define Eurocentrism, look up its history of settling into IR and emphasize how the Eurocentrism is criticized in the literature. Thirdly, how Eurocentrism within development theory occurred and criticized will be the main issue. This study will try to understand the limits of IR theory due to Eurocentric understanding, its possible remedies, and the scope of alternatives to Eurocentric development debate in IR literature. Besides, this thesis will highlight the post-development theory and its argument about deconstructing Eurocentric development to better respond to the problems of Third World countries. It is fundamental to analyze the post-development approach of reversing the process of development from an ethnocentric view to cultural-sensitive understanding and choosing the most appropriate strategy for alternative development policies; universalist or cultural-specific.

This research intends to study Eurocentric constructions in the framework of development debate, and International Relations literature and tries to highlight criticisms of Eurocentric formulations in the literature, show alternative ways to the development understanding and future of development debate under the globalized economic system. Post-development theory indicates a strong counterpart to Eurocentric development understanding with its challenging the discourse altogether. However, post-development also attracts criticisms as being only a critical stance rather than providing something visible alternative to the development understanding. In order to bring peace to development debate, reconstruction of development theory is needed with more balanced, cultural-sensitive, and indigenous alternatives to development taking advice both from Western and Eastern scholars, analysts, and people. A World Social Science Report (2010) highlights the dynamics of the divisions and connections between researchers and their effect on the quality and relevance of

social sciences. This report indicates a vast but irregular growth in social science production, the significant but unequal impact of this production on society and policymaking. Despite the crucial achievements, several substantial inequalities exist throughout regions and within states. While the number of researchers, students, graduates, and publications has increased worldwide over the past decade, the internationalization of knowledge has reinforced the existing big institutional players: North American and European journals, bibliographical databases, universities, and research centers (UNESCO, 2010: 350). For Said and Amitav Acharya (as cited in Burney, 2012: 164), IR literature has a clear potential to become more plural, interdependent, and participatory in the theory construction policy by enhancing the non-Eurocentric academic sphere in the universities.

There is plenty of literature on Eurocentrism in International Relations theory and development debate both separately and simultaneously. The literature can go back to the 1970s, when Edward Said (1978) wrote about 'Orientalism' and the first criticized Eurocentric understanding of development and modernization. Moreover, Arturo Escobar's 'Encountering Development: Making and Unmaking of Third World' (1995) made the first step to deconstruct the development paradigm and focused on localized development understanding from a post-development point of view. Today, literature widely focuses on the role of post-development theory in deconstructing development and reconstructing alternatives to development, especially in the Third World countries. Some other debates are about finding the errors of Eurocentrism in International Relations and Social Sciences and tries to unlock those errors by taking lessons from the previous mistakes.

For the development debate, there has been much work about the European biases in this development understanding and universalist international structures towards 'Others' (Said, 1978) which they have experience exploitation from the colonial period, from modernization theories to neoliberal globalization (Brohman, 1995; Dirlik, 1999; Amin, 2010). There is another current debate about erasing Eurocentrism in development debate and formulating alternatives to development from the perspective of the East by delinking ahistorical and one-sided European superiority (Brohman, 1995; Gulalp, 1998; Simon, 2006; Escobar, 1995; Burney, 2012; Sunar, 2016; Amin, 2010). The periodization of Eurocentrism and the creation

of the European version of universalism and replicating it using its norms and structures are the primary debates in the literature (Capan, 2017; Buzan and Lawson, 2013). Buzan and Lawson (2013) also pointed out the mistakes and errors of International Relations theory, ignoring global transformation in the 19th century. Finally, Nilsen (2016) talks about the importance of capitalist development understanding with a more balanced and non-Eurocentric framework and Mark Mazower (2014) points out the ending of European sphere with the rise of the United States (US) as a global power in the mid-1940s, but he admits that it does not mean that Eurocentrism has ended.

There are two main arguments in this thesis to explain the theoretical question of the study successfully. Firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it stays on the same Eurocentric path. The second argument is that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project. This research aims to benefit from various qualitative methods by using both primary and secondary sources. It put forwards a plan to analyze alternatives to development debate and focus on post-development understanding with post-structural background to the question of Eurocentrism in development debate and critique of it in IR literature. The first chapter deals with the fundamental theme of how to remedy Eurocentrism in IR literature. The second chapter analyses the historical transformation of development understanding to have background information about the initial discussion subject. Third chapter connects these debates and concentrates on Eurocentrism in development debate and alternatives to development understanding. This theoretical analysis primarily bases upon secondary sources on post-development analyses, traditional development and modernity theories, literature on Eurocentrism and Orientalism, and construction of alternative theories of discussion. This research will also try to analyze the efforts of building a common understanding on the issues of development and researching in IR literature by benefiting from both Western and Eastern resources. This situation will lead the research to the point of detecting alternatives to development theory and their instrumentality and analyzing the possibility of creating a non-Eurocentric construction of development understanding. In order to fulfill this task, the research will draw on scholarly journal articles, books,

magazine articles, and some international reports highlighting the crucial debates about Eurocentrism and development debate.

For achieving the aim of this research, the discussion will mainly rely on the views of Edward Said's 'Orientalism' (1978) in which he tries to show that Eurocentrism has been a form of oppression within the modern capitalist system which exploits the rights of Eastern 'other' and makes them inferior. To remove these prejudices, to deconstruct Eurocentrism and finding alternatives to development debate based on cultural needs is crucial. Another prominent figure in this research will be Samir Amin and his book of 'Eurocentrism: A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism' (2010). In this book, he tries to prove that the power of schoolbooks and classification of language is not something we can ignore, because they are the instruments of cultural imperialism of the West and Eurocentric constructions in literature. Finally, Arturo Escobar's 'Encountering Development: Making and Unmaking of Third World' (1995) will be the focal point of this research about post-development insights to Eurocentric debates and possible demolition of development understanding altogether. These three books will be the primary roots of this research, and for sure, there will be other branches to challenge and support the views of anti-Eurocentrism and alternative to development debates.

The main reason that makes me study on this subject is because injustice and top-down historical constructions in the IR literature and development debate, and their detrimental consequences for non-European societies. These consequences cause neglect of indigenous alternatives and their possible contributions to both IR literature and development debate. So, this research seeks to examine the historical background of development debate, Eurocentrism in IR literature and development debate, and look critically at both Eurocentric development understanding and anti-Eurocentric efforts with their challenging views by focusing mainly on post-development debate and alternative to the development understanding. This study can contribute the literature by taking a stance as showing insights from both criticisms to Eurocentric development debate and their criticisms to this critical view. It is essential because this was a rare area of discussion in literature in which scholars either take the anti-Eurocentric position or support traditional structures. Another critical contribution that this research can make to the literature is making a comprehensive theoretical analysis

of the deconstructing Eurocentric development debate and Eurocentric norms in International Relations literature and showing the critical stances from both Eastern and non-Eurocentric Western understanding towards Eurocentric, cultural-blind, and one-sided theorization. This research can fill the gap by highlighting both Eurocentric constructions in IR literature and development debate and possible remedies to undo this Eurocentric structure with a more balanced and harmonized viewpoints. Another point in which this research can enrich the literature is about the issue of alternatives to development and critical analysis of post-development responses to Third World countries' needs.

The first two chapters of this research comprises literature and theoretical discussions, and historical analyses about development debate and the Eurocentric formations in the IR. The third and final chapter connects these debates as highlighting the Eurocentric transformations in the development debate. The first chapter will deal with the questions of what the limits of being Eurocentric for IR theory are and what are the remedies proposed in the IR literature. This chapter mainly focuses on the general and shared understanding of Eurocentrism and comprehensively analyses the ways and methods of IR scholars used when they are studying Eurocentrism in IR literature. This chapter tries to understand the roots of Eurocentrism in the literature by looking at different sources from different geographies. Another crucial point which this chapter illustrates is to grasp the real effects and consequences of the usage of Eurocentric discussions and notions in IR literature. In this respect, the research aims to analyze whether Eurocentrism is truly criticized through IR scholars or that they are re-creating Eurocentric discourses when they are trying to criticize it. Another critical point is to show the works of better ways of understanding Eurocentric conceptualization in IR by offering visible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentrism in literature.

The second chapter tries to answer the question of what the main categories of research in development debate are historically after the Second World War. In the light of this question, this chapter aims to study different layers and transformations of development understanding through decades since the end of the Second World War. In this chapter, initially, the incidents that led to the emergence of development thinking will be discussed, and the main arguments of development thinkers will shed

light on the rebirth of modernization theory. Secondly, the dependency theory will be the primary discussion point in the light of views of leading contributors to this theory, like A. G. Frank, Samir Amin, and Baran. Thirdly, the main argument will be the general achievements and initiatives of neoliberal upsurge in the 1980s. At this point, sustainable development, and human development will take the flag of neoliberal development understanding to deal with the issues of poverty, environmental degradation, economic crises, and human sufferings. In the mid-1990s, a fundamental approach, post-development, entered the discussion of development debate, and this understanding, differing from others, did not try to change the development concept, but it aimed to eradicate it. Then, transformations in the development thinking in the 21st century will be the focal point of analysis from a global development perspective.

The third chapter aims to answer the question of are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding without repeating the same mistakes as Western development did in the past. This question is also the central question of the thesis because it is crucial to understand their capability as an alternative vision. This chapter highlights the parameters of development theory, which consist of Eurocentric constructions that are hard to reverse. So, it is a valid question to ask whether Eurocentrism and development theory have been growing distantly from each other, or they are representing two sides of the same coin. This chapter aims to illustrate alternatives to Eurocentric development by local-based approaches like Buen Vivir, Ubuntu, and Zapatistas or show post-development perspective as rejecting the development understanding altogether. Alternatives to Eurocentric development will be the point of analysis according to their efficiency and applicability, especially to the least advantaged communities in the Third World by deconstructing Eurocentric, universalist, one-sided development understanding. Concerning this view, responses of post-development to the problems of Third World countries will be dealt with both theoretically and practically in this chapter. To analyze this, firstly, it needs to understand whether post-development has enough strength to replace development theory as an alternative or not and what are the criticisms to post-development theory on this specific issue and other spheres. In other words, this chapter also analyses the critiques of criticisms to development theory.

CHAPTER ONE

WHAT IS EUROCENTRISM? HOW IS EUROCENTRISM IN IR STUDIED IN THE LITERATURE?

This chapter mainly focuses on the general and shared understanding of Eurocentrism and comprehensively analyses the ways and methods of IR scholars used when they are studying Eurocentrism in IR literature. Besides, it tries to understand the roots of Eurocentrism in the literature by looking at different sources from different geographies. Another crucial point which this chapter illustrates is to grasp the real effects and consequences of the usage of Eurocentric discussions and notions in IR literature. On this basis, this research aims to analyze whether Eurocentrism is truly criticized in the work of IR scholars, or they are re-creating Eurocentric discourses when they are trying to criticize it deliberately or not. Another critical point is to show the works of better ways of understanding Eurocentric conceptualization by offering visible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentrism in IR literature. The fundamental theoretical questions of this chapter are what the limits of being Eurocentric for IR theory are and what are the remedies proposed in the IR literature. The main argument is that even if there are some limits on research and teaching spheres in the IR literature, it is still possible to present alternative ways and methods, like localization, harmonious and altruistic living, without relying only on Eurocentric ideals. This chapter is fundamental for critically analyzing and connecting the debate of historical roots in development understanding in the second chapter and discussion of Eurocentric constructions in the development debate in the third chapter. The chapter will consist of three sections that critically analyze Eurocentrism, which is a brief history of Eurocentrism, effects of Eurocentrism in IR literature, and finally, possible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentric conceptions in IR.

It is argued that the history of Eurocentrism dates back to the period of Enlightenment. The Enlightenment and its logic of progress led to the construction of an image of superiority over people other than Europeans. In this period, universalist understanding started to flourish by taking European culture as a base and making it absolute and one-sided truth. Especially after the Industrial Revolution, European nations began to colonize Asia and Africa with the promise of 'bringing civilization.'

This notion eventually brought Eurocentric and Orientalist discourse construction, which sees people uncivilized, underdeveloped, and illogical other than European origin. This discourse construction started with modernization theory and now continues with neo-liberal globalization under the market imperialism. After the 1960s and 1970s, with the decolonization period, some of the people from Third World countries started to realize unrealistic, the detrimental vision of Eurocentric development understanding, and they started to criticize and try to find better alternatives that are not cultural-blind. The most viable example of this argument is the post-development theory, which began to challenge development theory altogether and tried to find alternatives to development theory, not to amend it. Other approaches like post-colonial and post-structural theories also challenge the Eurocentric structure of the world system and linguistic patterns.

The central theme of this research is twofold, firstly detecting Eurocentrism in the IR literature, and secondly, acknowledging the criticisms to this understanding based on post-development theory and alternatives to Eurocentric discourses. Regarding these objectives, this chapter deals with the analyses and proposals about deconstructing Eurocentric structures and critical analysis of anti-Eurocentric views for their possible alternative remedies. Another point in this chapter is to illustrate possible convergences and interdependencies between East and West's policies and ways of thinking. Besides, it argues to find common places for discussion in order not to repeat the same mistakes as Eurocentrism and Orientalist scholars did and reach a consensus among them for the amelioration of one-sided, cultural-specific and Eurocentric development debate. The main aim of this chapter is to analyze Eurocentric constructions in the framework of conceptualizations, development, and International Relations literature and tries to highlight criticisms of Eurocentric formulations in the literature and show alternative ways for development thinking. Another critical contribution that this chapter can make is to do a comprehensive theoretical and historical analyses about the deconstructing Eurocentric development debate and Eurocentric norms in International Relations literature and showing the critical stances from both Eastern and non-Eurocentric Western understanding towards Eurocentric, cultural-blind, and one-sided theorization and periodization.

There is plenty of literature on Eurocentrism in International Relations theory and development debate both separately and simultaneously. The literature can be traced back to the 1970s, when Edward Said (1978) wrote about 'Orientalism' and the first criticized Eurocentric understanding of development and modernization. Moreover, Arturo Escobar's 'Encountering Development: Making and Unmaking of Third World' (1995) made the first step to deconstruct the development paradigm and focused on localized development understanding from a post-development point of view. Today, literature widely focuses on the role of post-development theory about deconstructing development and reconstructing alternatives to development understanding, especially in the Third World countries. However, this theory does not exist without any failures, which can lead to even more significant problems in the future rather than solving the issue of Eurocentrism. The following section will briefly analyze the history of Eurocentrism and its changing conceptual framework throughout decades.

1.1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF EUROCENTRISM

For Escobar (as cited in Pieterse, 2000: 180), the development discourse, like Orientalism described by Edward Said, has been a process of management of Third World societies and the creation of artificial truths about their histories and way of life. Eurocentrism, in general, is regarded as a 'distorted ideology' that compromises the international structure by taking the Western hemisphere as the basis of research, history, and the modern world (Burney, 2012: 143). This ideology takes European culture, ideas, and beliefs as prominent features to rely on unquestionably. Overall, Eurocentrism regards the civilization of Europe or West in general as the primary motivator of human progress starting from the Hellenistic age to the Romans, to the colonization period, and the contemporary neo-imperial structures of capitalism (Burney, 2012: 143). Besides, Eurocentrism can also be traced back to the fifth century when the Greek historian Herodotus called Asian people 'barbaric' and regarded them with the shortage of European values despite their excellence in the architecture (Conner, 2011: 1). Another example could be the misuse of representation in the most popular world map, the Mercator project of 1569, which showed the European

continent as much larger than it should be compared to other continents (Burney, 2012: 144). This construction of ideological greatness as the center of the world led to the emergence of non-material superior thinking and Europe's significance in the eyes of people and other civilizations. If we search for the origin of Eurocentrism in the ancient world, it could be observed that there were some underlying prejudices and certain biases against other people who were not like Western civilizations. However, not until the trans-Atlantic slave trade in the 16th century, there were instances of racial ideology or color-hatred behaviors (Conner, 2011: 1).

There are six essential milestones which indicated the historical transformation of Eurocentrism. Firstly, at the beginning of the 16th century, the European world economy started to be shaped by capitalism, and it gradually took over the whole international structure by focusing on the endless accumulation of capital. This expansion of capitalism reached an enormous phase, both geographically and ideologically, which became the first historical structure that dominated the entire world (Wallerstein, 1997: 37). Samir Amin claimed that Eurocentric culturalism became a religious activity at a particular time in history, especially with the Protestant Reformation that led to a social transformation (Amin, 2010: 8). After that, an image of East, which creates stereotypes about those societies, was created with the help of the colonization period, and this image gradually replaced the real East (Sunar, 2016: 6). After the discovery of American continent by Spanish Empire, Eurocentric construction flourished and reached its predominance in the 18th century by the help of Renaissance and Enlightenment Period which consolidated a viewpoint that rejected traditional aspects and embraced modern ideas and knowledge (Hobson, 2012: 4; Bilgin, 2016: 495). However, most of the scholars believe that Eurocentrism reached its peak between the years of 1800 and 1945 because it made West as the focal point in the world system by the help of colonial period and a substantial technological difference was a creation of the Industrial Revolution (Mazower, 2014: 299).

Secondly, in the 19th century, with the help of colonization, a discriminatory racial viewpoint became the dominant argument to justify the European superiority and dominance in the other continents (Conner, 2011: 9). Similarly, Said clarified that the Oriental viewpoint in 19th century Europe proved to be the primary motivator for masking the racist, imperialist, and ethnocentric biases of Western people (Said, 1978:

203-204). For the post-colonial theory, the reconstruction and transfer of European values to other spheres of the world started with the colonization period and continues in the neo-imperialist modern age (Gulalp, 1998: 958). Another critical point in the Eurocentric historical base was the establishment of the Prime Meridian of the world as Greenwich, England, in 1875, which consolidated the dominance of the Western hemisphere even if it was a small move as a symbolic action (Burney, 2012: 145). Even Karl Marx, who was the chief representative of supporting the rights of the periphery, was accepted as a Eurocentric scholar and his idea of 'Asiatic mode' proves his behavior against this society by clarifying them as backward, miserable and absence in historical spirit (Mackerras, 2019: 4).

The third milestone for the construction of Eurocentric structure was Westphalian heritage, which gains prominence in the 19th century, which led to the creation of Western-centric bias in both IR theory and functional area by dividing the European system and other international systems (Kayaoglu, 2010: 193). This Westphalian heritage causes misunderstandings and wrongful transformations in the international system and theoretical construction. Throughout the 19th century, those supporting this Westphalian heritage dedicated themselves to proving the superiority and uniqueness of Western cultural and political structure. According to this viewpoint, older traditions and other worlds were largely rejected, and the Westphalian international system indicated the European exceptionalism (Kayaoglu, 2010: 199; Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 622). Western exceptionalism's uniqueness was supported by the Western mind and its desire to enlarge continued with the help of colonial expansion. By this colonial process, for the sake of the civilizing mission, European norms of political and religious tolerance were primarily overlooked (Kayaoglu, 2010: 203).

Fourthly, western social science has followed a universalist path for the transformations that occurred in Europe between the 16th and 19th centuries. This universal viewpoint shaped all developments in the world, presenting the basic needs of humanity and destroying the drawbacks of realizing these needs (Wallerstein, 1997: 25). The power shift from Asia to Europe occurred because of industrialization, cultural domination, and ideology of progress, and this shift created a global hierarchy between the old and modern civilizations as first in history (Buzan and Lawson: 2013:

625). So, Eurocentrism became more prominent by increasing the effectiveness of European powers and their self-confident behaviors over other parts of the world by imposing their ideals and superiority in the age of colonialism during the 19th and early 20th centuries (Mackerras, 2019: 1). For general understanding, world history has a direct connection with European history, including the Concert of Europe, the unification of Germany, the world wars, and the Cold War (Capan, 2017a: 657). This historicization of specific European heritage can be traced back to Ancient Greece and moving forward towards the contemporary age linearly and gradually by reconstructing its norms and values with taking itself at the center of historical transformation (Capan, 2017a: 657-658).

Fifthly, Bull and Watson (representatives of English School) claimed that Europe created international structure, and this is because Europe dominated historical transformation and our perspectives at the very beginning of the creation of this structure (Capan, 2017a: 656). This construction of the world system can easily be called Eurocentric as a natural, historical process. Similarly, Wallerstein argued that social science was the work of European creation, which contains Eurocentric features, especially in the modern international system (Wallerstein, 1997: 21). For him, Western hegemony in the contemporary system can be understood by specific European historical accomplishments, and this dominance has prevailed almost without any serious threat in the last two centuries (Wallerstein, 1997: 22). He maintains to claim that the term 'civilization' became an instrument to scale other countries with basic standards held by European countries, especially after the end of the Second World War (Wallerstein, 1997: 31). Later, the idea of 'progress' took the position of 'civilization' and became even more influential as the representative of Eurocentric construction (Wallerstein, 1997: 31). Lastly, he observed that even with anti-Eurocentric desires to understand European history's dominance, it is not possible to avoid Eurocentric viewpoint due to desired or non-desired consequences of European hegemony in the international system (Wallerstein, 1997, 33).

The sixth milestone is that Eurocentrism cannot be grasped without considering the power structures created by European and American dominance since the 15th century. This cumulative conjecture gradually replaced all other traditions by injecting Eurocentrism, universalized norms, and globalized ideals through European

lenses (Dirlik, 1999: 8). The modernization theory has been criticized for its ethnocentric and ahistorical position, which admits the birth of civilization as the beginning of European history, and with this creation of civilization term, modernization theory began its mission of development to spread the features of European dominance (Cavalcanti, 2007: 89). In general, this ethnocentric viewpoint can be considered as one of the essential characteristics of Eurocentrism, and it sees own culture, ideas and policies as something to be proud of and superior in order to make them available to other traditions as well without considering traditional preferences and cultures (Brohman, 1995: 127). So, it is possible to say that transformation of development theory and Eurocentric conjecture from modernization theory to neoliberal understanding has been adjusted according to the realities of few European powers and their beliefs regardless of other societies (Brohman, 1995: 121). Eurocentrism is a complicated term that includes all arguments within the Euro-American conjecture and has always been a part of the ahistorical process with the creation of 'others' by European powers (Dirlik, 1999: 12).

There is an apparent convergence within the Western international relations literature between Eurocentrism and Western-centrism, which cannot always be the same because in the middle of 20th-century European power was decreasing as opposed to rising effectiveness of the United States' (Kuru, 2016: 357). However, these two terms have generally been used interchangeably due to shared history and continuation of Eurocentrism in Western centrism by enforcing similar norms and ideas towards the other world (Kuru, 2016: 357). For instance, Western ideals considered to be the only reality and connected to economic growth and progress, while Third World traditions were ignored and even degenerated with a highly ethnocentric viewpoint. In general, Eurocentric values, with the help of modernization theory after the end of the Second World War, have been used to create the international development agenda, which enlarged the capacity of global capitalism and superiority of American dominance over Third World countries (Brohman, 1995: 133). So, it can be said that modernization theory was another cover for replacing traditional dynamics of Third World societies with the US-dominated universalized capitalist ideals. According to Dirlik, without the strength of the capitalist agenda,

Eurocentrism may have been another representative of the ethnocentric structure due to its transformative effects on political, cultural, and social spheres (Dirlik, 1999: 12).

Eurocentrism created a conjecture that covers all societies and cultures by historically dominating them through changing their realities, establishing new forms of lives, and indicating one-sided norms (Dirlik, 1999: 13). After the end of the Second World War, European age has come to an end, but this was not a final phase for the development and transformation of Eurocentrism (Mazower, 2014: 313). Following this stage, structural changes after the 1940s led to the emergence of collective European identity and decreased the previous differences between European countries (Amin, 2010: 172). Another feature of the post-1945 period is the disappearance of scientific racism from the conjecture; however, a more detrimental manifestation of Eurocentrism occurred in a subliminal form during decolonization and the Cold War (Hobson, 2012: 10). By establishing the United Nations in 1955, the US changed its preferential European policy to the establishment of close links with the Third World countries with the help of membership to the UN process (Mazower, 2014: 313). Nevertheless, it is clear now that the US did not initiate this policy with good intentions; on the contrary, it created a developmental aid structure to intervene in those countries by transforming their cultures, societies, and economies to exploit them better. So, Brohman (1995: 127) summarized this policy by emphasizing its universal, ethnocentric, and improper character for most of Third World countries.

Since the 1980s, International Relations scholars have aimed to diversify the one-sided atmosphere by taking different ideas outside of the Western base. However, this effort has not changed the current situation due to the endless Eurocentric reformations in the international system (Bilgin, 2016: 493). Still, an emerging consciousness in local studies to counteract the unequal and hegemonic atmosphere in IR literature started to flourish after the 1980s (Mackerras, 2019: 8). These localized initiatives can be useful to unwrap the hurtful manifestation of Eurocentric constructions that held since the 15th century. However, subliminal Eurocentric conjecture occurred as a response to avoid harsh criticisms and maintained its Eurocentric transformations in the IR literature (Hobson, 2012: 10). According to Wallerstein (1997), there has been a slight change in the discourse of ‘civilizing’ in the 19th century colonial period as dominating non-European societies and imposing

ethnocentric ideals upon them. He claimed that since the 1990s, this ‘civilizing’ norm has turned into an ‘intervention right’ approach to maintain the dominance of Western cultural hegemony over Third World countries (Wallerstein, 1997: 26).

In sum, most of the concepts occurred since the establishment of the capitalist, and the Eurocentric world order helped strengthen and reinforce Eurocentrism in international relations (Bilgin, 2016: 494). This situation backed by globalization after the mid-1980s and limited social sciences and international relations to the Eurocentric perspective, which is hard to deconstruct due to reconstructive characteristics of Eurocentric norms (Sunar, 2016: 11). There are clear examples of the declining power of Eurocentrism in the IR conjecture, as can be seen in the rise of Asian states like China, India, and Japan. Their capabilities are very high for driving European-based structures away from the Asian continent at the first stage (Mazower, 2014: 309). According to Edward Said (as cited in Mackerras, 2019: 9), alternative constructions show that Eurocentrism is losing its power since the decolonization period but has not yet disappeared from the stage eternally. With the rise of American power, Eurocentrism is just reshaped under the policies of developmental aid, humanitarian aid, and intervention principle and maintained its predominance behind the shadows. This transformation of Eurocentrism made it much harder to decipher and deconstruct to get rid of the concept altogether. The reasons why it became harder to propose remedies for Eurocentric construction and to replace the term will be carefully analyzed in the following section of the effects of Eurocentrism in IR literature.

1.2. EFFECTS OF EUROCENTRISM IN IR LITERATURE

To understand the effects of Eurocentrism, it is logical firstly to categorize those effects into two different areas, which are the research and teaching spheres. In the research area, there are five adverse effects behind Eurocentric transformations in IR literature. Firstly, it is essential to understand the detrimental effects of Westphalian construction, as indicated in the article of Kayaoglu (2010: 195). This historical structure makes a manipulative understanding of the rise of the modern international system. It causes the misinterpretation of fundamental issues in current IR literature. It eventually leads to ignoring the cultures of other civilizations by international

relations theorists. The Westphalian structure prevents the building of pluralist viewpoints in the globalized international atmosphere (Kayaoglu, 2010: 195). Besides, Westphalian norms, with the help of the European colonial process, justified the West's wrongful policies in the Third World civilizations in the name of 'civilizing' mission to spread democracy, the rule of law, and tolerance (Kayaoglu, 2010: 195). Another problematic effect of Eurocentrism that occurred from the selection bias issue led international relations scholars to justify existing theories rather than falsifying them. These scholars ignore the fundamental problem of taking history as singular without questioning its prominence (Kayaoglu, 2010: 196). So, in general, Eurocentric construction of international history and society made a biased view of non-European cultures and always labeled them as 'lacking something' like political order or religious tolerance (Kayaoglu, 2010: 206).

To grasp the real effects of Eurocentrism in the research area, secondly, it is crucial to understand the events that happened in the 19th century and then the 20th century because these events made the foundation and familiarity of Eurocentrism in International Relations theory. Indeed, the transformation of international relations and Eurocentrism went simultaneously, and they affected each other through time. Post-structural theorists claimed that global change in the 19th century made an enormous power-driven theory construction by Western scholars (Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 623). Most of the theoretical explanations about the foundation of the 19th-century international structure failed to consider non-European viewpoints, and they reconstructed the same one-sided European dominance in the theory construction process except for post-colonial school and a few feminist scholars (Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 624). General judgment against Eurocentrism in IR is about its limited understanding of the international system that always justifies Western perspectives and rejecting other types of thinking outside of European orbit. This situation makes Eurocentric IR a way of seeing things without considering plural understanding of political, social, cultural, and economic norms (Picq, 2013: 446). This selective bias in International Relations can be explained by methodological internalism and presentism, which together make the exclusion of non-Western societies from the theory-making process and real-life experiences in the world (Duzgun, 2018: 287). Another claim about the elimination of non-Western cultures from IR theory

construction is that first-generation IR scholars did not ignore the non-West; still, they acted following the Eurocentric international atmosphere (Kuru, 2016: 356). However, this does not mean that they were value-free about maintaining the Eurocentric order without even questioning it.

The third detrimental point in the research area is that Eurocentrism is a concept that takes the shape of the ideological needs of the moment and rejects possible alternatives by making one instrument to become unquestionable truth according to Western standards (Amin, 2010: 166). This Eurocentric theory formation makes universal and homogenized norm creation that do not change across the world and excludes other viewpoints and perspectives as non-positivist ideas (Picq, 2013: 446). This universal construction of the international system makes the norms and procedures in a single view and provides the same images, discussions, and statements all over the world. According to Foucault (as cited in Ziai, 2013: 125), these one-sided norms can be connected to relations of power and knowledge production process of Westernized ideals. So, the historical background of non-Western civilizations is generally ignored and devalued by European superiority in theory and historical construction process by making unique and universal history basing Europe its center. For instance, while French Revolution was made a fundamental part of a puzzle for the civilization process, the Haitian Revolution, which can be equally important in the history, was overlooked in the construction process of history by the help of Eurocentric international relations theory-making (Picq, 2013: 447).

The fourth significant effect in the research sphere is that Eurocentrism enforces dualisms and contradictions as Western and non-Western, modern and traditional, civilized and non-civilized in the IR literature. Besides, with the help of these dualisms, the process of naturalization and normalization of cultural, ideational, and political differences by marginalizing non-Western societies occurs (Capan, 2017b: 5). Another feature of Eurocentrism is to make the reputation of the same concepts through the theory-construction process and regard the superiority of the West as the basis of international structure (Capan, 2017a: 657). This feature destroys the traditional viewpoints of other cultures, and it rewrites their history by imposing Western standards over them, which was the primary motivator of the colonial and then imperial era of European culture (Burney, 2012: 146). This situation can be seen

in the changing street names, city identities, and cultural traditions of Third World states under the European will and power. Eurocentrism is not only about making the history of international relations by taking European history as the basis but also about designing and creating Europe as the origin of the development of international relations with crossing out old developments in making international structure by the help of both Western and Eastern civilizations (Capan, 2018: 2). In general, Eurocentrism helped to reinforce hierarchical power construction that makes Europe superior to other cultures and civilizations in everywhere (Capan, 2018: 4).

The fifth discrepancy in the research is about the rise of the capitalist order. Development of capitalist world order by European construction and representation of others can be connected to the origin of capitalist development. This process was about dividing East and West and South and North and making Europe the fundamental piece of the development of the capitalist system and marginalizing other societies in the international order (Amin, 2010: 175). Eurocentric constructions can exist everywhere in daily life; within the cultural, social, and political spheres of societies in various forms as sometimes violent and lead to apparent racism and sometimes subtle at the background of societal dynamics (Amin, 2010: 179). To grasp Eurocentric effects in historical, cultural, and political structures, we need to focus on its reproductive feature in particular perspectives by making single definitions and categories as the basis of actual development and made real history blurred behind this Eurocentric creation (Sunar, 2016: 5). So, Eurocentrism represents the reinterpretation of past, present, and future reality at the basis of European historical achievements and creations, which in turn rearticulated a hierarchical viewpoint about non-European society as being lacked something and trying to reach the European standards.

If we come to the effects of Eurocentrism on the teaching and academic sphere, it needs to mention two crucial aspects that lead to Eurocentric construction in the IR literature. Firstly, the limitations that Eurocentrism caused on the theory formation process, suggested by Hobson (as cited in Bilgin, 2016: 494). Said (as cited in Bilgin, 2016: 496) also made a similar claim which Eurocentrism imposes on Oriental Studies as taking Europe center of the teaching and history, and this limitation cannot be seen by students easily who wish to study the Orient. Eurocentrism accelerated the process of limiting teaching on specific topics and rejecting alternative conceptualization from

Third World societies in the North, and it made a forceful dependence on the superior European academic sphere that decides the teaching methods in the South (Brohman, 1995: 128). So, other societies are deleted from the international theorization process due to Eurocentric constructions, Orientalist biases, and Western scholars' efforts to determine the concepts, language, and knowledge in the academic circle and day-to-day affairs as well (Burney, 2012: 149). Secondly, there is a claim that the academic sphere has caused norm creation based on Eurocentric transformations in contemporary social sciences and this, in turn, reinforced the Eurocentrism deeper and deeper in international relations (Sunar, 2016: 11). As a result, understanding the reproduction of Eurocentrism in articles, books, in cultural transformations and as a criterion for academic achievement is crucial. In sum, this situation adversely affects universities' education systems and general teaching methods by making academic curricula standardized and shaping students under Eurocentric lenses for understanding the international relations (Capan, 2017b: 3-6).

Eurocentric theory-constructions and programs of development have caused destructive consequences for the Third World states and dominated their alternative viewpoints by reconstructing singular approaches through both research and teaching spheres in the IR literature (Brohman, 1995: 129). These alternative perspectives of Third World states can have a beneficial effect on the theory construction in IR literature with contributing to a more democratic atmosphere and inclusive development. The dominance of Western knowledge structure has made a limited theory-construction process by relying only on European norms and procedures and rejecting alternative ideas from Third World societies (Brohman, 1995: 138). Besides, with the help of Eurocentrism, these European norms have been enforced to those Third World societies by erasing their own cultures, ideas, and concepts. Euro-Americans dominated world affairs by changing the names of old places, inventing new economic initiatives, society and politics. They rewrote the history of the international system by ignoring the former premises of the premodern stage as holding European superiority and centrality in a permanent scene (Dirlik, 1999: 3). This Euro-American domination should not be understood as an only cultural representation of European superiority, but also power dynamics that have been held by European and American hegemony since the 15th century (Dirlik, 1999: 11).

Eurocentrism is not a simple ethnocentric viewpoint that homogenizes and assimilates other cultures into European orbit; instead, it is a systematic process in which Euro-American ideals have transformed different ways of teaching and research methods and social relations in the face of Eurocentric construction (Dirlik, 1999: 18). As a result, Third World societies gradually started to forget their histories and harmonize their values with the European concepts, way of life, and economic practices (Dirlik, 1999: 27-29). So, this Eurocentric reformation in the international system has made it harder to counteract easily with a simple normative response from other societies.

There is a general belief among critical scholars to the mainstream IR theories, especially neorealism and international history, which do not have a single reference to the issue of imperialism or the Third World (Kuru, 2016: 375). This situation brings them to the center of Eurocentric criticism that most of the International Relations literature is exposed. However, English School scholars believe that although Eurocentric roots of history- and theory-making processes exist in English School theory, it does not mean that different perspectives would be ignored as it happened in the post-war theory construction era (Kayaoglu, 2010: 209). So, they partially believe an objective process of theory construction, but they still caught up being Eurocentric due to the usage of current Eurocentric concepts. Similarly, Kuru (2016: 360) claimed that there were no IR theories or scholars that managed to escape from the Eurocentrism trap in the international system's current conditions. Nevertheless, it does not seem possible to build a cross-cultural dialogue between European and Third World societies like John Rawls (1996) mentioned as 'overlapping consensus' because Westphalian historical construction prevents a democratic, impartial and tolerant international society (Kayaoglu, 2010: 214). Since the development ideology has created its premises on Eurocentric reformations with the help of detrimental colonial legacy, the gap between European and Third World states has not diminished, somewhat increased even more (Amin, 2010: 184).

To sum, with the increasing effects of international institutions and actors in the global system, it is not easy to say that Eurocentrism in the IR literature died away. In contrast, it is now more inclined into remaking theories and identities through their research and teaching agenda. Some newly emerging theories of International Relations seem to be critical and pluralistic, but they also help to enhance the

Eurocentric international structure by marginalizing non-European societies in the literature (Sunar, 2016: 13). This situation contributes to the naturalization of Western ideas and knowledge production at the expense of alternative visions in Third World societies. The Eurocentric construction of the academic sphere causes the one-sided view in the universities outside of Europe, and it places European scholars at the center of their research and teaching (Franzki, 2012: 2). So, a worst-case scenario occurs when Eurocentric construction might be limiting the very possibility of critique by silencing those who are severely affected by Eurocentric creations both through direct actions and subtle forms (Franzki, 2012: 3). In the end, it is crucial to grasp the main purpose behind Eurocentric construction in both global and local stages by concentrating on reconceptualization in different societies. Only after understanding the actual effects of Eurocentrism in IR and realizing the background of theory construction process since the 15th century, deconstruction of Eurocentric discourse would be possible. So, in the next section, possible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentric discourse in the IR literature will be discussed for trying to ameliorate the detrimental consequences of Eurocentrism.

1.3. POSSIBLE REMEDIES TO DECONSTRUCT EUROCENTRIC DISCOURSE IN IR

For deconstructing Eurocentric conceptualization, theory creation, and history-making process, which based its roots in the Westphalian narrative, it needs to embrace alternative explanations rather than sticking into one-sided theory construction (Kayaoglu, 2010: 197). By achieving this, International Relations would be much more inclusive and respectful to different perspectives and ideas. According to post-colonial theory, it is crucial to uncover the Eurocentric structure and take different opinions from other societies in addition to European orbit (Burney, 2012: 149). For this theory, European domination must be challenged and not be copied by Third World societies to clean the Eurocentric viewpoint from the international structure. As soon as other perspectives are included in the creation of East-West cross-cultural dialogue by considering alternative viewpoints, as Said (1978) mentioned, it becomes possible to deconstruct the domination of Eurocentric conception in the international sphere

(Burney, 2012: 151). So, it leads to the normalization of Third World perspectives rather than marginalizing them. Eurocentrism, in the end, might not be a final destination for reaching some standards of civilization, instead it needs to be challenged by alternative perspectives from every part of the world (Dirlik, 1999: 3). That is how it would be possible to include other societies into theory and history-making processes as opposed to being decided by someone unfamiliar with distinct cultures. Said (as cited in Bilgin, 2016: 492) indicated that the 'composite approach' would lead to the addition of other perspectives into the construction of global history, present and future rather than relying only on European superiority.

There are six crucial remedies to deconstruct Eurocentric structure in the IR literature. Firstly, it is equally important to acknowledge the missing part of Third World elements in development discourse and to reconsider the fundamental norms and languages used in theory construction (Brohman, 1995: 123). According to Rist (1990), understanding the shortage of Third World perspective in the development of theories and concepts and presenting alternative ideas is crucial to deconstruct the current projects, in which there were clear examples of failures, to comprehend the main problems of other societies (Matthews, 2008: 1038). Another critical point in understanding the hierarchy within Eurocentric history formation and its challenging premises is to analyze the transformative character of Eastern and Western societies by understanding their changing historical and discursive constructions through time and space (Capan, 2018: 4). After the mid-1980s, there was an increasing awareness of understanding detrimental Eurocentric initiatives and finding alternative norms to deconstruct existing theories. Two fundamental problems led to the occurrence of alternative conceptualizations. Firstly, Eurocentric biases and universal wrongful policies of Western development perspective were seen; secondly, these development policies based on one-sided Eurocentrism brought unprecedented problems in Third World societies rather than promised benefits of development idea (Brohman, 1995: 131).

In order to achieve successful operation of deconstruction, it is crucial to grasp two important initiatives. At first, it is essential to deconstruct the current universal development and theorization process by selecting what is relevant for the Third World and what needs to get rid of (Brohman, 1995: 132). The second point is to reconstruct

an alternative structure that would include different viewpoints and needs of other societies (Brohman, 1995: 132). In this way, there will be plural reconstructions following various initiatives and consequences for different cultures rather than relying on a single approach as Eurocentric construction did and has still been doing. Another suggestion to deconstruct Eurocentric viewpoint and solve the selection-bias problem in International Relations is to build self-directed development or theory construction body to direct more pluralist programs to enhance North-South and South-South dialogue (Brohman, 1995: 137). It indicates a debate that to unleash the chains of Eurocentric structure, destroying the Orientalist understanding, which legitimized the dominance of Western knowledge, culture, and politics with the help of colonialism and imperialism, should be the primary objective for successfully deconstructing IR and social science in general (Wallerstein, 1997: 29). So, Eurocentrism is not only about questioning the values of European societies. It is also about challenging and deconstructing the ideas and constructions that are already part of unquestionable, and universal legacy driven by Western conjecture.

The second remedy is that since the decolonization period, there have been national struggles of Third World countries to counteract capitalist and Eurocentric international structure by rearranging their economic initiatives following their local and cultural needs (Dirlik, 1999: 20). Why it is fundamental to deconstruct Eurocentric conceptualization in the IR is because to highlight local initiatives that have been ignored by one-sided Western literature and history. These alternative initiatives are beneficial for understanding and embracing the local-based initiatives of other traditions in IR theory and history, which have been generally ignored by the policies of Orientalism, imperialism, and Eurocentrism. Acknowledging alternative perspectives will extend the framework of the research and International Relations theory in terms of bypassing the colonial and Eurocentric legacy of the theory-construction process since the 15th century (Picq, 2013: 453). So, it is a prerequisite to understand the historical failures and abuses of Eurocentric formations in every-day lives of societies, only then deconstruction of whole Eurocentric structure and reconstruction of new alternative methods based on local initiatives can prevail (Dirlik, 1999: 28-30). In the end, these alternatives to Eurocentric theory constructions should have a limited universalism instead of following a cultural relativist approach to

acquire a broad vision of reconstruction as post-development theory suggested (Matthews, 2008: 1040). Because, in this interdependent age, a complete localization or isolation from world affairs do not seem possible and alternative visions should have a broad agenda to spread critical stance without falling into universalization (Matthews, 2008: 1040). However, this universal vision might be dangerous in terms of possibly causing a similar one-sided Third-Worldist approach as Eurocentrism has been enforcing since the 15th century. So, the key is to harmonize both Eastern and European perspectives in the same pot in terms of creating plural historical initiations, plural ideas, and multiple theories, especially in social sciences, without marginalizing any parties.

Thirdly, there is an ongoing debate about the widening angle of International Relations theory by carefully following the global transformation and adopting its features into the IR debate. According to Buzan and Lawson (2013: 632), this situation would bring two following benefits to IR literature; firstly, it would help IR to take advantage of broadening its framework by seeing the plural transformative initiatives as non-European indigenous alternatives are included into process. Secondly, it would help IR to understand the real development of international structure historically and ongoing global transformation with a broader perspective (Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 632). Similarly, Said defends deconstructing Eurocentric narratives in the IR by re-reading and understanding the history written by other societies and researchers; however, there is a sad truth behind these benign initiatives that Eurocentric academic curriculum does not leave much air for alternative understandings (Burney, 2012: 156). For Said and Amitav Acharya, IR literature has a clear potential to become plural, interdependent, and participatory in the theory construction policy by enhancing the non-Eurocentric academic sphere in the universities (Burney, 2012: 164; Capan, 2017b: 3). So, the optimal consequence of changing the content of academic materials to avoid Eurocentric conceptualization is to include non-Western perspectives into textbooks and academic works by harmonizing both European and non-European knowledge in the construction of academic truths more objectively (Sunar, 2016: 12; Amin, 2010: 186). The international structure and International Relations theory without binding Orientalist, Eurocentric, and imperialist concepts would harmonize multiple beginnings and perspectives of Eastern and Western

societies. By achieving this aim, new approaches will be more inclusive and participatory rather than relying on a single aspect that has been Western since the 15th century.

Fourthly, there is a serious allegation against Eurocentric construction of modern civilization directed by critical scholars who claim that Western societies were indeed periphery before the 15th century and their historical, political, economic and social status was inferior compared to other societies in the East (Wallerstein, 1997: 34; Hobson, 2012: 10). It needs to understand that Europe gained its current superior position with the help of its reconstructions in the conceptualization of international affairs by artificial creations (Wallerstein, 1997: 38). In order to deconstruct the Eurocentric world order, it is crucial to know the transforming history of this European domination and how it acquired the superior position in international relations. Understanding the problem of Euro-American ethnocentrism is crucial for emphasizing the importance of 'other' perspectives rather than Eurocentric reformations in the international system. This view was the ultimate goal of neo-Marxist and post-colonial scholars, like Edward Said and Samir Amin, to emphasize alternative ideas from different parts of the world (Simon, 2016: 14). Besides, there has been an increasing need to consider the plural ideas and cultural perspectives from local societies to be more productive and objective in the policymaking, history-creation, and theory-construction processes. In the end, analyzing the international structure by giving importance to different perspectives and pluralist East-West dialogue will cause betterment in creating an active and constructive methodology in the IR (Simon, 2016: 15; Pieterse, 2000: 178).

The fifth remedy is that it is not enough to go beyond the Eurocentric structure by re-reading the history and reconstructing a new approach; however, this initiative should not be inclined to another type of centrism (Sunar, 2016: 7). If this occurs, the efforts to deconstruct Eurocentric structure goes for nothing, because it causes the same one-sided, ethnocentric, and self-centered understanding. To ameliorate Eurocentric theorizations and historical beginnings, an objective and ahistorical theoretical perspective in International Relations as opposed to building contradictory viewpoints among different parties in the international system is needed (Sunar, 2016: 13). So, for not making the same mistakes as Eurocentrism did, every culture should

be embraced in parallel to their particularities, historical backgrounds, and indigenous life forms rather than relying on hierarchic enforcements. It will be beneficial to keep the right sides of Western conceptualization and progress rather than eradicating European legacy, which may eventually cause non-European centrism, as Wallerstein (1997) mentioned (Sunar, 2016: 17). Therefore, cross-cultural dialogue and harmonization of Eastern and Western perspectives are crucial to have an actual construction of history and theory.

Lastly, for critical theories, like post-colonialism, post-development, and post-structuralism, there is a close relationship between comprehending the emergence of capitalism and construction of historical development and rescuing International Relations from Eurocentric viewpoint (Duzgun, 2018: 293). Cleansing modernization concept from Eurocentric capitalist understanding can benefit from harmonizing marginalized non-European cultures and their histories in the construction of a more balanced international structure (Duzgun, 2018: 303). Therefore, this initiative can reconstruct a more inclusive, polycentric, and intercultural dialogue, emphasizing the importance of harmonizing European and non-European commonalities and divergencies to tackle the IR literature's singular and exclusionary theme. It is a prerequisite to understanding the birth of IR as a Eurocentric construction; otherwise, it would lead to anti-Eurocentric Eurocentrism in the following theorizations (Kuru, 2016: 363). However, it does not need to sink into pessimism so much due to the decreasing effect of Eurocentrism in the literature with the help of anti-Eurocentric critical reactions and global transformations in the theory-making process (Kuru, 2016: 363). So, it is crucial to extract Eurocentric views from our way of thinking first individually, then, as a whole academic sphere, to challenge the exclusionary knowledge production and to deconstruct this Eurocentric construction in the structure of the IR literature (Capan, 2017b: 7-9).

In sum, from the 1980s and onwards, there has been an increasing tendency for appealing to non-European texts, ideas, and cultural norms in the IR literature. This transformation is not only limited to non-European societies but also valid for IR scholars in Europe. While ancient sources of Greece and its famous researchers maintain its prominence in contemporary IR, there has been a clear orientation towards non-European transformation in the theory-making stage (Kuru, 2016: 366). In order

to have a multicultural understanding and theory-construction in IR, harmonization of both European and non-European perspectives is needed rather than relying on a singular viewpoint in the post-modern world. Although Eurocentric conceptualizations have lost its previous effect on the contemporary International Relations literature and started to be challenged by anti-Eurocentric alternative reformations in the Western hemisphere, some scholars in non-European countries are still more inclined towards previous Eurocentric theories and their concepts (Kuru, 2016: 374). This is because those scholars must read the older works to acquire a broader status and they need to prove their knowledge through analyzing those existing resources (Kuru, 2016: 374). Then, it would be not wrong to claim that some non-European researchers and societies have a less critical agenda for Eurocentric constructions because of the lasting consequences of Eurocentric dogmas, policies that have been directed upon them since the 15th century. At last, to deconstruct Eurocentric structure both historically and theoretically, we need to acknowledge that there is not a singular Eurocentrism in the IR literature. It needs to build effective policies to analyze comprehensive frameworks within the Eurocentric structure, and alternative perspectives all-around the world.

1.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter mainly relied on the general and shared understanding of Eurocentrism and comprehensively analyses the ways and methods of IR scholars used when they are studying Eurocentrism in IR literature. It tried to understand the roots of Eurocentrism in the literature by looking at different sources from different geographies. Another crucial point which this chapter illustrated was to grasp the real effects and consequences of the usage of Eurocentric discussions and notions in IR literature. On this basis, this research aimed to analyze whether Eurocentrism is criticized through the work of IR scholars or not and their capability to visualize a better future for a non-Eurocentric theorization. Another essential point was to show the works of better ways of understanding Eurocentric discourse in IR by offering visible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentrism in literature. Following these understanding, Eurocentrism was analyzed under three subsections, which were the brief history of Eurocentrism, the effects of Eurocentrism in the IR literature, and

finally, possible remedies to deconstruct Eurocentric values in IR. Besides, this chapter, in general, tried to find the best answers to those critical theoretical questions which are what the limits of being Eurocentric for IR theory are and what are the remedies proposed in the IR literature.

Regarding the central theme of this chapter which detecting Eurocentrism in IR literature and criticisms to this understanding based on post-development theory and alternatives to Eurocentric discourses, it concentrated on the historical basis of Eurocentric analyses and proposals about deconstructing Eurocentric structures and also critical analysis of anti-Eurocentric views for their possible alternative remedies. For answering the central theoretical questions, this chapter mainly relied on the opinions of Edward Said's 'Orientalism' (1978) in which he tried to show that Eurocentrism has been formed within the modern capitalist system, which exploits the rights of Eastern 'other' and makes them inferior society. To remove these prejudices, to deconstruct Eurocentrism and finding alternatives to development debate based on cultural needs is crucial. Another prominent figure in this research was Samir Amin and his book of 'Eurocentrism: A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism' (2010). In this book, he tried to show us that the power of schoolbooks and classification of language was not something we could ignore, because they were the instruments of cultural imperialism of the West and Eurocentric constructions in literature. These detrimental effects had been analyzed in two important spheres: research and teaching. So, this chapter sought to examine Eurocentrism in IR literature and looking critically at both Eurocentric theoretical formations and anti-Eurocentric efforts to challenge this view by focusing mainly on post-development understanding and alternative visions. This chapter is fundamental for critically analyzing and connecting the discussion of historical roots in development understanding in the first chapter and debate of Eurocentric constructions in development debate in the third chapter.

Finally, the historical research on Eurocentric structure showed that Eurocentrism could not be limited to the recent past; instead, it can be traced back to even ancient Greece and its perspectives over non-European people as it was discussed in the six essential milestones in historical transformation of Eurocentrism. Another point was to understand that before Eurocentric constructions, Eastern civilizations were superior to that European periphery at a time. Without acknowledging this, it

would not be possible to grasp Eurocentrism's real effects in the IR literature and historical reconstruction process. Besides, to deconstruct the Eurocentric narratives, it is crucial to know that there have been plural Eurocentric constructions and their transformative institutions in the historical process. This chapter tried to highlight the background of Eurocentrism's historical process and its effects on different societies in the IR literature. It also aimed to analyze possible remedies to deconstruct these Eurocentric perspectives by taking help from both Eastern and Western literature and scholars. The main argument of this chapter is that even if there are some limits on research and teaching spheres in the IR literature, it is still possible to present alternative ways and methods, like localization, harmonious and altruistic living, without relying only on Eurocentric ideals. So, in the next chapter, historical transformation of development understanding will prepare the stage for the third chapter by analyzing Eurocentrism in development debate and presenting alternatives to the development understanding.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT DEBATE

The meaning of Eurocentrism and its roots in the IR literature in the first chapter will shed light on the following chapters by grasping the motivators of development understanding and its Eurocentric formations. Then, this chapter will maintain the historical foundations of development debate. In the third and final chapter, Eurocentric construction in the development debate will be the basis of the discussion by linking the previous debates in the two chapters. This chapter tries to answer the question of what the main categories of research in development debate are historically after the Second World War. In the light of this question, this chapter aims to study different layers and transformations of development understanding through decades since the end of the Second World War. The main argument of this chapter is that the enlargement of development thinking with more complex issues, areas, and research categories does not mean to increase the effectiveness and capability of development.

In this chapter, firstly, the awakening of development thinking after the Second World War and modernization theory as the starting motivator of the development objective will be the focal point. The first objectives of development understanding as economic growth, industrialization, and foreign aid provides a clear roadmap for further development conjecture. In the second section, the dependency theory emerged with Eastern counterparts' help to make the first reaction against modernization theory. Dependency theory and its credibility were highly debatable, but it made people understand that there could be alternative viewpoints to follow rather than adapting one approach. In the third section, the phases of development debate after the 1980s under the shadow of neoliberalism will make the focal point of this chapter. These phases are sustainable development, human development, post-development, and global development, respectively. Sustainable development notion creates hope for a better future of development understanding, but it also had side-effects that could hurt the balance of development. Human development takes a more local-oriented stance and focused mainly on individual-self. Then, post-development, differently from all other perspectives, rejects the development process altogether to grasp the failures of

development projects. It seeks to find real meanings behind the current concepts of development. Finally, global development tries to show that the development path has been a bumpy road, and there are different stops on this road. All these stops contribute to the accumulation of diverse viewpoints to gather in global development in the 21st century.

2.1. REBIRTH OF DEVELOPMENT UNDERSTANDING AND MODERNIZATION THEORY IN THE 1950S

Most scholars share the view that development understanding arose as a new branch of modern economics after the Second World War, and structuralism had a considerable part in this transformation of development thinking (Lin, 2012: 1). Great Depression was a turning point in the 1930s for transforming development theory in the Western hemisphere and creating the terms developed and underdeveloped societies (Hettne, 1983: 253). This creation occurred mostly because of meeting the market failures of industrialized states after this 1929 crisis by intervening in those developing nations and enacting the interventionist state viewpoint (Mundle, 1993: 1879). As a result of the destruction of the crisis and giving importance to the state as the basis of economic and political development, Keynesian economic understanding came into prominence in political and theoretical spheres in the West during the 1930s (Rapley, 2007: 2). Development and industrialization were used as synonyms for the primary purpose of increasing the level of income and giving poor people the same opportunity to have access to some goods and services as in industrialized states (Rapley, 2007: 1). Similarly, the attraction of development understanding comes from its agenda of repairing old inequalities caused by Western colonialism and proposing a better future for all societies (Gills, 2017: 158). After World War 2, with the decolonization and emergence of newly independent nations, the idea of underdevelopment and the need to destroy it with development understanding arose, especially in the West (Bilotti, 2015: 206). Most of the literature and scholars share the view that Truman's speech in 1949 about the recovering underdevelopment of Third World to get rid of the threat, affecting both them and more developed states, marked the rebirth of development thinking (Bilotti, 2015: 207). So, development

theory was made an official agenda for the newly independent states after the decolonization period (Pieterse, 1996: 554).

The end of the Second World War resembles the rebirth of development understanding and trust in new development thinking, which even rapidly increased after the two world wars and the Great Depression (Knutsson, 2009: 8). The postwar development understanding in the West contained state planning and intervention with the goal of economic growth and accumulation as a part of the Keynesian theory (Pieterse, 1996: 548). Even though states in Eastern Europe and South Asia adopted the Keynesian understanding of state intervention for the development project, others went the different direction of embracing free markets as the basis of development agenda (Sodhi, 2011: 562). So, in the 1950s and 60s, generally, the central unit of development understanding was accepted as state and tools of development used by state authorities to have absolute power in the territory of a nation (Scholte and Söderbaum, 2017: 6; Sonntag et al., 2001: 224). From the 1940s to 1970s, diverse understandings merged into a common approach, the Keynesian Consensus, to put state as the promoter of national development (Bilotti, 2015: 206). In other words, development understanding became the mechanism of social reconstruction of economies and societies by interventionist and managerial projects (Pieterse, 2000: 182). Another point was the Marshall Plan, which marked the beginning of an international development assistance program as its successful implementation on transforming the European economy after the Second World War.

According to Hettne (1983: 249), modernization theory came into existence in the 1950s as a reaction to development economics from different social sciences branches. He maintains that modernization theory was born as a Western development project aiming to eliminate the dilemma of underdevelopment (Hettne, 1983: 250). So, modernization theory, historically, came out of the first industrial revolution in the West and then the end of Second World War the project which covered Asia, Latin America, and Africa as development economics (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 631). The formation of international organizations, like the United Nations (UN), World Bank, and International Monetary Fund (IMF), served the purpose of enhancing the project of growth in the old colonies by Western industrialized states, and the communism threat further benefited this plan (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 632).

It is also possible to say that foreign aid or assistance program of modernization theory into underdeveloped regions was part of the American political agenda to deal with the communist threat in these specific areas during Cold War (Hodge, 2015: 430; Corbridge, 2007: 180). Similarly, as John Rapley (2007: 1) mentioned, development became crucial after World War II, and international institutions, especially World Bank, were created only for the development tasks. Their main instrument was foreign aid, which was transferred to those underdeveloped states to obey the Western modernization and development understanding measuring with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita growth parameter (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 632). As already mentioned, development can be counted as equivalent to industrialization in the postwar period, at the same time, it symbolizes the road to modernity in which individual society became the focal point of projecting this modernity (Sonntag et al., 2001: 223).

The transformation of development theory after 1945 contained a fruitful amount of mixture of ideas and approaches, which all shared the basis of Western perspective and modernity for development. Most scholars see the 1950s and the 1960s as the climax of development theory, which reached a highly interventionist position at those times (Mundle, 1993: 1879). The reasons for these highly interventionist policies can be found in the parameter of economic growth in modernization theory as the measurement of development, social mobilization, democratization, and freedom (Sonntag et al., 2001: 228). The primary motivators of development are economic growth, interventionist policies, and the state's role in shaping postwar development thinking (Knutsson, 2009: 11). So, modernization theory symbolized the core development understanding by focusing on industrialization, growth, and state interventions, especially in those so-called underdeveloped regions. To grasp the core of modernization theory and development thinking, it needs to understand the work of Rostow (1960: 1) which clarified the importance of economic growth:

I cannot emphasize too strongly at the outset, that the stages-of-growth are an arbitrary and limited way of looking at the sequence of modern history; and they are, in no absolute sense, a correct way. They are designed, in fact, to dramatize not merely the uniformities in the sequence of modernization but also – and equally – the uniqueness of each nation's experience.

These five stages of growth are, firstly, the traditional society as agricultural-based economy; secondly, the preconditions to take-off as starting point of development; thirdly, the take-off as a short period of intensive growth; fourthly, drive to maturity as increasing living standards through time; finally, age of high mass consumption as the final stage of being developed (Rostow, 1960: 3). So, the analysis of Rostow for the development understanding can be understood as being modern to reach the standards of Western morals in terms of both economic success and intellectual capability. This understanding was probably the most suited conceptualization of modernization theory presented by Rostow himself (Willis, 2005: 40). As a result, modernization theory represents a social evolutionary process and betterment of societies with the vital role of economic growth for the promotion of development.

Apart from the positive aspects of development understanding and modernization theory, there have been four critical viewpoints that are crucial to mention in this section. Firstly, something was not natural about this new development understanding, which mostly relied on the historical background of Western capitalist states and their perspectives (Frank, 1966: 17). According to Frank, to abolish the chains of underdeveloped nations and build a future following their reality in terms of development, an integrated, historical, and structural understanding can be useful (Frank, 1966: 30). The modern development understanding emerged as colonial economics in the mid-1940s and the 1950s, which put industrialization as the basis of development, especially in the underdeveloped nations (Pieterse, 1996: 547). In other words, modern development theory came into the agenda to maintain colonial ties with the Third World countries by forcing them to develop without taking their ideas seriously. This new period of development after the Second World War permitted Western colonial states to continue their existence in the old colonies for extracting their natural resources and using them as the promoter of Western markets to enhance their economic power. (Ziai, 2016: 68). Similarly, development can be translated as the control of colonial resources without directly exploiting underdeveloped nations but making them economically dependent on industrialized states (Pieterse, 2010: 6). This new understanding differed from the old colonial relationship, not by focusing on political domination but by taking control of the social and economic spheres of underdeveloped nations.

Secondly, the criticisms clarify the relationship between modern development understanding in the newly independent nations in Asia and Africa and colonial period in the 18th and 19th centuries to reject this development understanding for being as a covering image of old colonialism which was known as ‘civilizing mission’ (Cooper, 2010: 8). Like these criticisms, Rajni Kothari (as cited in Pieterse, 2000: 178) claimed that “where colonialism left off, development took over.” This view can be understood as the lightening on the decolonization period in which development projects obtained the position of exploiting underdeveloped states by using cultural imperialism (Pieterse, 2000: 178; Hettne, 1983: 248). So, it is possible to claim that development history begins with the colonial era, and after the Second World War, development understanding became even more complex area (Cooper, 2010: 9). According to Rist (as cited in Pieterse, 2000: 179), development understanding symbolizes the “new religion of the West,” but the worship process is not limited to the West. This situation can be explained by the efforts of cultural imperialism held by European and American dominance, which put their priorities, interests, and programs as vital through denying the diverged multicultural reality of other nations (Sonntag et al., 2001: 235). This new development understanding gradually became more dangerous than the old colonial domination because, at least in the colonial period, the threat was evident and apparent. However, new development understanding does not show its dangerous features beforehand and then leach into society without them even noticing.

Thirdly, the rebirth of development understanding as improvement of underdeveloped nations after the Second World War caused new theoretical and methodological problems (Hettne, 1983: 247). However, this development understanding was nothing more than the hegemonic ideal of imperialism, which is detrimental to underdeveloped states. According to Corbridge (2007: 189), development thinking makes an illusionary promise for the Third World, which cannot be accomplished within the same development system. This project was part of a bigger plan which tries to eliminate divergent views about development and accept only the Western modernization as something to be worshipped (Sonntag et al., 2001: 246). This position can be explained by the hegemonic character of modernization theory, which was the one-sided scientific, ideological, and academic transfer of Western views to underdeveloped regions (Binder, 1986: 3). The historical

transformation of liberal development theory has been the representation of ideological extension of the American political system, which tries to justify its position by claiming to serve universality. In other words, in the conjecture of the Cold War, modernization theory intervened most of the political, social, and especially economic spheres of underdeveloped areas by forcing them to obey its procedures in a hegemonic way (Pieterse, 1996: 551).

The last critic was that development understanding had been understood as the continuation of hegemonic relations of industrialized states with their old colonies by using Eurocentric, interest-driven, and one-sided policies. Also, for Pieterse (2010: 16), development has always been a mono-cultural plan, and modernization and westernization can be used interchangeably, which owns a universalizing ideal. Ethnocentrism was another central policy of modernization theory, which was maintained by Europe and mostly the United States. In the academic circle, modernization theory became a theoretical starting point for the imperial policies of developing Third World (Cooper, 2010: 14). For instance, Hodge (2015: 441) call modernization theory a representation of a specific ideology, which has been the US's since 1945, and it has the power to transform the world by following economic and cultural theorization. Moreover, as discussed before in this section, modernization theory replaced the old colonial understanding held by Europe after the decolonization period, and it also stood as the alternative to the threat of communism. For Hodge, development thinking was the perfect cover for achieving the real objectives of Western society, and its construction lay in the years between 1945 and 1955. In other words, modernization theory can be called an American project to make the world more dependent on itself in terms of ideology, policy, and mostly economy after the end of the Second World War (Hodge, 2015: 450). Finally, modernization theory was threatened for the first time, and the dependency theory stood as an alternative development understanding focusing more on Third World perspective and exploitation of periphery by the core. The next section will analyze the dependency theory's main arguments and its position in the development debate.

2.2. DEPENDENCY THEORY

The main contributor to the dependency theory, Andre Gunder Frank (1966: 17), claimed that the situation in underdeveloped regions could only be understood by learning their specific economic and social history. In light of this view, to analyze their job better and create a useful plan for reconstructing their economy without depending on external development agents, the dependency theory came into prominence with counteracting modernization theory. Paul Baran was another crucial scholar who linked economic development with imperialism, in which Western states try to maintain their connections with old colonies (As cited in Corbridge, 2007: 182). To achieve this purpose, they invented modernization theory to formulate some new rules which Third World countries would obey. These dependency writers, as Baran and Frank, claimed that development could not be applied successfully to old colonial states or underdeveloped regions after the invention of the term by development theorists (Corbridge, 2007: 182). Another critical point was that modern development understanding caused more problems than it provided good because the continuation of colonial management understanding damaged the economic, social and political situation in the underdeveloped regions (Cooper, 2010: 21). So, the better solution had to be bottom-up approaches rather than directing rules which were not suitable to those regions.

For Baran and Frank, the situation in underdeveloped regions was the expected cause of the long-lasting colonial period and its exploitative program that destroyed the natural resources of those regions by the industrialized countries (Bilotti, 2015: 209). As a result, underdeveloped states came into an endless spiral that cannot be escaped because the dependent economic and political relations continue with the modern development understanding. Dependency theory stepped into development thinking for these reasons, and according to this theory, the liberal economy was the main detrimental instrument that needs to be replaced by the state apparatus (Rapley, 2007: 3). Because, for dependency theory, with market mechanisms, Third World countries could not develop their industries and infrastructure due to weak state initiatives (Rapley, 2007: 3). For Hodge (2015: 433), by the 1970s, development understanding started to shatter and became open to doubts with the increasing

diversity in underdeveloped states and emerging new understandings that had more expertise on the issue. After the crisis in the 1970s, development understanding retrieved from Keynesian state-oriented policy and focused on 'free markets' by the program of Washington Consensus¹ (Bilotti, 2015: 205). The situation in underdeveloped regions had its roots in the colonial background and maintaining economic, social, cultural, and political ties with developed and underdeveloped states in the new development system. In this structure, underdeveloped countries were programmed to be exploited and trapped into a dead-end road, and in contrast, developed states were becoming more and more prosperous in this new system (Frank, 1966: 23). So, the system itself did not let underdeveloped nations become rich or free; instead, these states were getting into a swamp that did not have a path to reach a better destination.

The 1970s also saw the end of the Bretton-Woods system, and the Vietnam War was highly problematic for American foreign policy and domestic situations, like economic losses and the death of many soldiers (Knutsson, 2009: 15). Additionally, innovations of new technologies and deregulation of markets in the 1970s marked the beginning of the globalization process. Due to the results of the Vietnam War, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) crisis, and establishment of the Non-Alignment movement of Third World, the voice of this region appeared to be more heard and respected (Knutsson, 2009: 16). With the help of the rise of power and unity of Third World states with the contributions of Non-Alignment Movement, Group of 77 and Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Organization, reformation in world economic system by adding underdeveloped regions' perspectives became crucial in the 1970s, especially with the program of New International Economic Order (Gills, 2017: 158). In this atmosphere, underdevelopment as the vital detrimental issue in development agenda maintained, and the dependency theory challenged this situation with its focus on exploitative relations between rich and poor states (Knutsson, 2009: 17). Dependency theory had successfully transformed the agenda and changed the scope from dealing with inequality in trade terms to exploitative relations under the development understanding (Binder, 1986: 24). According to followers of dependency

¹ The Washington Consensus as a term refers to policy prescriptions directing towards developing countries in crisis started by the United States at the end of the 1980s.

school, which originated mostly in Global South, modern development understanding causes Eurocentric formulation of economic, social, and cultural structure based on partial truths about Western superiority (Knutsson, 2009: 17). For this understanding, modernization theory cannot be used to analyze the growing disparity between developed and underdeveloped countries and the causes of poverty in the Global South.

Dependency theory is a debated perspective in terms of its contribution to alternative development initiatives if it needs to compare it with sustainable development, human development, local initiatives in the South, post-development theory, and global development. It has four basic arguments that can be vital to analyze its effectiveness and credibility for grasping the development problematic. Firstly, this theory rejects the main argument of modernization theory, which claims that domestic problems of underdeveloped states are the fundamental drawbacks to develop. However, the dependency theory claims that a lack of capital and international aid are the main problems of development, external to underdeveloped states rather than internal. Secondly, exploitative relations between the regions as core and periphery were quite crucial to be effectively responding to the problems of underdeveloped nations. Thirdly, periphery countries cannot make wealth for themselves due to the exploitative relations, and development in the core regions cause underdevelopment in the periphery because of the dependent economic structure. The last argument is that to delink the dependent economic relations with the core, the periphery should not follow the world market path and work for self-reliance (Hettne, 1983: 253-254). This argument is crucial to grasp the essential contribution of the dependency theory as presenting to delink from the capitalist system and following a socialist path for Third World nations to take their independence from Western states. For Amin (1990), delinking is a fundamental stage for actively participating in the international arena because the core states develop at the expense of the periphery. So, Third World states cannot follow the same premises of global capitalist development; instead, they need to pursue an alternative strategy that brings autonomy to the national development of these states. For Frank (as cited in Hettne, 1983: 255), dependent relations between core and periphery had completed its natural phase and became a challenging issue due to crises in the 1970s. Similarly, Amin (2010: 175) believes that the structure built

by European powers throughout history by forming a hegemonic capitalist development led to the emergence of two opposing sides as core and periphery. According to him (as cited in Gulalp, 1998: 959), this transformation would eventually upset the situation for the periphery who started to rebel against capitalist development with starting the Third World socialist transition. However, he remains to be skeptical about the socialist dream of creating one universal economy and achieving this equality dream; there needs to have a long way of transformation (Amin, 2010: 186).

Generally, the dependency theory pursues an external model in which instruments of capitalism pours into the periphery from the core, and outer regions are included in the world system (Pieterse, 1996: 552). Four critical points can be directed towards the dependency theory. Firstly, some scholars claimed that the dependency theory overvalued the external motivations, which can be explained as focusing more on foreign relations rather than relying on problems at the domestic level (Hettne, 1983: 263). The debate was the credibility of its answers and solutions to point the reality of underdeveloped states in terms of dealing with poverty and backwardness of these states and their citizens. The second critic is the school's weakness about not being a unitary voice towards explaining the problems of Third World states. Similarly, Bilotti (2015: 207) claimed that while dependency school gave importance to core and periphery relations and counteract the old theorization, it could not escape from theorizing within the same Keynesian Consensus focusing on state intervention.

Thirdly, dependency school was close to a nationalistic utopia with little beneficial theorization. Successful development examples in South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and others challenged the dependency theory's primary motivators. The tautological consequence of defining underdevelopment as a dependency and explaining it by again dependency overshadowed the credibility of the dependency theory (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 634). Lastly, the dependency theory did not manage to find any better alternatives to the development problem and end up being as only the critical stance rather than providing useful solutions to issues of underdeveloped regions. Because of the declining position of dependency school, neo-liberalism came into prominence in both the world-system and development plan in the 1980s. According to Pieterse (2010: 16), the importance of the cultural sphere in the development understanding stepped in as another version of development

thinking in contrast to the old belief in the modernization paradigm that it was just a drawback. Although the dependency theory has been criticized primarily for its failure to produce the practical solutions for the underdevelopment of countries in the South, it still stands as a crucial perspective that extracts the harsh polarization between North and South (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 925). The criticisms also cannot ignore the critical questions raised by this school, which were very crucial. The dependency theory challenged the traditional patterns of development understanding by its critical positions; still, it could not stop the rise of neoliberalism as the main development actor in the 1980s. In the next section, transformations in the development debate after the 1980s will be discussed by mainly focusing on the rise of neoliberal understanding and its newly initiated features.

2.3. DEVELOPMENT DEBATE AFTER THE 1980S

The success of the neoliberal economic project during the 1980s led to the decline of postwar development understanding, and hegemony of international liberal markets weakened the capability of national governments in the global structure by taking the position of primary provider in economic planning and social welfare (Hodge, 2015: 436). Due to inefficiency in the long-term state planning after the industrial development project, the creation of necessary resources fell short, and more wasted. So, it was a debate that this situation occurred because postwar economic success had exhausted its definite gains towards the end of the 1970s, and deficiencies in state-planning development became more apparent (Rapley, 2007: 3). The main target, economic growth, had to be reached through deregulation, liberalization, privatization, and decreasing the state's capacity to interfere in financial planning. Therefore, the status of the state was replaced by the market dynamics and international organizations as the main actor in development understanding. Another fundamental transformation was the abandoning modernization goal or withdrawal from reaching the standards of industrialized states as the primary motivator of development (Pieterse, 2010: 1, 7). This change in international economic position made the end of Keynesianism and victory of neoliberalism. Therefore, policy planners at that time concentrated more on macro-economic stability with its

instruments of the balance of payments, low inflation rates, and budget balance. Generally, the 1980s saw the advance of neoliberal understanding, which organized the rules and provided necessary instruments for dealing with the problems of Asia, Latin America, and Africa (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 635). In the 1980s, the mainstream paradigm of development issue transformed into the problem of exclusion from the global economy in which neoliberal understanding got the position of the main actor of development debate and caused the decline of dependency school (Knutsson, 2009: 24). The transformed notion of development understanding in the 1980s did not give up economic growth as the primary motivator of the economy. Instead, it altered the scope and instruments from state-dominated policies to free market and global trade paradigms (Knutsson, 2009: 25). This neoliberal turn in the 1980s made an enormous influence on the economic, social, and political spheres of life.

Neoliberalism can be understood as a theory of political and economic practices that presents that human capability can best be enhanced by freeing individual entrepreneurial emancipations and abilities within an institutional framework constituted by private property rights, free markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2005: 2). The state's role here is to support and defend the practices of the institutional framework without engaging in active participation. Moreover, neoliberal practices take part in very different areas as promoting education, media, financial institutions, powerful state bodies, and international institutions like the IMF, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO) that organize global finance and trade (Harvey, 2005: 3). Neoliberalism considers market exchange as a significant figure to shape all human activity, highlighting the importance of contractual relations in the marketplace. It emphasizes that peace and prosperity can only be achieved by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions and by gathering all human activity into the dominance of the market (Harvey, 2005: 3). The crucial milestone in the reinforcement of neoliberalism as a new economic theory was the enhancement of its policies in the United States and Britain in 1979 (Harvey, 2005: 22). Afterward, neo-liberalization has come to the meaning of the financialization of everything, and this increased the role of finance over all aspects of the economy, state apparatus, and daily life by emphasizing the importance of global exchange relations (Harvey, 2005:

33). Developmental countries began to apply neoliberal premises by enhancing competition between firms, corporations, and regional bodies, and they initiated the rules of free trade and depended mainly upon freedom of export markets in the international area (Harvey, 2005: 72). The Asian crisis in 1997 has boosted these developmental states to follow neoliberal policies in a more standardized fashion. Before this crisis, neoliberal countries have already given the IMF and the World Bank authority in 1982 to negotiate debt relief policies to defend the international financial institutions from any disturbance (Harvey, 2005: 72). Thereby, the IMF and World Bank have become the central bodies of the neo-liberalization process through structural adjustment policies to help those in need in mostly underdeveloped regions.

Washington Consensus, in general, has become as development policies that concentrated on privatization, liberalization, and macro-stability by applying the free market and minimized the role of state strategies (Stiglitz, 2008: 41). The Washington Consensus has mainly occurred to respond to the state's failures and ameliorate the market prescriptions. Nevertheless, it could not find the balance between state and market as overfocusing on the latter by taking the worst-case scenario of government policies and applying one size fits all strategies (Stiglitz, 2008: 43). According to Lin (2012: 3), the 'Washington Consensus' led to transformation from state to market autonomy in which there was a belief in free markets to automatically adjust and organize the policies of neoliberal thinking to deal with the problems of nations. For him, by denying the role of the state in this process, the Washington Consensus failed to deal effectively and rapidly with the construction of economies in specific countries (Lin, 2012: 3). He maintained that without government prescription, transformation occurs slowly or even never happens (Lin, 2012: 4). The Washington Consensus has tried to transform old practices of development and claimed that developed and less developed states differ from each other, mainly because of their resource capabilities (Stiglitz, 2008: 48). When the Washington Consensus policies began to bring more damage than good, it transformed itself by enlarging its policies through the Washington Consensus plus strategies (Stiglitz, 2008: 49). For instance, when the growth strategy failed to achieve its premises, other additional policies as competition prescriptions to follow privatizations of natural monopolies were initiated (Stiglitz,

2008: 49). So, the Washington Consensus strategy follows a never-ending path through changing its premises according to specific circumstances.

The structural adjustment policies marked the beginning of a new era where old development understanding was taken over by the neoliberal movement, and this movement inclined towards the position that all states should obey the rules of the global economy to survive without any exception (Pieterse, 1996: 542). The main argument behind these structural adjustment programs was their focus on more markets and less state, followed by almost all Third World countries at that time. The common belief in neoliberal understanding was that underdeveloped countries failed because of their wrong policies, and they could not survive if the state continued to be the main actor in development programs. Due to the sharp increase in the crisis of development in underdeveloped nations, substantial assistance from international development agencies like World Bank and IMF, which became the main actors in structural adjustment programs, was necessary (Pieterse, 1996: 549). Generally, there was a changing tendency towards international institutions rather than state dynamics in development understanding during the 1980s, and it consequently broke down the old system of Bretton Woods and led to the rise of OPEC. After the 1980s, structural adjustment and free-market liberal economy programs were accepted as the only road to follow with the growth of neoliberal understanding. These policies became as permanent rules and the compulsory path towards development by applying the neoliberal adjustments through authoritarian tendencies (Sonntag et al., 2001: 242). Even today, there is a highly debated issue, especially with China's rise and its complicated and mixed development program with the role of the state and its liberal market forces. The market-oriented policies of the 1980s could not be understood as permanent solutions. So, to maintain a successful transformation, it needs to be transformed along with the changing circumstances (Cooper, 2010: 16).

The neoliberal upsurge in the 1980s could not escape from criticisms, which can be gathered around six essential points. Firstly, the optimistic atmosphere in the previous decades about development understanding paved the way to more pessimistic opinions. So, this period after the beginning of the 1980s was considered as 'the lost decade of development' (Knutsson, 2009: 22). The one result of the advance of neoliberalism was to decrease in the multidisciplinary approach of development

understanding due to the loss of its specific character. This advance caused a downgrade of the method from multidisciplinary to a monodisciplinary paradigm in which universal and one-sided economic development rules prevailed (Knutsson, 2009: 23). Secondly, this approach resembles the old colonial understanding and new imperialistic development thinking in which exploitative relations maintained by powerful or industrialized states in terms of their standards to take advantage of the weaknesses of newly independent states. Thirdly, being squeezed into restraining monetary planning in the industrialized countries led to a gradual rise in the real interest rates at the beginning of the 1980s, and thereby debt crisis occurred. Following this incident, most of the developing states got drawn into the debt trap (Knutsson, 2009: 23). Also, the oil crises and international recession in the 1970s caused the loss of hope in the old development understanding and structural adjustment strategies of IMF and World Bank in the 1980s further affected social planning poorly, which people had believed in, with the wrongful market policies of neoliberalism (Cooper, 2010: 7). These IMF and World Bank structural programs were the creation of the 'Washington Consensus,' which enhanced their capability with the rise of neoliberalism; still, they created more problems for developing states, especially during the 1980s.

Fourthly, these policies did not always bring benefits; on the contrary, they contained more problems (Rapley, 2007: 3). Besides, the structural adjustment policies brought benefits only to those more advanced Third World states. Moreover, most of the disadvantaged countries in the underdeveloped region, which needed immediate help, did not take advantage enough from these programs and even got more harm than good (Rapley, 2007: 4). Fifth critic towards neoliberal upsurge in the 1980s as its lack of historical foundation that neoliberal globalization process was counted as equal to general globalization with the technological and economic transformation in that era (Pieterse, 1996: 555). This critic could be right to point out that neoliberal economic globalization occurred as something new and unique; still, this transformation resembled the old mercantilist ideas and colonial financial management in the past. The last critic is that neoliberal thinking puts some limits to what is imaginable or not and crossed lines for possible development policies and theorization, which could be the most crucial achievement of this understanding to become the dominant paradigm.

There were challenging parties, but no unitary or credible ideological alternative was healthy enough to counteract neoliberal upsurge. Nevertheless, the crisis in this new transformation occurred with development setbacks, the increasing position of international financial organizations, and clashes in underdeveloped states (Pieterse, 2010: 5). These neoliberal instruments forced some standards on developing countries in the South, which they did not have a similar experience before. With the implementation of European economic structure standards, these developing states were dragged into bigger and harder problems to solve quickly. According to Ziai (2017a: 2550), the idea of reaching total equality between developed and underdeveloped states was abandoned by the illusion of neoliberal development understanding with the 'loss decade of development' in the era of the 1980s. However, through the end of the decade, new concepts emerged to change the unfortunate failures of neoliberal understanding by focusing more on sustainable policies and a human-centric viewpoint. So, in the next section, two crucial mainstream concepts as sustainable development and human development will be discussed to highlight the transformation in neoliberal understanding.

2.3.1. Mainstream Development Transformations after the 1980s

The first efforts to propose alternative visions in the neoliberal paradigm occurred with the rise of the sustainable development concept. In 1987, 'Our Common Future'² was brought out to set a mission for respecting future generations by the efforts of sustainable development understanding, which was explicitly created by the commission (Knutsson, 2009: 24). This report aimed to stop unsustainable development policies and offer sustainable development understanding with the help of multilateral actors instead of national actions. Another crucial point is that sustainable development understanding concentrated on the significance of a global process but also supported local-oriented policies as an integral part of this process (Knutsson, 2009: 27). These local-driven policies are also familiar with alternatives to development, alternative development, and post-development positions that will be discussed in the following chapters. The new paradigms like globalization, sustainable

² Also known as the Brundtland Report.

development, poverty reduction, gender, and diversity were mostly acknowledged by development actors with the rise of awareness in sustainability and different viewpoints through the end of the 1980s (Pieterse, 2010: 11).

The 'sustainable development' understanding has been a highly debated concept because it has been used for very diverse economic, political and social interests by very different actors in contrast to its main developmental purpose (Knutsson, 2009: 25). According to Knutsson, the commission made a huge mistake by not considering the unsustainable economic growth consequences, and it even supported these neoliberal export-oriented growth policies as the main motivator of development projects (Knutsson, 2009: 26). Paradoxically, 'Our Common Future' could not predict that there were some limits to development even if it concentrated on sustainable development understanding. This common appreciation of sustainable development principles among development actors occurred just because development discourse was losing credibility after the crises in the 1970s, and there was an urgent need to find an alternative notion. Similarly, Sachs engaged with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and he found it as being continuation of same premises of traditional development understanding (As cited in Ziai, 2017a: 2553). He also claimed that development agenda after the SDGs maintained the mission of dominating developing countries through the sustainable development programs using quantitative data to put economic growth into an undeniable position for catching up with developed countries (Ziai, 2017a: 2553). Relatedly, Demaria and Kothari (2017: 2597) argued that there are five weaknesses of SDGs. Firstly, it did not have a comprehensive analysis of poverty with the historical background. Secondly, it ignored the detrimental consequences of economic growth with its limited enlargement capacity. Thirdly, it excessively relied on private capital for economic growth rather than democratizing it. Fourthly, cultural, and normative spheres had secondary importance. The last critic is that the localization and self-assurance process did not have a clear agenda in the sustainable development goals (Demaria and Kothari, 2017: 2597). These weaknesses of sustainable development and its challenging theorizations and practices led to the emergence of alternative conceptions in the 1990s, like human development. However, sustainable development

understanding still maintains its prominence mostly in environmental issues, especially in the European Union policies.

The second alternative effort is the human development concept, which came into existence in the mid-1980s as 'the enlargement of people's choices' defined by Human Development Reports of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Pieterse, 2010: 7). What meant by enlargement was to deepen development understanding and make it closer to individual perspective rather than relying on external definitions. The failure of structural adjustment programs of development paradigm, generally held by the World Bank and IMF, on underdeveloped nations led to the emergence of human development concept by UNDP's efforts at the beginning of the 1990s. This concept initiated a program that aimed to increase the quality of life by adding education, health, basic needs, and freedoms into the development agenda (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 926). These non-economic instruments were incorporated into neoliberal economic development as human capital by the efforts of human development understanding (Oslington and Mahmood, 1993: 634).

The end of the Cold War caused a transformation in the development understanding, in which the ultimate security problem was replaced by democracy and human-centered issues without forcing power-driven efforts (Knutsson, 2009: 30). However, this loosening importance of security paved the way to a different security understanding by the emergence of a new category of recipient states which needed immediate foreign aid by the development agents. This situation led to the reorientation of Western assistance flows from the South to the former communist countries in the East after the end of the Cold War (Knutsson, 2009: 31). The new era after the 1990s can be described as changing characterizations of wars and security threats in terms of actors, scope, and levels. These transforming security problems had threatened not just the nation-state but also individuals by both external and internal actors with the violations of human freedom and dignity (Knutsson, 2009: 28). These global security threats involved poverty, ill-development, mass migration, new diseases like HIV, ecological problems, human and drug trafficking, terrorism, political instability, and civil wars within the countries (Knutsson, 2009: 30). After the increased density in human suffering throughout the world, the weak state conception

occurred for identifying mismanagement of state apparatus in those states to protect their citizens from themselves and external threats.

Modern development understanding comprehended the view that development is a controlled mechanism by the human agency. In other words, the betterment of society or human beings in quality was possible through the problem-solving tool of a new era after the 1990s (Knutsson, 2009: 3). Nevertheless, traditional development understanding maintained the vital development problem as exclusion from the global economy, which had continued since the establishment of modernization theory in the 1960s. However, the difference lies in the consequences of this exclusion for global security, which was progressively recognized by the securitization of development paradigm (Knutsson, 2009: 32). This consequence was the possible threat of underdevelopment, which can cause the domino effect and, in turn, might affect the welfare of developed states. After the invention of the human development concept, governments in both developed and developing states had to organize qualitative spheres of life for their citizens by ensuring health care, education, environmental protection, poverty reduction, infrastructure, and providing macro-economic balance (Mundle, 1993: 1881). According to Amartya Sen (as cited in Mundle, 1993: 1882), a contributor to human development theory, democracy can be connected to the success of development as a necessary condition after the enlargement of development scale as including human-centered instruments into the measurement. So, the neoliberal market economy and state role were reformed by adding new responsibilities to provide individuals with basic human needs. However, the goal of economic growth is still the primary motivator behind development understanding, but it has new characteristics supporting poverty reduction policies and sustainable development projects.

Human development understanding succeeded in uniting growth and equality, as indicated in the Human Development Index, which was developed by UNDP. This index was based on measuring development by adding life expectancy, literacy rate, and per capita income into an agenda to counter GDP-based traditional measurement (UNDP, 1990: 16). In the neoliberal development agenda, the market was still the most prominent actor of development; yet, the construction of 'human development' as an alternative gave a specific role to the state in terms of providing basic needs to human

beings (Knutsson, 2009: 33). Through this human development understanding, the individual sphere was included in the development agenda in addition to global, regional, and local levels for providing necessary freedoms to people. The new development model after the 1990s had an impact on the whole society by introducing human development with the democratization of society, which meant to bring more freedoms to people, and the state regained its proactive position for the construction of the society (Pieterse, 1996: 556). According to Corbridge (2007: 195), human development understanding focused mainly on the lack of empowerment concerning basic needs. For him, the accumulation of wealth in the previous development understanding ignored different voices and viewpoints, especially against the benefit of poor people (Corbridge, 2007: 195). Relatedly, the disadvantaged people were caught in a trap that they could not avoid and dragged into even more profound and deeper while they were trying to get rid of it. The importance of individual well-being became apparent after the invention of human development theory and its penetration into mainstream development theory after the 1990s.

The rational-choice theory also tried to mediate between market and state in the transformation of development understanding by emphasizing community-based development, which was called 'civil society' in the 1990s (Hodge, 2015: 436). Similarly, development should be used to enlarge the real freedoms of people, which they can act according to their very own needs in human development understanding. Those freedoms can be summarized in five themes: economic engagements, political liberties, social initiatives, security, and transparency assurances (Sodhi, 2011: 565). These five freedoms proved that the development should be initiated and applied in a broad base attitude by adding those freedoms into the development agenda in which GDP was still the main instrument of measurement of development (Sodhi, 2011: 569). So, human development must be the final step of development road where people can feel real comfort and improvement because of the consequences of this development. The human development perspective was also used by alternative development understanding to counteract the neoliberal economic growth paradigm by using human-centered development to satisfy the basic needs of individuals (Bilotti, 2015: 214). From this perspective, the material wealth must be divided into all the participants of society and not just limited to a few wealthier individuals or businesses.

In an atmosphere where inequalities and poverty were quite common, and the system constrained the possible solutions to those problems, cultural and normative transformation of the human-self was needed (Bilotti, 2015: 216). Nevertheless, with the effect of globalization and the human development transformation in development understanding, foreign aid into developing states went up almost six-fold after the 1990s (Sodhi, 2011: 563).

The human development concept has its flaws, critically analyzed by opposing scholars in five crucial arguments. Firstly, according to Lin (2012: 2), developing states did not have the necessary strength and instruments to reach the economic and social standards of developed nations because of permanent poverty in the Western standards of development. So, the international aid community turned their focus more insistently on those countries to apply humanitarian plans, like investing the basic needs of disadvantaged people, but this, in turn, turned out to be a hollow plan in most of the developing states. For post-development scholars, these dreams of development proved to be wrong, and they even led to an increase in inequality, poverty, and generally in standards of living for those developing states (Ziai, 2017b: 2721). This criticism can be seen from two different angles because some states in the Global South were willingly participated in the developing program and wanted immediate help from Western developed states. However, others were given no choice to accept Western development thinking by rejecting their identities and cultures. Secondly, the neoliberal goals and dreams of permanent victory of liberal democracy and free-market economy in the international arena appeared to be causing even more damage to the system. Also, unequal conditions in the global world by letting harsh and endless competition for wealth and power become unchained (Gills, 2017: 157). In order to challenge this neoliberal economic growth program, to save the environment and to retreat from economic, political and social damages, there was an immediate need to turn to more locally based indigenous development by spreading it to the global sphere (Scholte and Söderbaum, 2017: 10). So, the human development perspective was not a new initiative that was already held by alternative development thinking, post-colonial theory, and post-development theory. Nevertheless, the neoliberal human development understanding was theoretically more successful than those counterparts and practically initiated their plans rather than just relying on theoretical formulations.

These plans were highly debatable in terms of their ambitions, solutions, and benefits to developing states.

Thirdly, the weak states created an ambiguous atmosphere in the international arena, especially after the end of the Cold War and led to the construction of the 'humanitarian intervention' concept to quickly intervene in those states by slacking the rules of intervention principle of UN (Knutsson, 2009: 29). This concept caused a harsh debate about the national sovereignty issue among the scholars, and when or how to use this concept was not clear, it eventually led to a policy of abusing states' and citizens' freedoms without permission. Fourthly, the human development concept could be interpreted as the continuation of old interventionist development thinking only with masking the old procedures under the name of sustainable development or human development (Knutsson, 2009: 29). The last critic is that human development understanding does not bring total freedom to individuals and the local level as the main actors of development (Knutsson, 2009: 30). They were just recognized more, but the real motivation behind development understanding prevailed as providing benefits mostly to developed states and their citizens. Developing nations still lacked the necessary equipment and instruments to develop freely without depending on Western-based development thinking. So, they securitized the development project to protect the ongoing achievements of Western development rather than rescuing so-called failed states from ill-development. In the next section, critical transformations in the development debate will be the focal point of analysis by stressing the importance of post-development contribution and global development understanding.

2.3.2. Critical Development Transformations after the 1980s

At the beginning of the 1980s, there was growing consciousness among people and scholars that development objective was misleading, and its premise of accepting a universal ideal about living well failed to grasp the reality of societies (Esteva and Escobar, 2017: 2561). These development projects' failures led to the emergence of Post-development thinking to focus on the needs of people by their standards rather than imposing on them (Esteva and Escobar, 2017: 2561). Post-development understanding had critical views about the Eurocentric features of development, which

was the common theme with the works of Gandhi, Ferguson, and Illich, and these writers were the early influencers of post-development understanding. Rist (1990), who was one of the prominent figures of post-developmentalism, believed that development itself has detrimental features, and its projects should be rejected immediately. Post-development thinking started as a critic of development understanding but eventually moved beyond the criticism and focused on dismissing the development paradigm altogether (Simon, 2006: 11). So, to grasp post-development better, it needs to understand its premise of ‘alternative to development,’ rather than ‘alternative development’ (Escobar, 1995: 215). What is meant by ‘alternative to development’ that post-development did not try to ameliorate old development premises; instead, it denied the whole development concept (Ziai, 2017a: 2547). In order to compare the post-development with other critical development understandings, like the dependency theory, which focused on international inequality or human development which concentrated on the needs of people, post-development differently shed light on the background of the programs of development and rejected it ultimately (Pieterse, 2000: 176).

By rejecting the whole development idea, Escobar took credit from a discourse analysis of Foucault and Said to analyze the ‘discourse of development’ and its linguistic, ideological power impacts over the development concept (Corbridge, 2007: 185). The studies of Foucault and Said can be counted as significant works that affected post-development thinking deeply in the 1990s (Hodge, 2015: 438). To understand the ties between post-developmentalism and the work of discourse analysis done by Edward Said, it needs to observe this passage written by him in ‘Orientalism’ (1978: 3):

Taking the late 18th century as a very roughly defined starting point Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. . . . My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse we cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage—and even produce—the Orient politically, sociologically, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.

This passage is the early critic of development understanding by the post-colonial perspective of Said, and post-development thinking took inspiration from this

understanding. However, post-development relies mainly on the deconstruction of traditional development understanding and focuses on the realities of Third World societies to grasp the main problem of these societies (Escobar, 2001: 153). For Escobar (as cited in Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 929), traditional development understanding applied top-down, ethnocentric, and one-sided policies that saw peoples of global South only as a statistical figure and cultures as abstract notions. So, it was not possible to understand the realities of those distinct cultures in the global South by the ethnocentric programs of development. Paradoxically, these programs brought more destruction to these regions, although they started the process by focusing on the needs of people's interests in the first place.

In the 1990s, there was a belief that development theory lost its ability, and it needs to start something new by rejecting the development ideal altogether. For this emerging belief, development has been the tool of European powers and actors to shape the world according to their viewpoints, and it is time to change this destiny by focusing on the post-development perspective (Gulalp, 1998: 957). Besides, scholars of post-development harshly criticized traditional development understanding and its practices, especially in the Global South. So, the enhancement of old development thinking can no longer be considered a credible actor in fighting poverty and underdevelopment (Matthews, 2008: 1035). Relatedly, there are four main reasons why the age of development thinking has come to an end asserted by post-development school. Firstly, since the 1950s, there have been worsening environmental conditions in the world, mostly caused by wrongful development policies and their misuse of natural resources (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). Secondly, with the dissolution of Cold War conditions, there was no motivative objective of the West to continue its ideal of development in the Global South (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). Thirdly, the widening gap between rich and poor states under the reign of traditional development understanding since the end of the second world war proved that the promise of development could not be realized by these traditional policies and actors (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). Lastly, there is a growing awareness among people that successful development means at the same time westernization of the societies under the leadership of global mono-culture (Ziai, 2017a: 2548).

As it was already mentioned at the beginning of this section, scholars that follow the post-development path believe in alternatives to development by focusing on local perspectives, grassroots movements, and the idea of deconstruction of old development understanding, especially in the beginning of 1990s (Escobar, 1995: 215). Escobar claims that reconstruction of development should be based on bottom-up approaches by integrating regional and local ideas to enhance equality, welfare, and participation in politics. For him, the transformation of old development understanding must be dealt with by destructing the one-sided, ethnocentric Western knowledge to include different viewpoints into the formation of development thinking (Escobar, 1995: 216). This transformation needs new types of power and knowledge construction processes to involve all participants in development reconstruction rather than sticking into mono-cultural ideals. Besides, post-development scholars believe that modern development understanding has ties with the Enlightenment period and European industrialism, which created the notions of economic growth, progress, development, and social change in the first place. In this respect, mainstream development thinking is Eurocentric because it arose in Europe and was created to deal with social chaos, poverty, and unemployment (Cowen and Shenton, 1998: 29). Traditional development understanding is mainly regarded as the recipe for the problems of poverty, inequality, underdevelopment, and social chaos. However, post-development theory problematized the very definitions of these problems, which were created by the Western development perspective in the first place to get rid of ethnocentric conceptualization (Matthews, 2008: 1042). Like the dependency theory, post-development scholars believe that much of the misery occurred in the Global South due to exploitative and oppressive relations. So, to ameliorate the condition in Third World societies, it needs to have a transformation in the relations between people and societies by involving more egalitarian and participatory perspectives (Matthews, 2008: 1045).

Throughout fifty years, there had been lots of transformations and enlargement in the development understanding, which began only as of the exploitation of resources after the colonization period and turned into something much bigger and complicated area. It covered traditional development paradigms, alternative development, sustainable development, human development, post-development, and global

development. However, the globalization process, especially after the 2000s, changed this atmosphere and challenged the traditional development understanding by forcing it to redefine its basic premises according to global development procedures (Pieterse, 1996: 541). Besides, the main actors and areas of interest were transformed by the social, political, and economic circumstances which occurred under the globalization paradigm. No longer the national sphere dominated the development initiatives, rather international, regional, and local areas became more crucial to conduct more comprehensive development plans (Pieterse, 1996: 557). In other words, this global transformation democratized the development agenda by involving different actors like the UN and other international organizations into the development program (Pieterse, 1996: 559).

After the Asian economic crisis in 1997, people in developing states became self-aware of the current situation, which had unequal conditions for accumulation of wealth in the atmosphere of free markets (Rapley, 2007: 7). Because this crisis showed that the world trading structure had worked for the favor of developed countries and inequalities between the regions in this crisis came to the light (Rapley, 2007: 7). Even more critical turmoil occurred after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in 2001, and this incident proved that security was still a crucial aspect for maintaining order with the help of nation-states. At that time, George W. Bush decided to follow a unilateral strategy that irreversibly changed the atmosphere (Knutsson, 2009: 34). The lessons were clear that neoliberal victory following the Cold War proved to be temporary, and now new threats emerged, especially in the underdeveloped countries, mostly because of failures of development projects in those countries. By counteracting the dominance of neoliberal thinking, they formed some terrorist organizations with the help of the globalization. This situation could be counted as a warning for the cultural homogenization process of development understanding, which accelerated after the globalization, and made regional or local spheres more visible (Sonntag et al., 2001: 242).

In most of the states throughout the world, the more welfare-oriented governments regained their positions with the help of the globalization process (Bilotti, 2015: 213). There was a highly debated issue about the situation in East Asia and Africa, where there was a huge difference in the development of those regions by

applying the same development instruments and how globalization took part in these districts due to impoverishment of some countries and the betterment of others. These inequalities between the situation in East Asia and Africa in terms of economic development was open to question and area of debate (Corbridge, 2007: 203). After the 2000s, development theory redefined its premises by focusing less on programs and more on the flexibility and adaptability and whether the state was necessary for development or lost its prominence (Rapley, 2007: 5). This changing character of the development theory can be explained by the transformation of development thinking following the changing atmosphere in the world in order not to attract more attention by the critical sides. The actors like World Bank and IMF formed the mainstream development body under the globalized world with the help of developed nations, and the WTO dominated the neoliberal trade liberalization process by emphasizing lower tariffs and abolition of trade barriers in the world (Sodhi, 2011: 563). For Rapley (2007: 6), the national development issue became useless with the rise of globalization and its focus on regional, local, and international spheres. This situation could be true for general tendency throughout the world, but not for the miracle of East Asian economies.

There is an interesting point which can be explained by the economic globalization that led to the connection of challenges against terrorism, the economic miracle in China, new exploitative development understanding in Africa, and increased attention towards climate change and destruction of the environment (Knutsson, 2009: 35). These diversified agendas implied the importance of admitting the global complexity in the new millennium. In this modern age, development thinking seemed to be transformed into something that favors the rights of the Third World, and international organizations showed critical sensitivity towards underdeveloped regions and their poor citizens. In doing so, development thinking became a more human-centric and people-sensitive approach in the globalized age (Rapley, 2007:9). Although development theory has transformed into some consensus from its starting point in the 1960s to the 21st century, it still relies on the role of political leaders, especially global leadership. In this atmosphere, the main problem of most underdeveloped states, and some portions of people in developed states, such as

poverty and oppression, should be dealt with by the policies of global leadership to overturn the previous conditions in the 20th century (Rapley, 2007: 10).

Millennium Declaration was a turning point for the new development assistance program, which was established in 2000 by the United Nations. This declaration committed itself to solving poverty, hunger, disease, lack of education, ecological deterioration, and discrimination against women. However, development aid programs alone cannot overcome the problem of underdevelopment, and these programs were just one issue among other issues in the relations between developed and less-developed states (Knutsson, 2009: 36). In the twenty-first century, the principal instruments of modern development understanding appear to be a mixture of the abolition of poverty, enhancing economic growth, human rights, democracy, and ecological sustainability. Development becomes more inclined towards local-based and indigenous development by focusing more on people-oriented policies. So, this modern development thinking relies more on diversity and differentiation of ideas by giving importance to local knowledge (Pieterse, 2010: 12). By increasing awareness of local experience with the global development perspective, intercultural dialogue with more equal power relations needs to be established with the help of multilateral global governance. This global development understanding was a bilateral process of dialog between all development parties to counteract market-oriented economic globalization (Knutsson, 2009: 39). The adaptation of the global development understanding into traditional development theory made it more complicated, multi-layered, and enlarged in terms of considering different ideas of development rather than focusing on a single approach (Knutsson, 2009: 40).

The enlargement of economic and market policies towards social and political organizations and cultural practices shows the changing circumstances in the development understanding. Accordingly, development thinking in the globalized world needs a multi-dimensional and comprehensive approach with more local initiatives (Pieterse, 2010: 14). This increased awareness of a holistic approach comprehends the importance of local, national, and macroregional spheres in addition to the international area with the help of international organizations like the United Nations. The brand-new complex issues and problems, which occurred primarily after the 1990s, have been gradually getting involved in the dialogue between governments,

organizations, and market forces (Pieterse, 2010: 17). Those old-colonial practices had already perished from the development stage by emphasizing more on the needs of human beings or individuals rather than just nation-states. Besides, the power of so-called Third World states has been growing, and their perspectives will matter the most in the future transformation of their societies (Gills, 2017: 155). However, there occurs another side of the coin in which the rising power of Third World states in the real transformative policymaking process remains limited in terms of changing the dominant power structure in the international development organizations (Gills, 2017: 159).

In the new millennium, global market programs have initiated a 'Post-Washington Consensus'³, that has taken control of development thinking. This new transformation maintained the neoliberal market-driven development understanding but added some critical solutions to solve the problems created by autonomous market forces, as giving necessary initiatives to civil society and governments (Söderbaum, 2017: 9). The Post-Washington Consensus presents detailed analyses of the Washington Consensus failures by concentrating on its misjudgments of economic structures in developing states and stressing narrow policies and limited prescriptions (Stiglitz, 2008: 49). The 2008 financial crisis⁴ led to awareness of the market-driven economy's failure, and it gradually lost credibility as a reliable policy for economic development. In turn, state activities became preferable again for the development policies due to this problematic situation in the market economy. This failing power of a market-driven economy caused an understanding that higher rates of GDP growth could not guarantee the success of human development and development in general (Sodhi, 2011: 565). Therefore, various alternative development understanding occurred after acknowledging the problems of traditional development thinking by initiating sustainable, human, local-driven, and endogenous development versions. There were also emerging alternatives to development from the global South like Buen Vivir and the post-development idea of the destruction of development.

To sum up all the critical views against traditional development and global development understanding is not easy. The fundamentalist reaction by critical

³ The Post-Washington consensus approach is created in a way that ensures its effects are long-term on the economy as supposed to the short-term effect of the Washington consensus.

⁴ This crisis affected neoliberal premises poorly and led to increase criticisms towards its policies

thinkers to the significant threat of development concept for the sake of earth and individuals had not started before the 1990s (Esteva and Escobar, 2017: 2571). However, it could be useful to categorize them under four main critical arguments. Firstly, despite many changes and crossroads occurred in development thinking since the 1950s, the same hypocrisy of one-sided Western development thinking continued (Hodge, 2015: 445). These transformations in development understanding were just seen as a perceptual masking project to attract more victims into development swirl, from which it was impossible to turn back into the previous condition. Secondly, traditional development understanding got exhausted and reached a dead end with the rapidly changing atmosphere of globalization in the 21st century. So, it needs to question the development concept altogether, like post-developmentalism suggested, to adapt contemporary problems of developing states and poor people and various issues more efficiently. These voices of counteracting the whole development concept and deconstructing it raised not just from developing countries but also within developed states. In traditional development thinking, the divergent, polyphonic, and unique voices of Third World countries were largely ignored due to top-down policies of Western so-called superior scientific knowledge. After the rising of dependency school, this one-sided viewpoint leastwise diminished in terms of seeing Southern ideas more in the development understanding. Other initiatives of the Global South as alternative development and human development enlarged the narrow developing understanding, and it led to increasing the awareness of failed efforts that had been followed by traditional development agents (Pieterse, 2000: 178).

Thirdly, the contemporary development thinking still lacks an inclusive, value-free, and globalized problem-solving mechanism, especially for preventing the rise of poverty and economic crises throughout all regions (Gills, 2017: 157). Nevertheless, the growing power of Third World states, more specifically China and India, since the economic crisis in 2008 caused a gradual reactionary movement against hegemonic views of Western developed states (Gills, 2017: 158). Only through global development understanding, including all spheres of life into the development process to make regions and local areas more autonomous in the decision-making process for their future, it seems possible to reverse the failures of development understanding. In order to deconstruct old premises of imperial policies of development, the whole

development agenda needs to be transformed into something utterly new and remote from unequal conditions (Söderbaum, 2017: 5). Lastly, the increased differentiation of actors, issues, and problems in development understanding makes it more challenging to handle development problematic in today's globalized world where the agenda of development has arrived into point of no return. These new problems as migration and environment started to become more crucial to deal with because no national borders can stop all dangers of environmental consequences, which have the potential to destroy not just the developing states but the whole world in the globalized system (Söderbaum, 2017: 8).

2.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter tried to shed light on the question of what the main categories of research in development debate are historically after the Second World War and aimed to grasp different stages and transformations in development understanding for analyzing it better to construct new realities. The main argument of this chapter is that the enlargement of development thinking with more complex issues, areas, and research categories does not mean to increase the effectiveness and capability of development. This argument brings us firstly to the discussion of the first chapter as understanding the meaning of Eurocentrism and its roots in the IR literature and then to the debate of the third chapter as Eurocentric construction in the development debate. The understandings of modernization theory, dependency theory, sustainable development, human development, and global development turn out to be an accumulative process of development goals rather than divergent interests (Knutsson, 2009: 38). So, deducting from these claims and practices occurred in the developing states shows that development understanding forces some top-down approaches with claiming to have a supreme or absolute knowledge about conditions of other countries outside of the Western sphere. Due to these unequal development phases in different regions and effects of globalization led to the emergence of critical thinking to counteract traditional development understanding in the 1990s and these voices were gathered around anti-globalization movements, and later as post-development theory (Rapley, 2007: 4). This school claimed that the poorest of the world became even

poorer, and the richest became even richer in the globalized world with the increasing gap between rich and poor. Only a small amount of lucky states in the developing region had the chance to increase their welfare by seeking optimum conditions. Besides, alternative development perspectives ended up being just as remaking of the same mistakes by concentrating on economic growth rather than using another symbol for development (Gudynas, 2017: 726).

To conclude, development understanding has attracted harsh criticisms as being the agent of capitalism and Western developed states for making it easier to exploit poor people who wish to become developed by the foreign aid programs (Cooper, 2010: 6). As seen by the unequal development conditions for developing and underdeveloped states, the economic growth has been largely increased while the disparity between developed and developing countries, and between poor and rich people both within and between states has been widening (Sodhi, 2011: 564). So, to enrich development understanding and increase its both normative and practical power, it needs to involve more actors with different perspectives rather than enforcing standardized and interest-driven approaches as they know what is best for those who need development aid. So, in the next chapter, harmonization of debates in both the first chapter and this chapter will be the focal point as highlighting Eurocentrism in development debate and presenting alternatives to the development understanding.

CHAPTER THREE

HOW EURO-CENTRIC IS DEVELOPMENT THEORY?

The previous chapter sought to analyze Eurocentrism in IR literature and look critically at both Eurocentric theoretical formations and anti-Eurocentric efforts to challenge this view by focusing mainly on post-development debates with post-colonial and post-structural insights. This chapter links this debate by primarily focusing on the issue of Eurocentric construction in development debate and its practices in the Third World societies. This chapter aims to answer the question of are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding without repeating the same mistakes as Western development did in the past. The main argument of this chapter is twofold; firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it stays on the same Eurocentric path. The second argument is that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project. To find a suitable answer to this question, the argument of this chapter will consist of four consecutive sections that lead to understanding the nature of the Eurocentric development debate and its criticisms. In the first section, the analysis of mainstream development about its Eurocentric transformations in both linguistic and practical spheres will be the focal point of discussion to understand its policies of development thinking. In general, this section tries to highlight the detrimental effects of Western hegemony, modernity, and capitalism through their hierarchical construction of an image that every society should oblige.

In the second section, possible alternatives to mainstream development understanding will indicate the main discussion about deconstructing the one-sided and Eurocentric development policies. These alternatives are not singular; instead, there are multiple versions of alternatives in different societies. In the third section, post-development criticisms against primary development understanding will be the focal point, and its prescriptions and policies for deconstructing the current Eurocentric structure will comprise the main topic in the discussion. After this section presents the proposals of post-development theory to deconstruct and reject old development

thinking, its solutions for reconstructing an alternative vision for Third World societies will be the main issue. Finally, the criticisms of the critical argument of post-development will be taken into consideration to understand all reactions both positively and negatively to post-development policies and its imagination to destroy mainstream development problematic. Besides, there is a critic directed towards post-development, which will be an essential analysis in this section that post-development theory might represent a continuation of Eurocentric structure while it has been trying to deconstruct Eurocentric development ideas.

3.1. TRANSITION TO EUROCENTRIC DEVELOPMENT DEBATE

This section aims to highlight the detrimental effects of Western modernity and capitalist development through their hierarchical construction of an image that every society should obey. Modernism or modernity constructed its image for the first time through European hands, so it can be understood as a Eurocentric building that has three essential dynamics: Unconditional belief in science; in progress; and material welfare in order to convince undeveloped people to become developed (Kanth, 2009: 2). This modernity understanding created a pseudo-scientific claim that those native populations with their unique linguistic and cultural existence should be dominated by the European development projects as if they were not independent entities before (Burney, 2014: 144). Being civilized had been a controversial concept since its usage in the colonial period and then modernization theory as opposed to primitiveness and ignorance. Modern Europe sees itself as privileged and civilized, which is why it initiated development programs towards non-European societies to enlighten them. At the end of World War II, the development of underdeveloped nations became the official agenda of Western agents to construct a Eurocentric reorganization of the Third World societies (Wallerstein, 1997: 30). So, Eurocentrism is not an understanding that came out of nothing; rather, it co-developed with the Western modernization process like capitalism, Orientalism, colonialism, and Westernization (Sunar, 2016: 3). Besides, the basic concepts of Western development as modernity, progress, and universal history constructed a standardized Eurocentric economic and political progress (Franzki, 2012: 2). Gradually, the belief in progress has become the

primary motivator of the development plan to give some hope to other societies for catching up or even becoming a highly developed nation. However, modernization approach could not succeed in transforming non-European cultures through its one-sided policies; but it laid the foundation of development initiatives across the world by making it more subtle than colonialism.

Five transitory movements have a crucial impact on the construction of Eurocentric development understanding. Firstly, the existence of Western hegemony in the discourse leads to the inevitable destruction of Eastern characteristics as Said's claim by creating the Other, which is inferior to European counterpart (Burney, 2014: 150; Nilsen, 2016: 275). In other words, Orientalism was a prior version of Eurocentrism, which created a hegemonic relationship between West and East by interfering with Eastern societies, defining their existence, and exploiting their cultures (Burney, 2014: 152). This situation eventually led to a false representation of East by West through modernization and development programs as reconstructing their way of life under the shadow of European image. The rise of capitalism coincided with the increasing effect of modernity throughout the world by showing instances of cultural-specific development programs, which eventually led to an asymmetric increase in the inequality between First and Third World (Amin, 2010: 8). So, the West created an unnatural development process as a universal path to be automatically followed by non-European societies (Hobson, 2012: 6; Kayaoglu, 2010: 206; Bilgin, 2016: 495). This creation indicates a hegemonic development understanding through shaping economic, social, and cultural characteristics of non-European cultures with the significant help of development language, which occurred mostly at the local level (Escobar, 1995: 18). This system organized a one-way ticket for non-European states that can never reach the Western standards and achieve the highest standard of development in terms of Eurocentric development understanding (Kayaoglu, 2010: 196). By grasping Eurocentrism's real power on the consciousness of people and societies, it is hard to look from different angles, especially for non-European cultures. This Eurocentric world-order prevented IR scholars from seeing the real needs of non-European societies and their local practices for their well-being.

Secondly, development economics represented the Western style of economics, which aimed to direct orders to the Eastern hemisphere. Development

agents followed their Eurocentric perspectives without considering local needs and cultural expectations while dealing with the transformation of the global South (Alvares, 2011: 79; Burney, 2014: 163). Eurocentric viewpoint takes Europe as the beginning and final chapters of developments, like democracy, freedom, and individual rights, and constructs a top-down understanding through one-sided development initiatives (Capan, 2018: 2). Universalist terminology creates a hegemonic understanding by ignoring diverse cultural thinking and applying Eurocentric cultural values to all societies. This universal truth claim constitutes a fundamental piece of Eurocentric development and discourse (Burney, 2014: 161). Without understanding the Eurocentric roots of development theory, it would not be possible to grasp the truth behind this hegemonic and ethnocentric development. Nevertheless, some development theories originated their focus outside Europe and focused more on exploitative relations and human-centric development, like dependency theory, alternative development, and human development (Pieterse, 2010: 9). However, these alternatives could not succeed in replacing Eurocentric development understanding and did not propose concrete solutions for the betterment of Third World societies by considering their priorities.

The third crucial point is that US President Truman's speech in 1949 indicated the starting point of development discourse by aiming to ameliorate Third World societies to protect the welfare of the Western hemisphere. With the help of the 1948 Marshall Plan and 1949 Truman Declaration, the development agenda turned into a more sophisticated level that incorporated Third World societies into hegemonic and universal belief systems (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 924). According to Escobar (as cited in Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 925), this transformation of development discourse after the world wars did not change the main motive of development and one-sided adaptations in the construction of the new world. In the postwar development understanding, different cultures and their local initiatives were largely ignored and even seen as detrimental to the central development paradigm of West. This development thinking has been a mono-cultural initiative with Eurocentric and Westernized historical and intellectual roots (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 927). So, Eurocentric development understanding focused mostly on the needs and priorities of European societies at the expense of other cultures by using imperial and hierarchic

management methods in different levels of development. The military technology of the West also helped a lot to intervene in those non-European countries and made it easier to construct universal and Eurocentric development understanding (Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 621).

Fourthly, the ongoing policies and practices of development have not generally improved human beings' well-being, especially in the Third World societies due to Eurocentric, hegemonic and exploitative character of development (Ziai, 2013: 123). The development initiative has indicated Eurocentric models where Western societies are developed, complete, and mature compared to other cultures that are incomplete and underdeveloped (Ziai, 2013: 128). This situation necessarily framed those societies linguistically as lacking, backward, and inferior to European counterparts, and eventually, this image became a fundamental and irrefutable reality. There have been different stages in the development understanding from modernization theory to the neo-liberal or globalized development of the 1980s. These transformative stages proved that Western societies adjusted the policies of development and acquired new goals with the changing circumstance throughout decades. The general claim of development idea, which aimed to improve both European and other societies, has been cynical because Eurocentric development policies ignored the historical and cultural dynamics of other societies and caused unprecedented damage to Third World nations and people. With the increasing interdependent relations, especially after the initiation of development programs, societies in the East became gradually more dependent on development programs, and the development gap grew at an increasing pace (Buzan and Lawson, 2013: 621). This growing inequality had always been a part of development programs' consequences, but it gradually transformed into something impossible to avoid. In alliance with Arturo Escobar's critical viewpoint towards mainstream development understanding, the agents of development followed a hierarchic and ethnocentric policy, which brought nothing more than misery to Eastern societies.

Lastly, Eurocentric development presents a singular path for how to develop economically, politically, socially, and culturally rather than building multiple approaches that embrace different viewpoints at the same time (Dirlik, 1999: 11). The development policies have been constructed upon reliance on European

conceptualizations, research techniques, and mono-cultural universalism while ignoring diverse societies and their historical realities to justify European right to reconstruct non-European cultures. It is crucial to question the dominance of Eurocentric representation to grasp the real problems behind the one-sided historical creation (Dirlik, 1999: 11). Therefore, development planners and professionals created some abstract needs, like to modernize, to democratize and to capitalize, to highlight what is crucial for local people and shape their past, present, and future through those artificial policies to develop (Cavalcanti, 2007: 87; Brohman, 1995: 122). In this situation, Eurocentric development or modernization aimed to transform the realities of non-European societies by creating a mono-cultural reality and making the history of Europe as the ultimate reality of all communities in the world (Cavalcanti, 2007: 88; Brohman, 1995: 126, 128). So, a pseudo-scientific reality was created by Eurocentric development initiatives to enforce other societies to believe in one type of history, culture, progress, and a single truth. In this way, there would be no objection to this Eurocentric understanding because reality would become blurred. Overall, this Eurocentric development thinking absorbed the historical facts of developing states and made alternative formulations invisible under the shadow of universal progress.

According to Amin (2010: 177), the dominance of capitalism both ideologically and culturally cannot be limited only to Eurocentrism because it is just a one piece of grand picture of development. Another crucial part of this ideology can be said economism through subtle policies of progress and growth (Amin, 2010: 177). Eurocentric and universal claims of development thinking in the capitalist understanding are controversial to each other because Eurocentrism mainly focuses on a specific culture, which is European (Amin, 2010: 178). As a result, the Eurocentric structure makes it impossible to think of an alternative future for other societies outside of Europe (Amin, 2010: 180). This line of understanding eventually created a forceful atmosphere where all participants must obey and fulfill the objectives of development and capitalism in general. However, there has been increasing critical voices to challenge the dominance of this Eurocentric structure, which indicated new imperial understanding by formulating one-sided, cultural-blind policies of development (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 927). So, it seems inevitable to follow a Eurocentric

pathway without acknowledging different viewpoints unless challenging the whole development paradigm by focusing on local initiatives of every culture.

General understanding about the end of the development era has occurred since the 1990s, and the idea to deconstruct development altogether has started to flourish due to its Eurocentric notions. This challenge to Eurocentric understanding mainly comes from post-development theory, which sees mainstream development projects as ideological tools of European societies (Gulalp, 1998: 957). From the beginning of development understanding since the 1950s, the main objective stands still as the transformation of world affairs through European lenses and its duplication over the world like it happened with the modernization theory, dependency theory, and neoliberalism (Gulalp, 1998: 957). The dependency theory stands here because while contradicting mainstream development, it also shares the main parities of it as aiming to achieve economic and technological development (Gulalp, 1998: 957). This objection claims that all development theories share the joint mission to dominate other societies even if they have different strategies in different areas. Eurocentrism has made a clear position in this development thinking as making European superiority something to be obeyed and blaming other societies for not replicating the same procedures in the Western development understanding (Amin, 2010: 185). So, Eurocentric structure has constructed universal claims to not see anything besides cultural-specific development paradigms and modernity, and it helped abolish local civilizations with their unique ideas, beliefs, and cultures.

The highly problematic issue about the Eurocentric constructions in the knowledge and power structures of the world is its capability to constraint the very possibility of critique by cutting out the voices of other societies through both subtle and direct policies. Nevertheless, there are some new efforts to challenge and transform the Eurocentric development understanding with the increasing awareness in alternative visions and local norms to deconstruct mainstream development theory. The alternative versions to development understanding are quite diverse, especially in the global South, some of which are 'Buen Vivir' in South America, 'Ubuntu' in Africa, and other various indigenous movements that aim to construct a more bottom-up approach (Ziai, 2013: 134). In the next chapter, the more detailed analysis of

alternatives to development understanding will be the main topic to challenge traditional Eurocentric development understanding.

3.2. ALTERNATIVES TO EUROCENTRIC DEVELOPMENT DEBATE

It is essential, firstly, to differentiate the concepts of alternative development and alternative to development. Alternative development does not reject mainstream development but tries to ameliorate it in the same conjecture to develop Third World societies (Saffari, 2013: 46). Dependency theory, sustainable development, and human development can be the examples of alternative development understanding because they represent the same direction with the mainstream development thinking as discussed in the second chapter. However, the alternative to development, which is supported by critical scholars and post-development thinkers, put forward the total deconstruction of mainstream development understanding (Saffari, 2013: 46). The later version will be issued in this chapter to highlight different alternatives in the Global South and their effect on traditional development understanding. Alternatives to the development concept try to show the exploitative relationship between Third World and European societies, which have a hegemonic connection through top-down policies of development (Saffari, 2013: 48). Advocates of alternatives to development also make critical statements about alternative development concept which remains under the shadow of same Eurocentric development understanding and aims to arrive at the same direction of modernity by using different methods (Saffari, 2013: 48). For presenting real alternatives to development, it is crucial to support local initiatives under the various versions rather than maintain the same development concept.

Before starting to offer some alternative solutions to the development problem, it is crucial the question Eurocentric history-making processes and the superiority of European policies (Sunar, 2016: 7). For achieving this, rewriting history is vital to focus more on the needs of non-European societies and their historical background rather than solely relying on Eurocentric discourse (Sunar, 2016: 9). Criticisms of development thinking have a common claim that its instrument of modernity represents a subtle ethnocentric viewpoint, which contradicts with its universal understanding (Sunar, 2016: 13). To undo the mistakes of mainstream development programs, supporting local, regional, and global indigenous movements and especially

the international solidarity movement is fundamental for the betterment of disadvantaged and underprivileged societies of the world (Saffari, 2013: 50). Localness is the most crucial aspect of alternative visions to development understanding because it challenges the universal concepts by emphasizing different cultural characteristics (Picq, 2013: 449). Supporting the local practices is much more beneficial than directing top-down policies of development without learning the realities within those societies (Matthews, 2008: 1044). The precise contribution of local initiatives is to emphasize cultural facts and flexible adaptations of them into alternative policies to mainstream development understanding (Simon, 2006: 17). By achieving this, individuals would have more widened and complex viewpoints about the way of life through specific circumstances. Besides, there are more beneficial aspects of bringing alternative visions into development understanding as recognizing multiple views to be more respectful to the ecological sphere and enhancing the plurality rather than enforcing ethnocentric perception (Simon, 2006: 18). So, this plural understanding can create more harmonized viewpoints and strategies to initiate a non-Eurocentric structure and help to promote North-South and South-South dialogue, as opposed to Western monologue, that can create a significant impact on the deconstruction of Eurocentric understanding.

Unfolding the Eurocentric development discourse can be the first step to transform a narrow understanding of history, international relations, and subjective capacities of previous development initiatives (Nilsen, 2016: 270). Breaking ties with Eurocentrism, Enlightenment, and their dominant discourse contains going back to traditional and locally sensitive methods to regain national autonomy from dominant development discourse (Kanth, 2009: 239). According to alternatives to development understanding, major civilizations had existed in the Global South, like Egypt, when the European continent was periphery at that time (Conner, 2011: 5). This situation can explain non-European cultures' motives for presenting alternative formulas to deconstruct European cultural dominance. Besides, to counteract the Eurocentric viewpoint, Afrocentrism can be initiated to support the perspectives and needs of African societies, and this understanding claims that African civilizations have their sui-generis histories apart from European universal history discourse (Conner, 2011: 6, 16). In this respect, deconstruction of Eurocentric development understanding is

central to all alternative visions to make non-European societies more involved in the reconstruction process. According to Duzgun (2018: 289), anti-Eurocentric approaches follow an integrative and inclusive policy that includes both European contributions and non-European characteristics to construct a broader understanding between and within societies. European construction of superior understanding is not an acceptable formula for other societies any more due to the detrimental consequences of previous development programs as it can be seen in the growing disparity between regions, increasing inequality and disappearance of alternative visions. That is why alternatives to development understanding have been trying to succeed in the deconstruction of old premises that makes European programs, discourses, and achievements as necessary formulas for the betterment of Third World societies (Duzgun, 2018: 293; Rapley, 2004: 351).

The vital figure of Third World societies, Nehru, helped to initiate an Inter-Asia conference in Delhi in 1947 which was a crucial step to question the old premises of colonialism and centrality of Europe in international relations (Mazower, 2014: 309). This conference aimed to challenge the British hegemony in India and highlight the fundamental aspects of Asian civilizations. Another prominent figure was Gandhi, who started a rebellion against Eurocentric structures and their hegemonic policies towards Eastern societies. Thoughts of Gandhi, also, inspired post-development thinking that aims to deconstruct development understanding. A critical contribution, here, also came from Said's work which questioned the exploitative relations between West and Orient, and construction of a wrongful image of East in the minds of Europeans (Burney, 2014: 163). So, the alternative to development thinking shares an anti-development enthusiasm to show the structural violence, environmental crises, cultural destruction, exploitation, dependency, and economic interventions of Eurocentric development (Simon, 2006: 11). Acquiring an understanding of going beyond the Eurocentric historical construction of international structure helps to embrace multicultural and diversified knowledge systems worldwide (Kayaoglu, 2016: 214). Counteractions of indigenous groups and solidarity movements can help to initiate localized solutions to the problems of Third World societies and the construction of pluralistic alternatives to the old development concept (Escobar, 1995: 216). With the booming voices of alternatives to development, the power of indigenous

struggles in the international structure has grown enormously, and their existence has started to be more recognized (Nilsen, 2016: 280).

According to Brohman (1995: 122), finding answers to development problems is not accessible due to its changing characteristics through time and space; therefore, alternatives to development must consider plural historical and theoretical development processes. Different policies should be maintained for different countries and periods to grasp ongoing transformations in knowledge production of development understanding (Brohman, 1995: 124). This indication means that every redefinition of development concept causes the creation of new problems and, therefore, new solutions to answer those problems. To grasp the reality of Third World societies, a new understanding of indigenous development has gone onto the stage that covers the different roadmaps of development in very different countries rather than following only one historical experience (Brohman, 1995: 132). Therefore, two steps are vital to create a more harmonious development understanding. Firstly, deconstruction of contemporary Eurocentric and hegemonic development thinking is a must to extract the true motives of Third World cultures (Brohman, 1995: 132). Secondly, the reconstruction of a new development understanding is fundamental to highlight the different needs and cultural interests of different societies in the East (Brohman, 1995: 132). This transformation of the new paradigm will not produce one universal policy, but rather polycentric reconstructions that reflect different local initiatives of every country. So, there has not been a comprehensive answer to the problems of Third World societies from the perspective of alternatives to development, and this might be the real solution because there cannot be an ultimate solution to very different problems in very different societies.

Post-colonial studies cannot be ignored in the construction of alternatives to development understanding because it firstly denied the Eurocentric structure and partial history-building process. These studies aimed to reorganize the one-sided historical construction to benefit local societies and enhance different development strategies in different cultural atmospheres (Dirlik, 1999: 23). Other contributions came from postmodernism, feminism, and various cultural studies, all of which criticized the concept of development and tried to show its failures and wrongful policies followed in developing countries. These studies mostly took part in

deciphering the exploitative and dominative discourse of development as representing the Third World societies (Cavalcanti, 2007: 89). So, this realization helped us understand that certain biased concepts and norms in the development thinking organize power relations in Western countries. In addition to present practical solutions for the needs of Third World Societies, it is equally essential to transform the way of living and to understand world affairs because changing the Eurocentric theorization of development would help to respond to the needs of disadvantaged people and societies more efficiently (Matthews, 2008: 1041). Therefore, both abstract and concrete reformulations of Eurocentric development understanding is needed to undo the universalized constructions of the concepts and strategies.

In the post-colonial world, a person or a state cannot ignore the lives of other societies and their right to exist in the same multicultural world because increasing interdependencies and globalization, especially since the 1980s, have made the international atmosphere more open to alternative pieces of knowledge. There have been various critical studies that raised questions to the dominant development paradigm in different tones. One of them was the dependency theory, which mostly focused on exploitative relations and global inequality; another was human development mainly addressed the issue of focusing on individual needs, and finally, post-development presented the destruction of old development understanding and building local-sensitive initiatives (Pieterse, 2000: 176). So, to build our future, it needs first to consider our past rather than relying on Eurocentric structural adjustment programs, which were carried out in the 1980s by World Bank, and then understand the failures and dangers of those mono-cultural development policies. Some successful indigenous reconstruction policies rise in the Global South to counteract the hegemonic viewpoint of development thinking, like 'Buen Vivir' in Latin America, 'Ubuntu' in Africa, and inspirational 'Zapatista movement' in Mexico. For their relatively more successful responses to traditional development understanding, it is crucial to mention them briefly in this section. However, this does not mean that alternatives to development are limited to only those three examples.

In Latin America, there is a belief that environmental destructions and shortages of natural resources are not due to high population growth, but because of luxury consumptions in the developed nations (Svampa, 2019: 19). This understanding is

central to almost all anti-development parties because developed states absorb most of the world's natural resources regardless of the needs of other societies. Critical stance in Latin America was born with this view and then expanded to other areas like common goods, ethical living, food sovereignty, environment rights, autonomy, and interrelated knowledge systems, all of which are part of the post-development world (Svampa, 2019: 21). Buen Vivir represents the post-development understanding in Latin America with a particular focus on living well in this intercultural world. This viewpoint puts a highly radical perspective of an indigenous alternative to question the premises of mainstream ethnocentric development understanding (Chuji et al., 2019: 111). Buen Vivir embraces different perceptions particular to each social, political, historical, and cultural context, and it presents harmonization of indigenous concepts with a critical stance towards modernization (Chuji et al., 2019: 111). This alternative vision questions the norms of progress, universal history, and economic growth of development understanding by focusing on multiple, parallel, and interrelated historical initiatives (Chuji et al., 2019: 112). Besides, it rejects all sorts of colonial and imperial relations and follows an intercultural understanding instead of multiculturalism to grasp the plurinational vision without falling into the trap of globalization.

It is essential firstly to understand the origins of Buen Vivir. Its inspiration takes place in ancient philosophies and cosmologies of life where development as a term does not exist in the literature (Walsh, 2010: 19). The richness of the concept is hard to decipher into English. It widens the meaning of quality of life as something achievable only within a community that has an ultimate connection with Nature (Gudynas, 2011: 441). In this respect, this concept is not limited to one definition, but has various interpretations relying on cultural, historical, and natural atmospheres (Gudynas, 2011: 441). At the first stage, Buen Vivir was an independent concept from post-development understanding, but they have an enormous resemblance, which they both offer a revolutionary deconstruction of cultural-specific development understanding (Gudynas, 2011: 442). There are different versions of Buen Vivir, one of which was the Ecuadorian concept 'sumak kawsay' that aims to establish a completed life in a community connected with other people and Nature. Besides, a different version of Buen Vivir also occurred in Bolivia with a similar concept under

the name of 'suma qamana' (Gudynas, 2011: 442). These versions attracted more and more people in a short period and received widespread social, cultural, and political support. They presented vital roadmaps to undo the development concept's failures and find alternatives within a pluricultural environment (Gudynas, 2011: 442). This enlarging capacities of the premises of Buen Vivir found itself a place in the new Constitutions of Ecuador in 2008 and Bolivia in 2009 (Gudynas, 2011: 442). This incorporation of the goals of Buen Vivir into those two constitutions marked a political reaction towards the neoliberal financial reforms in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Gudynas, 2011: 442). These constitutions have different settings, while Bolivian one took Buen Vivir as an ethical process Ecuadorian one resembled a more substantial case because of its plural set of rights (Gudynas, 2011: 443). This situation shows that Buen Vivir, as an alternative approach, does not follow a single prescription because it has multiple interpretations responsive to cultural differences.

These interpretations of Buen Vivir are quite the opposite of Western modernity because they have emerged as representations of decolonial attempts to enrich their cultural identities (Gudynas, 2011: 443). However, Buen Vivir does not mean to go back to the ancient past or pre-colonial times, and it is not a stable term, but an evolving process that can change through time and space. All these diverse opinions about Buen Vivir are specific to each culture with unique linguistic, historical, social, and political atmospheres, and it is not plausible to apply Buen Vivir to other regions (Gudynas, 2011: 444). Each region should find its interpretation and build their own Buen Vivir without relying on a single understanding. Nevertheless, five shared views can present a clarification for thoroughly grasping the meaning of Buen Vivir, although it has multiple interpretations in different locations. Firstly, Buen Vivir is a concept or area where critical ideas about development understanding are shared (Gudynas, 2011: 445). Secondly, Buen Vivir encourages to go beyond Eurocentric understanding by exploring alternatives to development and deconstructing colonized minds (Gudynas, 2011: 445). Thirdly, Buen Vivir acknowledges the internal plurality of conceptions without any hierarchies within them, and it follows an intercultural mission rather than a liberal multicultural understanding (Gudynas, 2011: 445). The fourth shared view is that Nature is an inseparable part of the society in contrast to the dualism between Nature and Society

(Gudynas, 2011: 445). Lastly, Buen Vivir is not merely a material understanding; it is a common understanding about sharing feelings and affections (Gudynas, 2011: 446). Overall, Buen Vivir respects the indigenous movements with their rights to become autonomous in contrast to the neoliberal understanding of suppressing indigenous people in where traditions and cultures are impediments to development (Giovannini, 2015: 83). These indigenous movements support the localization process by defending their cultures and territories with a post-development tune. In short, Buen Vivir is an ongoing proposal of alternative understanding, which includes both critical insights to European development thinking and constructive perspectives, including different viewpoints by highlighting cultural identity.

Another important initiative is 'Ubuntu,' which highlights the importance of interconnectivity between human beings and criticizes mainstream economic parities of the West (Bassey, 2019: 5). Ubuntu represents a rising African critical movement, and it focuses mainly on the relationship of human beings with other human beings and with nature (Le Grange, 2019: 323). For this African concept, humanness resembles the situation of being and a state of transforming rather than monotone living like floating over the sea. Ubuntu's main characteristics come from the expression of 'Umuntungumuntungabanye Bantu,' which explains that an individual's life becomes meaningful only if an interconnected relationship with other individuals would occur (Le Grange, 2019: 324). This argument means that every living creature in the world needs a companion to sustain a loving, caring, and meaningful life by sharing knowledge, ideas, cultures, and, most importantly, lives. This thinking contradicts with capitalist or neoliberal individualistic understanding on the stage of development and other spheres as well. According to Cilliers (as cited in Chimuka, 2015: 60), Ubuntu is a very complicated term which has various meanings like “a way of life, a universal truth, an expression of humanity, an underpinning of the open society, African Humanism, trust, helpfulness, respect, sharing, caring, community, and unselfishness.” He believes that the best interpretation of the Ubuntu concept can be humanity or humanness (Chimuka, 2015: 60). So, it is evident that Ubuntu has different versions in different cultures of Southern Africa. For Hailey (2008: 5), Ubuntu is the representation of African spiritual life:

It is a multidimensional concept that represents the core value of African ontology's – such as respect for human beings, for human dignity and human life,

collective sharedness, obedience, humility, solidarity, caring, hospitality, interdependence, and communalism. While these are all values that are valued in the West they are not emphasized to the same extent. In the West, we might talk of “I think therefore I am” whereas the Ubuntu version would be translated as “I am human because I belong”. Thus, Ubuntu can be seen as a radical reflection of our humanity, yet also has the universal appeal of traditional community values.

Ubuntu offers an alternative vision focusing on community strength by achieving success and happiness through communal life, self-sacrifice, altruistic living, and community loyalty (Fagunwa, 2019: 4). The relationship between an individual and the community under Ubuntu is about interdependence and mutual nurturing. Ubuntu as a worldview did not just occur because of colonial domination and marginalization of African society, still it has got a positive meaning during African nationalist movements as a philosophy of liberation and a vision of a better future (Chimuka, 2015: 70). It also represents a unique antiapartheid movement in which people and communities struggle for a peaceful, non-violent, and non-racial South African alternative vision to overcome inequalities and failures of previous projects (Swanson, 2007: 61). There are two compelling visions of Ubuntu, one of which is a philosophy and worldview, and the other one is a humanistic ethic (Chimuka, 2015: 70). As a philosophy, Ubuntu represents a humble attempt by Bantu speaking cultures of Southern and Central Africa to protect their identity, which had been crushed by colonial and imperial understandings (Chimuka, 2015: 70). So, Ubuntu indicates the mission of both scholars and communities to reconstruct and highlight the importance of the African identity through integrating different groups.

Ubuntu is quite an important concept as an alternative to development understanding because it has the potential to unite value systems and give autonomy to the oppressed people whose humanity has been in danger of exploitation by Eurocentric values (Fagunwa, 2019: 6). In this regard, Ubuntu is an interactive philosophy in which people improve their humanness through relations with other people. Ubuntu preserves its valuable mission to unite members of the society who have been dominated by colonialism and European modernity even if Eurocentric history tried to cover its true meaning (Chimuka, 2015: 71). So, Ubuntu highlights a vision for collective interdependence and a mutual understanding of the aim of building a sustainable future concerning the environmental, moral, and social well-

being of its members (Swanson, 2007: 65). It presents an alternative vision, like Buen Vivir, to understand the challenges of traditional development understanding, which are faced by all humanity through increasing inequalities, destruction of natural resources, and problems of new technologies (Le Grange, 2019: 325). In short, according to Ubuntu, nowadays, it is hard to explain what being a human is due to the sophisticated way of lives in the globalized world. As a result, Ubuntu is an ongoing process that aims to contribute to alternative research spheres, education, socio-political discourses, and, most importantly, to sustainable and human-centric integration of societies (Swanson, 2007: 54).

The other alternative and reactionary movement towards traditional structures in Mexico is the Zapatista movement. This autonomy movement is an essential representative of social resistance to neoliberal premises and it controls some territories in Chiapas, Mexico. The neoliberal projects since the 1980s have empowered state apparatus with decreasing power of corporatist and clientelist mechanisms in Mexico and cleared the way for Zapatista uprising, which aimed to glorify collective identity and national citizenship (Sholk, 2007: 48). Zapatista Autonomy has constituted a struggle and rebellion to the existing system and institutions and proposed a radical alternative version of living a harmonious life (Leyva-Solano, 2019: 335). One of the central premise of this movement is the principle of “governing by obeying” which comprises following features: “To serve and not to be served; to represent and not to supplant; to build, not to destroy; to obey, not to command; to propose and not to impose; to convince, not to defeat; to go down, not up” (Leyva-Solano, 2019: 336). These characteristics of Zapatista Autonomy embrace a communal life within a multicultural world and challenges the classical governing understanding and state apparatus. According to the Zapatista communique, capitalist structure enforces a universal framework in which everything should be controlled by Western hegemony and decide what is good and bad for all societies (Leyva-Solano, 2019: 338). It is crucial to challenge this system to take control of our way of life and independence. Their basic argument is to claim that they are using words instead of weapons to deconstruct current development understanding and the capitalist system.

The Zapatistas maintained many of the emancipatory premises of previous reactionary movements, but they organized their social position in an attitude that is

more democratic, participatory, and global (Olesen, 2004: 256). In this respect, their views about current social and political dilemmas do not marginalize any group in the globalized society, whether it is first, second or third world (Olesen, 2004: 256). Global solidarity, for Zapatistas, means that there are certain commonalities between physically, socially, and culturally diverse societies while embracing local and national differences (Olesen, 2004: 256). So, global solidarity continuously finds a shared spot between the particular and the universal in a democratic way, which the Zapatistas represent the contemporary example of this form of solidarity. This solidarity in Zapatista understanding is not an easy mission that needs taking immediate action against racism, sexism, homophobia, and the global economic system rather than using only words (Olesen, 2004: 260). Thereby, this is the most appropriate way to regain the rights, identities, and cultures of people who have been suffered from failed initiatives of the globalized capitalist system. The Zapatistas accepts the solidarity in the form of material aid and presence of human rights observers, but they also clarify their position as a defender of solidarity domestically against the neoliberal development premises (Olesen, 2004: 261). The other essential premise of the Zapatistas is not to construct a new identity or acknowledge an old identity, which creates a negative distinction between “them” and “us”; instead, they desire to become a globalized symbol of exclusion and oppression (Olesen, 2004: 261). Because they try to become an idealized vision or movement for other social struggles throughout the world against the mainstream development understanding. To achieve this desire, they highlight the importance of global consciousness and solidarity among different social groups to defend their particularity and unique identities.

The Zapatistas as an alternative movement continually tries to protect indigenous people's rights and their struggle into the global system by constituting a balance between the idea of indigenous reputation and the desire for “a world in which many worlds fit” (Olesen, 2004: 262). This motto is a crucial transformative motive in alternative vision and post-development understanding because it emphasizes the importance of cultural plurality. The Zapatistas are the supporters of a vision in which democracy and civil society are the primary motivators of a radical social change that challenges the dominant economic and political settings (Olesen, 2004: 263). This social change can occur only from below rather than above to make all people the

fundamental part of a revolutionary change. The Zapatistas explain their understanding of democracy as a framework in which there are multiple interrelated histories and identities of different societies (Olesen, 2004: 274). The Zapatistas' theoretical revolution indicates an ethical and political transformation of old Eurocentric premises and encourages different societies to seek diverse possibilities for imagining and constructing democratic futures (Mignolo, 2002: 273). So, the Zapatistas, as an alternative ideology or movement, have constructed a space for local societies to try to create a new government model with accommodating plural identities (Sholk, 2007: 61). Overall, there have been enormous attempts to deconstruct the dominant ideology of development since the 1980s to rebuild a better future without using racist, ethnocentric, and Eurocentric discourse (Kothari et al., 2019: 339). These alternative visions have been trying to find a common understanding to build solidarity between local, regional, and global levels.

Three crucial criticisms challenge the motives of alternatives to development thinking. Firstly, it is claimed that the Eurocentric notion of development has been overstated, and the impact of this ideology has led to an exaggeration by ignoring the geo-historical formulation of this European world order (Kuru, 2016: 352). According to this critic, deconstructing a whole Eurocentric ideology is much harder than challenging its economic dimension due to longstanding settled classes of this world (Amin, 2010: 187). So, for this viewpoint, building an alternative construction to contemporary development understanding is unrealistic, and delinking can be a better solution for creating an impact against this order. Secondly, alternatives to Eurocentric development fall into the trap of criticizing and analyzing this system under the same Eurocentric conceptualization and constructing another type of centrism, like Afrocentrism (Sunar, 2016: 16). Alternatives to development are not clear enough to highlight historical differences and controversies within Europe before criticizing the hegemonic relationship between Europe and other parts of the world (Sunar, 2016: 16). Also, ethnocentric criticism towards Eurocentric development does not entirely explain the reasons for the domination of Eurocentric construction; instead, they try to deconstruct it without even asking a normative question (Dirlik, 1999: 14). Because, they are somehow incapable of addressing those normative values of West, like human rights, due to overfocusing on the fact of domination itself (Dirlik, 1999: 14). So, these

alternatives can be called post-Eurocentric due to their inescapable characteristics from the dominant structures, and they fall into the trap of reinventing the same centrism (Dirlik, 1999: 29).

The third critique of alternatives to development is their lack of a shared ideological response to dominant structures and development policies. It is mostly due to disregard for changing consequences, including development initiatives, the increasing role of international institutions, and dilemmas in the Global South (Pieterse, 2010: 5). In sum, these three criticisms have a common stance for explaining the ineffectiveness of alternatives to development because they are incapable of deconstructing development concepts by using the same web of norms and ideas. According to these criticisms, redefinition of development and its conceptual implications seem to be a losing battle or might take decades to undo their failed initiatives (Ziai, 2013: 132). Post-development response to dominant development understanding can propose a better alternative to reject development altogether and find new conceptualizations without falling into the same trap of creating ethnocultural initiatives. Besides, according to Escobar (1995), there is an increasing number of controversial viewpoints towards the Eurocentric development paradigm, and they propose to support localized autonomy and multicultural knowledge creations (Gulalp, 1998: 958). This transformation of post-development understanding will be the main point of discussion in the next section through more detailed debates and analyses.

3.3. POST-DEVELOPMENT RESPONSES TO THE PROBLEMS OF THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

Post-development can be defined as a critical vision which highlights and the negative effects of mainstream development understanding by rejecting its premises and embraces the importance of localized alternatives to replace traditional development. Post-development understanding has aimed to deconstruct universal and global enforcements of modernity and replaced it with the idea of “a world in which many worlds can be embraced” as Gustavo Esteva (as cited in Klein and Morreo, 2019: 4) had quoted from Zapatista motto. With this central argument, the post-development theory has sought to support various development conceptualizations by considering

different cultural perspectives as valuable assets in the multicultural transformation of old development thinking. Post-development theory has taken a position to promote diversity in societies and accept multiple viewpoints, especially from Third World cultures, due to their previous misallocated position in the mainstream development understanding. Generally, there are three main arguments of post-development understanding that can highlight the roadmap of this theory. Firstly, according to the post-development theory, the term underdevelopment was created artificially by the United States as President Truman made a speech in 1949 to enhance Western interference in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (Ziai, 2017b: 2721). Secondly, the idea of development is disputable and unclear, especially after the end of the second world war it transformed and became more ambiguous and amoeba-like concept as post-development scholars claimed (Ziai, 2017b: 2721). Therefore, the development concept should be deconstructed and rejected altogether to open a new page for the alternative reconstruction process according to post-development belief. The third argument is that Third World societies have become frustrated from the false and deceptive promises of development programs and started to revolt against Eurocentric and Westernized economic understanding (Ziai, 2017b: 2722). In turn, these societies have decided to follow alternative versions of economy, politics, and knowledge systems based on multicultural understanding and local perspectives, which embrace hybrid models in contrast to ethnocentric and universal development understanding (Ziai, 2017b: 2722). This reaction, as mentioned in the previous section, represents alternatives to development movement.

Post-development upsurge in the 1980s sparked a new reflection on the critique of development concept by rejecting it altogether that had not even been thought of by other critical perspectives and took development norm for granted. This post-development reflection shows itself in its criticism of the colonial legacy of development understanding and its ongoing transformed mechanism under the shadow of developmental aid policies (Ziai, 2017b: 2724). According to post-development thinking, human betterment is not the real objective of the development project; instead, human domination and control is the primary motivation through subtle developmental aid for constructing dependent economies (Rapley, 2004: 352). The critical perspective on development is the main feature of the post-development theory,

and it departs from other critical approaches, which mainly focused on inadequacies of development policies in the South, as rejecting the development concept entirely and proposing to deconstruct it (Escobar, 1995: 216). Gustavo Esteva, one of the most significant contributors to post-development theory, claimed that development is an 'unburied corpse' from which every kind of insects and diseases has started to spread (Esteva, 2010: 6). This understanding explains the general viewpoint of post-development thinking over development theory, which stands like a ruin in the theorization and practices of development projects (Ziai, 2016: 65). So, the post-development theory is revolutionary rather than reformist, like anti-development and beyond development, in terms of answering the problems of development policies. Development is seen as the ideological representation of European culture, and its policies cannot be redeemed by alternative development solutions (Pieterse, 2000: 175). Instead, post-development proposes alternatives to this development understanding by shaking the roots of its historical and ongoing structures as Arturo Escobar rejected any transition in the same development paradigm. (Escobar, 1995: 215).

There are six critical arguments in which post-development theory has questioned mainstream development understanding. Firstly, development is criticized for being a pure ideology of the West, and it is seen as an unsuccessful mission in terms of universalizing the doctrine of Western developed countries on a more global stage (Ziai, 2017a: 2547). Secondly, it is highly accused of being Eurocentric and hegemonic through policies regarding non-European societies as inferior and in need of Western help (Ziai, 2017a: 2547). Post-development scholars criticize development projects as often being universalist and based on western standards of industrialization that are unsustainable and irresponsible to the limits of natural resources. These development policies deny the existence of indigenous perspectives and their historical background through top-down policies and arrogance of development agents as claiming to be knowing local cultures better than themselves. For Escobar (as cited in Pieterse, 2000: 180), the development discourse, like Orientalism described by Edward Said, has been a process of management of Third World societies and the creation of artificial truths about their histories and way of life. The critical viewpoint about the Eurocentric construction of development discourse can also be seen in the works of

Mahatma Gandhi, Ferguson, and Illich, who were some of the fundamental contributors to post-development understanding together with Escobar and Esteva. The third argument is the critic of capitalist economic mechanisms concentrating on economic growth and accumulation through the help of privileging market system (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). Besides, there has been a cultural challenge to Eurocentric dominance by the non-European societies in both theorizations of development and capitalist economic practices (Gulalp, 1998: 959).

Fourthly, development project interferes into lives of other people who are called as less developed or uncivilized to supposedly propose them better lives by people claiming to know their lifestyles better than local people (Ziai, 2017a: 2548; Matthews, 2008: 1035). This project is generally explained as the hypocrisy of development understanding for its claiming to know better than who is experiencing or living the actual situation. So, this kind of understanding causes destructive consequences with failed initiatives and policies of development; that is why it is more beneficial to deconstruct it. The fifth critical point is that the informal sector and unpaid labor are not taken into consideration, and distribution is generally ignored when measuring development through the GDP method (Ziai, 2016: 69). Instead of the GDP measurement, an alternative version is created as a Gross National Happiness (GNH) index to avoid repeating the same development paradigm mistakes and include more comprehensive tools (Ziai, 2016: 69). Lastly, development theory came into prominence for finding solutions to poverty, inequality, and underdevelopment, but, according to post-development, these problems and their answers were constructed by development understanding itself (Matthews, 2008: 1042). So, like the dependency theory, post-development scholars claim that almost all the suffering of Third World societies occurs due to exploitative and hierarchic policies of development (Matthews, 2008: 1045). These critical points summarize the viewpoint of post-development understanding against mainstream development. To undo this situation and rebuild a more sensitive understanding, it needs to have harmonization of positions by acknowledging indigenous perspectives without marginalizing any ideas.

According to Escobar (as cited in Ziai, 2016: 67), post-development theory suggests that emphasizing local culture and ideas, critical position against universal discourses, and supporting multiple ways of indigenous reconstructions are crucial

steps for presenting alternative ways of life. Gandhi, like all other post-development scholars, claimed that Third World societies must rebuild their history without relying on Western failures and achievements by their development programs (Ziai, 2016: 67). For Esteva (as cited in Ziai, 2016: 75), Third World societies have started to rebuild their future according to their way of life without relying on capitalist development understanding and receiving external aids from other parties. This transformation represents the movement towards alternatives to development, to Western-style economic plans, policies, and ideologies and concentrates on localized alternatives without falling into the trap of any centrism (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). Zapatistas revolt in Mexico, Buen Vivir in Latin America, Ubuntu in Africa, and other examples of alternative visions can be counted as valuable representatives of alternatives to development thinking, as discussed in the previous section. The importance of increasing the tendency towards alternative ideas is to let people decide their future, to be independent without being dominated by a higher authority, and to reconstruct better lives according to their preferences and cultural characteristics (Ziai, 2013: 128; Siemiatycki, 2005: 58). So, the post-development theory rejects the one way-path to development and embraces the diversity of cultural views and preferences. As it is clearly stated by Escobar (1995), post-development understanding claims that economic relations should rely on solidarity and reciprocity, and the program must deal with the direct democracy with evident participation of local societies. Besides, he believes that reconstruction of development must come from below through indigenous movements by emphasizing egalitarian and participatory politics.

For post-development understanding, discourse analysis of development is crucial to grasp the real ideological vision behind Western development projects and understand the importance of different alternative contributions to the reconstruction of development (Pieterse, 2000: 180). It is essential to acknowledge that the post-development theory presents its primary purpose as replacing the old development understanding rather than reforming its institutions and policies as alternative development had tried before (Simon, 2006: 12). This viewpoint can be understood as the continuation of post-colonial ideology, but it should be differentiated for post-development efforts to move beyond the critique of traditional development by focusing more on reactivating the perspectives of Third World societies (Simon, 2006:

13). The primary purpose here is to reconstruct development and strip its colonial, Eurocentric history by finding alternative perspectives focusing on human betterment and the dialogical process between Western and Eastern societies and within Third World cultures (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 922). So, to counteract the Eurocentrism in the mainstream development understanding, there is an urgent need for post-development theory as an alternative vision to reclaim the history of Third World societies and rewrite their present and future (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 929).

There has been growing trust in the post-development stage since the 1990s, especially with its capacity to enhance alternative methods and ways of reconstructing development understanding. Here it comes the most crucial contribution of post-development vision that helped mostly disadvantaged societies to realize the power relations in development discourse and practice and to follow a different path, including resistance and alternatives at the local level (Ziai, 2016: 79). In order to deconstruct old structure and build a new one, it is fundamental not to repeat same mistakes as development discourse did in the past by enforcing some rules which were not suitable to those societies that are affected. There should be a democratic decision-making procedure for the related people to achieve the aim of a good society rather than relying on external knowledge that cannot grasp the reality within a specific culture (Ziai, 2017b: 2728). In general, it is tough to accept different alternatives and cultural knowledge production, especially when taking the heterogeneity as a starting point of post-development thinking (Escobar, 1995: 212). However, it is also the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project.

Post-Development Dictionary is a book which gathers different ideas and background of least-heard authors and societies in the development literature. This Dictionary was written in 2019 with the contributions of various scholars, especially from the South edited by Arturo Escobar, Ashish Kothari, and three other writers. The primary purpose of the Dictionary is to widen and multiply the research agenda by focusing on multicultural perspectives and interrelated dialogues between different scholars, policymakers, and activists (Kothari et al., 2019: xxi). Parallel to this understanding, there is an urgent need for cultural reconstruction both within and between societies worldwide and between individuals and nature (Kothari et al., 2019:

xxiii). To remedy the mistakes of mainstream development, understanding the limits of nature, and making peace with the Earth is crucial. The Dictionary criticized development as being naïve to answer the global problems, and this understanding only proposed some short-term solutions in order to prevail status-quo between the North and South (Kothari et al., 2019: xxv). By using the concept ‘pluriverse,’ the Dictionary quotes the Zapatista motto ‘a world where many worlds fit’ and wants to highlight the importance of living together by respecting to ourselves and others without applying to exploitative, selfish and hegemonic relations which led to discriminatory behavior (Kothari et al., 2019: xxviii).

In order to embrace a more harmonized world through accepting the cross-cultural dialogue and alternative visions, there are some values presented by Post-Development Dictionary: diversity and pluriversality; autonomy and self-respect; solidarity and reciprocity; collectivity; harmonization with nature; interdependence; simplicity; inclusiveness; equality; non-hierarchy; respect to environment and non-violence (Kothari et al., 2019: xxix). Local practices propose active participation, mutual interdependence, respect, and acceptance of different ideologies without despising other viewpoints, and these practices strictly oppose violence, domination, and any control over other societies (Kothari et al., 2019: xxxiv). This understanding believes in the renewal of life circle and trust in both human beings and nature itself. According to Post-Development Dictionary, there will always be drawbacks on the road to the deconstruction of development policies, but this road should reach the destination of pluriverse that is multiple, open, and in ongoing transition (Kothari et al., 2019: xxxv). So, transformation to cultural-sensitive pluriverse includes sophisticated methods from different societies to demolish settled ideas and concepts of ethnocentric development understanding. This transformation can only be achieved by inter-cultural dialogues and projects beyond the Eurocentric structure and by reconstruction of an atmosphere with respecting diversity and multiple viewpoints to create an equal and respective global governance process (Escobar, 2019: 123).

The process of deconstructing development is hard and slow, and there is no easy shortcut for achieving the reconstruction of a new alternative. Especially for European scholars and countries, it consists of two phases, which are accepting the self-destructing character of development understanding and then making efforts to

deconstruct the same system they have been living since the 18th century (Escobar, 1995: 217). To propose alternatives to development, we should purify our language from sticking into same contradictory concepts like tradition and modernity; so, it is crucial to embrace multicultural alternatives for inventing brand-new languages (Escobar, 1995: 219). According to this hybrid understanding, cultural differences and harmonization of diverse ideologies into the same shared vision should be achieved by rejecting the mainstream development concepts (Escobar, 1995: 220). The subjective characters of every Third World societies are crucial for constructing hybrid cultures by considering different directions of different communities without rejecting any viewpoints (Escobar, 1995: 224). The late 20th and beginning of the 21st century can be regarded as the peak of globalization and post-development theory, emphasizing the importance of cultural contributions to development and way of life. So, both Third World and Western societies' mission is to close the gap between each other by accepting their differences without marginalizing or destroying different viewpoints (Escobar, 1995: 226). However, the mainstream development understanding and its projects, like liberalization modernization, democratization and so on, are still valid that continues to destroy alternative views to reinforce the universalization of mainstream development paradigms. Then, it is essential to realize the positive mission of post-development theory to reconstruct something new by rejecting the whole development paradigm; nevertheless, it could not escape from criticisms that accuse it of not proposing a credible alternative viewpoint and not offering practical solutions to the problems of Third World societies (Cavalcanti, 2007: 90). In the next section, potential Eurocentrism and alternative vision in the post-development understanding and critical arguments against the post-development projects will be the main point of discussion to understand whether the post-development theory is a useful strategy to replace the position of mainstream development or not.

3.4. CRITICISMS TO POST-DEVELOPMENT THEORY

In recent years, the post-development theory has attracted some doubts about its credibility to replace the old development mechanism as a reliable alternative theory without repeating the same mistakes. Besides, there are essential criticisms that explain

this theory's ineffectiveness and its lack of practical solutions to solve the problems of Third World societies. There are eight critiques which highlight the various weaknesses of the post-development theory. Firstly, the post-development theory tries to deconstruct all aspects of modernity and development, including their beneficial aspects, one of which is rising life expectancy and decreasing mortality rate in the Third World countries (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). There is a claim that post-development scholars intentionally ignore the positive effects of development and overlook the advancement of material well-being, increasing life expectancy and health quality in the developing states. (Rapley, 2004: 353). So, this critic desires to prove that post-development understanding, deliberately or not, undervalued the complexity and dynamics in the development paradigm and its policies (Pieterse, 2000: 183). Secondly, post-development theory overvalued the importance of alternatives to development and its local visions, but it does not grasp the hierarchic relationships within these various traditional societies as well (Ziai, 2017a: 2548). So, post-development understanding assumes that indigenous people do not desire the fruits of development, Western modernity, and material well-being. Thirdly, post-development thinking has attracted criticism as being cultural relativist in the sense that it does not permit any outside intervention and comments to ameliorate those Third World societies (Ziai, 2017a: 2549). According to the post-development theory, cultural beliefs and practices can be understood and judged only by those who live in these cultures to see reality more clearly.

The fourth critic directed at post-development understanding is its paternalistic feature of making the same mistake as claiming to know better about the needs and priorities of local societies (Ziai, 2017a: 2549). In other words, post-development theory misperceived the real problems and desires of Third World cultures and applied wrong methods to deconstruct traditional development, sometimes by falling into the same mistakes as mainstream development did. Moreover, this critical viewpoint claims that the post-development theory rather than mainstream development understanding maintains the hegemonic relationship and Eurocentric structure as the continuation of the colonial legacy (Siemiacki, 2005: 59). So, while post-development thinkers live in European states and enjoy the fruits of development, they propose some prescriptions for Third World societies without consulting them

(Matthews, 2017: 2656). The fifth argument is about the shortages of viable alternative visions presented by post-development understanding (Ziai, 2017a: 2549). They mainly stood as being critical and deconstructive viewpoints rather than constructing something practical as opposed to their main statement (Pieterse, 2000: 180). According to this criticism, post-development school focuses more on Africa, Latin America, and India by ignoring the underprivileged people living in the West, and the alternatives to development remains in theory without presenting practical remedies to solve the problems of disadvantaged communities (Pieterse, 2000: 183). So, changing the meaning of development term or replacing it does not immediately solve the main problems of Third World people like inequality, poverty, exploitation, and so on (Simon, 2006: 17). The sixth argument is the lack of methodological consistency, especially for the issue of selection bias in post-development attitude towards dangerous indigenous movements in the Third World societies (Ziai, 2013: 126; Ziai, 2017a: 2548-2549). This uncritical approach towards some parties in the local area can harm the process of the betterment of people more than mainstream development. So, this can eventually lead to misinterpretation of the history of development and causes more problems instead of creating benefits for disadvantaged societies in the East (Pieterse, 2000: 183).

The seventh critique is that there is a contradiction in the aspect of localization of the post-development argument; on the one hand, it aims to detach local societies from globalizing and universalizing development effects. On the other hand, this indigeneity should succeed universally to attract more people to believe post-development understanding (Simon, 2006: 13). This uncertainty creates a dilemma in the conceptualization process of post-development understanding and causes a relatively weak argument about deconstructing of development theory. The universalization of indigenous perspective contradicts the main post-development objective, and it can lead to discrepancies with post-structural and post-colonial concerns about written out of Third World alternatives from historical transformation and theorization process (Simon, 2006: 14). Lastly, Post-development theory is criticized for ignoring the heterogenous mainstream development perspectives and takes development as one sphere which reflects Eurocentric and universalized ideas across the world. By rejecting development understanding altogether, post-

development scholars fall into the trap of seeing development discourse as homogenous, and they make the same generalization about putting all development initiatives under the same Western dominance. However, there has been different transformations in the mainstream development understanding since the 1950s from modernization theory to neoliberalism, from sustainable development to human development (Pieterse, 2000: 188; Ziai, 2016: 77). According to criticisms of post-development, development understanding has always been heterogeneous in both discourse and its policies rather than implications of post-development scholars as being universalist vision (Simon, 2006: 12). Post-development theory repeats the same single-minded vision and narrowing down the framework of development as development ideology has been doing since the beginning of the discourse.

After highlighting these general critiques, there is also a crucial contribution of Pieterse (as cited in Ziai, 2017b: 2725), who can be representative of the first critical scholars to post-development understanding. He (as cited in Ziai, 2017b: 2725) claims that there are no beneficial aspects in post-development arguments, and its policies are exaggerated and contain romanticization, strengthening the local initiatives by giving them additional authorities that can be easily abused. Moreover, according to Pieterse (as cited in Ziai, 2017b: 2725), post-development policies have misleading claims, and biased representation concentrated on traditional values that can cause ideological and cultural relativist viewpoints. There is also an argument that post-development understanding does not provide a clear delinking between alternative development and alternatives to development while it is rejecting the previous one (Pieterse, 2000: 184). Another general criticism is about the lack of practical approaches in the post-development approach. While it opposes development interventions in Third World countries, it lacks the primary objective of bettering disadvantaged people in those societies by totally rejecting development understanding (Matthews, 2008: 1039). So, critical voices towards post-development thinking claim that post-development scholars are wasting their precious time with focusing on the theorization process to change the existing language while Third World societies are expecting immediate help in practice (Matthews, 2008: 1043).

There are four crucial counter-arguments of post-development scholars in response to these critical arguments against their claims and policies. Firstly, according

to Escobar (1995: 215), criticisms about the taking development as monolithic discourse are correct, but with the idea of deconstructing development understanding, it is possible to challenge development in more solid grounds. It is not illogical for post-development theory to accept mainstream development as universalizing and monolithic approach because it has been applying similar policies since the beginning of development discourse even if it has different versions. Secondly, the power of the post-development critic also lies in its uniting character against one enemy even if some people do not share its central policy to follow alternatives to development (Ziai, 2017a: 2551). This uniting vision does not stop at the critic on the exploitation of underdeveloped countries; instead, it focuses on knowledge and discourse analysis to question the very meaning of underdevelopment and position of developed states as universal development agents. So, post-development theory aims to overcome the inequality of this discourse by opening up some space for non-Western societies and their concerns. Thirdly, according to criticisms, most of the arguments and theorization in post-development understanding undervalued the dynamics in Africa that numerous resistance movements exist to challenge the dominant narrative of development (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 930). However, this critic fails to appreciate the contribution of Ubuntu as an alternative development born in Africa that post-development argument considers as a valuable initiative with other alternative visions. The last defense argument is for the critic on the lack of practical solutions of post-development theory to answer the problems of Third World societies. Post-development theorists answer this critique by saying that they are not trying to repeat the same mistakes done by traditional development thinking (Escobar, 1995: 215). Also, this critic undermines the efforts of the post-development theory for its premise on strong local initiatives and human-centered remedies to ameliorate the failures of development. In general, there are two ways in which post-development has contributed to the transformation of the structure. Firstly, it has remarked on the issue of different power relations existed in development discourse; secondly, post-development theory has a great potential to build non-Eurocentric and more cultural-sensitive structures to reconstruct social spheres of other societies (Ziai, 2017a: 2550).

There is a mixture of ideas about accepting and rejecting specific characteristics of post-development understanding and finding a uniting argument in

it while several scholars have been rejecting its premises (Ziai, 2017b: 2729). The human-centered vision of the post-development theory to construct a more meaningful life for those suffering from development policies is appreciated; however, its rejection of the whole development concept and romanticization of indigenous movements have attracted various criticisms (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 930). Nevertheless, post-development critic about the Eurocentric and paternalist character of development thinking has generally been welcomed by other scholars in the development literature, but its engagement with alternatives to development and deconstruction of modernity are not widely approved (Ziai, 2017b: 2729). Overall, post-development theory has not been successful to directly ameliorate the lives of poor people, especially in the East; still, it has been very effective to increase awareness in the wrongful policies of development and its dominance over the Third World societies (Siemiatsky, 2005: 60). Besides, this school of thought has enabled Third World societies to build a better future for themselves and around them. So, criticisms on post-development theory are not entirely wrong, but they mainly fail to appreciate the revolutionary power of post-development theory which have a great potential to challenge mainstream development thinking. It is well understood that development vision is not a final prescription for all societies in the world as alternative ways of living have proved that there are multiple perspectives to reach self-reliable and self-governed constructions in the new world (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 929). However, according to criticisms, it is illogical to replace the old development approach with post-development alternative vision without examining its features thoroughly since this theory has initiated its policies as early as the 1990s. (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 929). Lastly, it can be beneficial to quote from Edward Said (1978) at the end of this section because he claims that Eurocentrism is on the decline in the post-colonial era, but it will not perish from the stage very soon.

3.5. CONCLUSION

Overall, this chapter tried to answer the question of are the alternatives to development and post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding without falling into the same mistakes as Western

development did in the past. This chapter mainly concentrated on the issue of Eurocentric development debate and its construction of a universal understanding without acknowledging the alternative way of life. This viewpoint was challenged by alternatives to development thinking by rejecting the premises of mainstream development and trying to reconstruct local-sensitive, multicultural, and subjective policies of Third World perspectives. In this essence, different alternative versions to propose concrete remedies were there to undo the failures of old development understanding and create better futures for themselves. Another contribution to criticism towards development problematic came from post-development understanding, which rejected development discourse altogether rather than reforming it and aimed to reconstruct the alternative way of life, especially for the disadvantaged societies in the East. However, this post-development argument has attracted some criticisms for shallow and inadequate claims to analyze mainstream development and ignorance towards the beneficial aspects of development understanding. It might be accurate to say that post-development scholars dismissed the positive contributions of development understanding. However, they ultimately emphasized more negative consequences of development discourse by exposing their so-called universal policies on those local societies in the East.

On this basis, this chapter aimed to analyze whether Eurocentric development is truly criticized through the work of alternative to development perspectives and post-development scholars and their capability to visualize a better future for Third World societies. Another critical point was to see the responses of post-development scholars to significant claims about them, and they managed to present their viewpoints. So, the main argument of this chapter was twofold; firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it stays on the same Eurocentric path. The second argument was that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project. Post-development thinking has inspired many people who were not happy about the way they live in the current development structure even though it could not present a reliable alternative to taking over the position of development paradigm. However, it is soon to celebrate or vilify any alternatives to development thinking and post-development theory because they have

only begun their practices as early as the 1990s. Finally, this chapter could contribute the literature by taking a stance as showing insights from both criticisms to Eurocentric development debate and their criticisms to this critical viewpoint. So, this chapter was crucial to connect the debates in two previous chapters as focusing on the issue of Eurocentric construction in development debate and its practices in the Third World societies.



CONCLUSION

This study sought an answer to the question of are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding. The main aim of this research was to analyze Eurocentric constructions in the framework of development debate and IR literature, and tries to highlight criticisms of Eurocentric formulations in the literature, show alternative ways to the development understanding and future of development debate under the post-development era. There were various explanations for the capabilities of alternatives to development debate in the literature, but they generally focused on their critical stance. The critical contribution that this research tried to make to the literature on this point is the making a comprehensive theoretical analyses about the deconstructing Eurocentric development debate and Eurocentric norms in IR literature and showing the critical stances from both Eastern and non-Eurocentric Western understanding towards Eurocentric, cultural-blind, one-sided theorization and periodization. This research tried to fill the gap by highlighting both Eurocentric constructions in development debate and IR literature, and alternative ideas about their locally based development perspectives like Buen Vivir, Ubuntu, and Zapatistas.

Regarding the central theme of the research which detecting Eurocentrism in IR and development debate, and criticisms to this understanding based on post-development theory and alternatives to development visions, this research dealt with the analyses and proposals about deconstructing Eurocentric structures and also critical analysis of anti-Eurocentric views for their possible alternative remedies. This research firstly focused on the historical background of the development debate to grasp the motivator of this understanding. Secondly, the study examined the ideas about deconstructing Eurocentric themes in IR literature and development debate by analyzing scholarly articles and critical stances. Lastly, it relied on the insights of post-development theory and alternatives to development thinking about proposing something new to traditional modernity approaches. So, this research tried to clarify the possible effects of Eurocentrism in the IR literature and future development debate by analyzing research about cultural and indigenous alternatives to universalist Eurocentric development and possible harmonization of insights from East and West

at the same time. On this basis, there were two main arguments in this thesis to explain the theoretical question of the study successfully. Firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it stayed on the same Eurocentric path. The second argument was that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project.

In the first chapter, the fundamental theoretical questions were what the limits of being Eurocentric for IR theory are and what are the remedies proposed in the IR literature. The main argument was that even if there are some limits on research and teaching spheres in the IR literature, it is still possible to present alternative ways and methods, like localization, harmonious and altruistic living, without relying only on Eurocentric ideals. There was a historical roadmap for Eurocentric formation in the literature by affecting both research and teaching spheres of the IR. So, to have a non-Eurocentric and decolonized structure, the International Relations needed to be purified by taking alternative conceptualizations and beliefs from Eastern societies more seriously. In contrast to Eurocentric understanding, the West was not the starter of the process of development, modernity, or civilization in general because it took advantage of most of the Eastern techniques by copying their procedures as if they invented something new (Hobson, 2012: 10). For counteracting this artificial viewpoint, deconstruction of Eurocentric thinking should be achieved by giving particular importance to Third Worldist approaches and techniques (Amin, 2010: 186). In sum, it was crucial to grasp the polycentric policies and taking multiple centers as the beginning of theory-construction and historical development processes rather than over-focusing on the Third Worldist approach (Pieterse, 2000: 178).

In the second chapter, the central theme was around the question of what the main categories of research in development debate are historically after the Second World War. In this respect, the main argument of this chapter was that the enlargement of development thinking with more complex issues, areas, and research categories did not mean to increase the effectiveness and capability of development. After World War II, development understanding as a policy started to flourish by interventionist and economic-based policies, especially towards Third World countries. Towards the end of the 1960s, development understanding was highly questionable phenomena,

especially in five critical points that were already discussed in this chapter, by their reductionist and one-sided viewpoint on economic growth and modernization theory started to decline by the rise of dependency school (Knutsson, 2009: 14). The 1970s marked the beginning of critical thinking with the help of dependency theory and its challenging paradigm of core-periphery structure. Furthermore, the national sphere was not the only actor in development understanding, rather global and local spheres came into the theorization process as the supplementary parts for the national level (Knutsson, 2009: 21, 22). However, the dependency theory had been charged for its lack of producing real solutions in underdeveloped regions and standing as only a critical voice (Nilsen, 2016: 2).

The second chapter also claimed that by looking at the political success of the neoliberal globalization project after the 1980s in pushing its development program into Third World states, leftist states in the East and Western European countries it could not be decided that this project was a victory for neoliberalism because of its apparent economic failures (Bilotti, 2015: 213). The structural adjustment programs were like a debt collection program of richer countries by taking advantage of natural resources and capacities of developing states. So, this program was quite successful in terms of changing the angle of the 1970s crises towards underdeveloped regions and redistributing the global income to the good for industrialized states in the West (Bilotti, 2015: 216). The mainstream transformations in this period, as sustainable and human development, was also a continuation of the same premises, but with more people-oriented policies. Nevertheless, these transformations failed to integrate non-European cultures into the theory-making process. In the 1990s, the critical transformations occurred, and, according to the post-development perspective, development understanding initiated a standardization process that all societies see as inevitable and natural agenda to follow. So, traditional development thinking finds a common approach to analyze all different societies, and concepts through the lens of Western perspective (Ziai, 2017: 2551). In sum, since the beginning of development debate in the post-war era, only a small amount of states could be counted as truly developed, and other states had been trying to achieve development criteria by destroying the environment and their resources. These contemporary environmental, economic, social, and political problems, created by exponential economic growth

perspective of neoliberal and globalized world system, caused irrevocable damages to earth, which had a certain limit to absorb all development initiatives. At last, enlargement of development agenda did not mean the improvement of conditions in the South, like catching up with the developed states, rather the inequalities within developed states as well became more transparent in the globalized world.

The last chapter was the chapter where all this study was breathing by aiming to answer the question of are the alternatives to development or post-development thinking strong enough to replace Eurocentric development understanding without repeating the same mistakes as Western development did in the past. The main argument of this chapter was twofold; firstly, no matter how different transformations occurred historically in the development debate, it stayed on the same Eurocentric path. The second argument was that the weakest point of the Global South is not to propose a strong alternative vision or visions as against to mainstream development project. It was also the chapter where the main argument of the thesis was discussed, and the arguments in the previous chapters were connected to the debate of Eurocentric development understanding and alternatives to development concept. Eurocentrism created a hegemony over the discourse of development in both North and South by limiting alternative thinking and sources from Third World societies and putting quotas on subject matter to discuss (Brohman, 1995: 128). This Eurocentric development understanding caused the creation of an imperial management of non-European societies as the continuation of neocolonial discourse.

In the final chapter, there were alternative concepts of Buen Vivir, Ubuntu, and Zapatistas, which presented an ongoing process that aimed to deal with post-development questions by highlighting cultural identity and offering alternatives to European development understanding. The crucial point, regarded by post-development scholars, was the privileged role of development agents as few in contrast to large numbers of people suffering from poverty (Matthews, 2008: 1035). Another crucial debate was about post-development thinking, which argued that the development mission was the injustice representation of the East by the West through speaking and writing about them without acknowledging multiple versions of their cultures. For the post-development theory, there were various indigenous versions of how to live a good life, and each society's objective was to invent its roadmap to

develop (Ziai, 2013: 128). Due to Eurocentric, hegemonic, and universalized viewpoint of traditional development understanding, post-development theory proposed to abolish all the historical and ongoing effects of development policies through changing the rules of the game (Escobar, 1995: 216). In general, the vision of alternatives to development had been questioned by critical scholars who claimed that the post-development theory did not propose a visible alternative, so it stayed only as a critical perspective rather than a constructive one (Andrews and Bawa, 2014: 930). It was the primary deficiency of post-development understanding because failing to create a concrete alternative approach, post-development theory led to maintain the current status quo in the development policies (Pieterse, 2000: 184).

This thesis aimed to examine the historical background of development debate, Eurocentrism in IR literature and development debate, and look critically at both Eurocentric development understanding and anti-Eurocentric efforts with their challenging views by focusing mainly on post-development debate and alternative to the development understanding. This research contributed the literature by taking a stance as showing insights from both criticisms to Eurocentric development debate and their criticisms to this critical view. The third chapter shows that alternatives to development debate, such as Buen Vivir, Ubuntu and Zapatistas, and post-development understanding, showed insights from critical understanding and the belief in indigenous development. Besides, there were various criticisms to these positions, mainly about their lack of capacity to take control and unite as a unitary alternative. It was crucial because this was a rare area of discussion in literature in which scholars either took the non-Eurocentric position or supported mainstream structures.

Another critical contribution that this research could make to the literature was making a comprehensive theoretical analysis of the deconstructing Eurocentric development debate and Eurocentric norms in International Relations literature and showing the critical stances from both Eastern and non-Eurocentric Western understanding towards Eurocentric, cultural-blind, and one-sided theorization. This contribution could be seen in the mainstream transformations in the development debate of sustainable and human development as Western-based ideas and critical transformations of post-development understanding, global development, and

alternatives to development as the Eastern part. This research tried to fill the gap by highlighting both Eurocentric constructions in IR literature and development debate and possible remedies to undo this Eurocentric structure with a more balanced and harmonized viewpoints. This harmonization of ideas was crucial because Eastern contribution to the development debate was extremely narrow due to a one-sided theorization process since the 1950s. Nevertheless, after the 1990s, with post-development understanding and locally sensitive alternatives to development, there was increasing consciousness in the literature and practices towards Third World countries.

There were four main limitations that this research had been affected. Firstly, due to the language barrier, this research could not reach all the alternative visions in the non-English speaking cultures. For this reason, this study mainly focused on three alternatives as Buen Vivir, Ubuntu, and Zapatistas. It was because these alternatives were more commonly discussed in the literature, and they had the potential to challenge mainstream understanding. However, this did not mean that other alternative visions in different cultures were trivial. The second limitation was the time uncertainty. The alternatives to development and post-development understanding were relatively new formations because they started to flourish in the literature after the 1990s. So, they need to prove themselves as reliable alternatives against mainstream beliefs in the literature for an uncertain period before relying solely on their viewpoints. Thirdly, the costliness of some books in the literature limited this research's capability to analyze some topics in more detail. Still, this study had reached various resources from different areas to discuss the main arguments impartially. Lastly, this thesis could not focus on one specific topic in detail due to the lack of space. This issue was the discourse analysis of Western concepts because linguistic research was a whole different area to make an analysis. However, the power of the discourse construction had a crucial impact on Eurocentric theorization and development understanding. So, this research highlighted various essential points of this issue about its effects on the Eurocentric theory formation process.

This study can widen our vision by highlighting various alternatives to Eurocentric theorization and development debate. By emphasizing local-based alternatives, like Buen Vivir, Ubuntu, and Zapatistas, the voices of less-advantaged

societies will be heard. The grasping the phases of development through history, the place of Eurocentrism in the IR literature, and discussion about Eurocentrism in development debate is crucial to present possible remedies by taking post-development and alternatives to development understandings into consideration. The research is also crucial for analyzing critical arguments and challenges to these critical debates simultaneously. In this respect, this study does not stop at showing alternative methods and their critical discussion about development understanding, but it also questions the practicality of those alternative visions by presenting their weaknesses. Besides, while this study criticizes the Eurocentric perspective in the literature and development area, it also manages to look critically at the alternatives offered by post-development theory and local-based understandings in non-European societies. This research can be beneficial both to highlight the harms of the Eurocentric perspective and to show that over-focusing the non-European perspective can lead to the same problems. So, it is vital to harmonize various viewpoints from every culture and society rather than focusing on one specific or universalized idea.

REFERENCES

- Alvares, C. (2011). A Critique of Eurocentric Social Science and the Question of Alternatives. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 46(22): 72-81.
- Amin, S. (1990). *Delinking: Towards a Polycentric World*. London, New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.
- Amin, S. (2010). *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion, and Democracy: A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Andrews, N. and Bawa, S. (2014). A Post-Development Hoax? (Re)-Examining the Past, Present and Future of Development Studies. *Third World Quarterly*. 35(6): 922-938.
- Bassey, N. (2019). Breaking the Chains of Development. Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary (pp. 3-5). New Delhi: Tulika Books.
- Bilgin, P. (2016). How to Remedy Eurocentrism in IR? A Complement and A Challenge for the Global Transformation. *International Theory*. 8(3): 492-501.
- Bilotti, E. (2015). From Keynesian Consensus to Washington Non-Consensus: A World-Systems Interpretation of the Development Debate. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*. 38(3): 205-218.
- Binder, L. (1986). The Natural History of Development Theory. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 28(1): 3-33.
- Brohman, J. (1995). Universalism, Eurocentrism, and Ideological Bias in Development Studies: From Modernization to Neoliberalism. *Third World Quarterly*. 16(1): 121-140.
- Burney, S. (2012). Erasing Eurocentrism: "Using the Other as The Supplement of Knowledge". *Counterpoints*. 417: 143-172.

Buzan, B. and Lawson, G. (2013). The Global Transformation: The Nineteenth Century and the Making of Modern International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly*. 57(3): 620-634.

Capan, Z. G. (2017a). Enacting the International / Reproducing Eurocentrism. *Contexto Internacional*. 39(3): 655-672.

Capan, Z. G. (2017b). Decolonising International Relations? *Third World Quarterly*. 38(1): 1-15.

Capan, Z. G. (2018). Eurocentrism and Construction of Non-West. E-International Relations. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/06/19/eurocentrism-and-the-construction-of-the-non-west/>, (01.01.2020).

Cavalcanti, J. G. (2007). Development Versus Enjoyment of Life: A Post-Development Critique of the Developmental Worldview. *Development in Practice*. 17(1): 85-92.

Chimuka, T. A. (2015). “Ubuntu”: The Itinerary, Import and Utility of the Idea. *International Journal of African Society Cultures and Traditions*. 2(2): 58-78.

Chuji, M., Rengifo, G., and Gudynas, E. (2019). Buen Vivir. Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary (pp. 111-114). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Conner, C. (2011). Afrocentrism vs. Eurocentrism in Ancient History. Socialist Action. <https://socialistaction.org/2011/08/12/afrocentrism-vs-eurocentrism-in-ancient-history/>, (01.02.2020).

Cooper, F. (2010). Writing the History of Development. *Journal of Modern European History*. 8(1): 5-23.

Corbridge, S. (2007). The (Im)Possibility of Development Studies. *Economy and Society*. 36(2): 179-211.

Demaria, F. and Kothari, A. (2017). The Post-Development Dictionary Agenda: Paths to the Pluriverse. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12): 2588-2599.

Dirlik, A. (1999). Is There History After Eurocentrism? Globalism, Postcolonialism, and the Disavowal of History. *Cultural Critique*. 42: 1-34.

Duzgun, E. (2018). Against Eurocentric Anti-Eurocentrism: International Relations, Historical Sociology and Political Marxism. *Journal of International Relations and Development*. 23: 285-307.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: Making and Unmaking of Third World*. New York: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (2019). Civilizational Transitions. Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary (pp. 121-124). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Esteva, G. (2010). Development. Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power (pp. 6-25). London: Zed Books.

Esteva, G. and Escobar, A. (2017). Post-Development @ 25: On 'Being Stuck' and Moving Forward, Sideways, Backward and Otherwise. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12): 2559-2572.

Fagunwa, T. (2019). Ubuntu: Revisiting an Endangered African Philosophy in Quest of a Pan-Africanist Revolutionary Ideology. *Genealogy*. 3(45): 1-17.

Frank, A. G. (1966). The Development of Underdevelopment. *Monthly Review*. 18(4): 17-31.

Franzki, H. (2012). Eurocentrism. InterAmerican Wiki. www.uni-bielefeld.de/cias/wiki/e_Eurocentrism.html, (01.02.2020).

Gills, B. (2017). The Future of Development from Global Crises to Global Convergence. *Forum for Development Studies*. 44(1): 155-161.

Giovannini, M. (2015). Indigenous Community Enterprises in Chiapas: A Vehicle for Buen Vivir? *Community Development Journal*. 50(1): 71-87.

Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow. *Development*. 54(4): 441-447.

Gudynas, E. (2017). Post-Development and Other Critiques of the Roots of Development. *The Essential Guide to Critical Development Studies* (pp. 84-93). New York: Routledge.

Gulalp, H. (1998). The Eurocentrism of Dependency Theory and the Question of 'Authenticity': A View from Turkey. *Third World Quarterly*. 19(5): 951-961.

Hailey, J. (2008). *Ubuntu: A Literature Review*. London: Tutu Foundation.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hettne, B. (1983). The Development of Development Theory. *Acta Sociologica*. 26(3/4): 247-266.

Hobson, J. M. (2012). *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–2010*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Hodge, J. M. (2015). Writing the History of Development (Part 1: The First Wave). *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*. 6: 429-463.

Kanth, R. K. (2009). *The Challenge of Eurocentrism: Global Perspectives, Policy, and Prospects*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kayaoglu, T. (2010). Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory. *International Studies Review*. 12(2): 193-217.

Klein, E. and Morreo, C. E. (2019). *Post-Development in Practice: Alternatives, Economies, Ontologies*. New York: Routledge.

Knutsson, B. (2009). The Intellectual History of Development: Towards A Widening Potential Repertoire. *Perspectives*. 13: 1-47.

Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., Demaria, F. and Acosta, A. (2019). *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary*. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Kuru, D. (2016). Historicising Eurocentrism and Anti-Eurocentrism in IR: A Revisionist Account of Disciplinary Self-Reflexivity. *Review of International Studies*. 42: 351-376.

Le Grange, L. (2019). Ubuntu. *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary* (pp. 323-326). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Leyva-Solano, X. (2019). Zapatista Autonomy. *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary* (pp. 335-338). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Lin, Y. J. (2012). The Development Debate: A Rejoinder. World Bank Blogs. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/the-development-debate-a-rejoinder>, (10.12.2019).

Mackerras, C. (2019). Eurocentrism. Encyclopedia.com. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/dictionaries-thesauruses-pictures-and-press-releases/eurocentrism>, (10.12.2019).

Matthews, S. (2008). The Role of The Privileged in Responding to Poverty: Perspectives Emerging from the Post-Development Debate. *Third World Quarterly*. 29(6): 1035-1049.

Matthews, S. (2017). Colonized Minds? Post-Development Theory and the Desirability of Development in Africa. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12): 2650-2663.

Mazower, M. (2014). The End of Eurocentrism. *Critical Inquiry*. 40(4): 298-313.

Mignolo, D. W. (2002). The Zapatistas's Theoretical Revolution: Its Historical, Ethical, and Political Consequences. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*. 25(3): 245-275.

Mundle, S. (1993). Policies, Paradigms and Development Debate at Close of Twentieth Century. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 28(36): 1879-1882.

Nilsen, A. G. (2016). Power, Resistance and Development in the Global South: Notes Towards A Critical Research Agenda. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, Society*. 29: 269-287.

Olesen, T. (2004). Globalising the Zapatistas: From Third World Solidarity to Global Solidarity? *Third World Quarterly*. 25(1): 255-267.

Oslington, P. and Mahmood, M. A. (1993). History of Development Economics. *The Pakistan Development Review*. 32(4): 631-638.

Picq, M. L. (2013). Critics at The Edge? Decolonizing Methodologies in International Relations. *International Political Science Review*. 34(4): 444-455.

Pieterse, J. N. (1996). The Development of Development Theory: Towards Critical Globalism. *Review of International Political Economy*. 3(4): 541-564.

Pieterse, J. N. (2000). After Post-Development. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(2): 175-191.

Pieterse, J. N. (2010). *Development Theory: Deconstructions / Reconstructions*. London: Sage.

Rapley, J. (2007). *Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in the Third World*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Rist, G. (1990). Development as the New Religion of the West. *Quid Pro Quo*. 1(2): 5-8.

Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The Five Stages of Growth-A Summary. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Saffari, S. (2013). Alternative Development(s), or Alternative(s) to Development? Challenges and Prospects for Genuine Alternative-building. *Africa Yesterday, Today & Tomorrow: Exploring the Multi-dimensional Discourses on 'Development'*

(pp. 40-51). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Scholte, J. A. and Söderbaum, F. (2017). A Changing Global Development Agenda? *Forum for Development Studies*. 44(1): 1-12.

Sholk, S. R. (2007). Resisting Neoliberal Homogenization: The Zapatista Autonomy Movement. *Latin American Perspectives*. 34(2): 48-63.

Siemiatycki, E. (2005). Post-Development at a Crossroads: Towards a 'Real' Development. *Undercurrent*. 2(30): 57-61.

Simon, D. (2006). Separated by Common Ground? Bringing (Post)Development and (Post)Colonialism Together. *The Geographical Journal*. 172(1): 10-21.

Sodhi, J. S. (2011). Beyond GDP: The Debate on Globalization & Development. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 46(4): 562-570.

Sonntag, H. R., Contreras, M. A., and Biardeau, J. (2001). Development as Modernization and Modernity in Latin America. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*. 24(2): 219-251.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2008). Is There a Post-Washington Consensus Consensus? . The Washington Consensus Reconsidered: Towards a New Global Governance (pp. 41-54). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sunar, L. (2016). *Eurocentrism at the Margins: Encounters, Critics and Going Beyond*. New York: Routledge.

Svampa, M. (2019). The Latin American Critique of Development. Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary (pp. 18-21). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Swanson, D. M. (2007). Ubuntu: An African Contribution to (Re)search for/with a 'Humble Togetherness'. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*. 2(2): 53-67.

UNDP. (1990). *Human Development Report 1990: Concept and Measurement of Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2010). *World Social Science Report: Knowledge Divides*. UNESCO Publishing.

Wallerstein, I. (1997). Eurocentrism and Its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science. *Sociological Bulletin*. 46(1): 21-39.

Walsh, C. (2010). Development as Buen Vivir: Institutional Arrangements and (De)colonial Entanglements. *Development*. 53(1): 15-21.

Willis, K. (2005). *Theories and Practices of Development*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ziai, A. (2013). The Discourse of “Development” and Why the Concept Should Be Abandoned. *Development in Practice*. 23(1): 123-136.

Ziai, A. (2016). Post-Development and Alternatives to Development. *Introduction to International Development: Approaches, Actors, and Issues*. 3: 65-83.

Ziai, A. (2017a). Post-Development 25 Years After the Development Dictionary. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12): 2547-2558.

Ziai, A. (2017b). I Am Not A Post-Developmentalist, But... The Influence of Post-Development on Development Studies. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12): 2719-2734.