

**GEOGRAPHIES OF DEVELOPMENT AND ANTI-DEVELOPMENT  
GEOG 721**

**Instructor:** Ed Carr

**Office:** Callcott 229

**Office Hours:** Thursdays 1-2 and by appointment

**Ph.:** 777-1854

**e-mail:** carr@sc.edu

**Course Structure and Evaluation:**

This is a reading-intensive seminar course. Students are expected to come to class meetings having familiarized themselves with *at least* the required readings for the week. It is recommended that students attempt to engage some of the suggested readings for additional depth in areas of particular interest. Course readings will be available in the copy room across from the Geography Department office on the first floor of Callcott.

This seminar relies upon the participants' capacity participate in a fruitful discussion in the seminar meeting. This means that each student should be familiar with the central arguments of the required readings, and be able to develop thoughts on the connections/disconnections in the larger body of readings for the week and across the semester. Students who do not/cannot meet this first requirement will fare poorly in this class, as they will be unable to make a positive contribution to seminar discussions. Student participation in seminar meetings will make up 40% of the final grade.

Each student will lead discussion in one seminar meeting during the semester. This requires not only doing the reading for that week, but also preparing a list of topics/questions for discussion and a three page response paper for the readings from that week. Response papers should not be a "book report" on the week's readings, but an intensive engagement with one of the readings, or a common theme in several of the readings. This discussion role and response paper will be worth 10% of the final grade.

For the final 50% of the course grade, each student will complete a term paper in this course of approximately 20 pages. The paper should engage one or more of the theories discussed in this class. How you choose to conduct this engagement is up to the student - anything from an exposition of the way in which these concepts come into/are put into play in a particular place/case of the student's choosing to an extended discussion derived from the close reading of some of the seminar material is acceptable. The other requirement of this paper be that it, in some way, take an analytical approach to the topic – it is not enough to simply describe a particular theory. There are many ways to do this. For example, one might ask how particular theories define terms, build discourses, and shape practices in particular places. Is the use of a particular theory implied or overt? How do particular theories open and close approaches to understanding and/or dealing with particular situations? Starting from questions like these will allow for the development of critically-informed papers that will enhance our understanding of how these theories shape our understanding of various issues and processes, and perhaps be suitable for conference presentation or publication.

The paper grade will be broken down as follows:

(5%) Topical abstract: Due on March 2, this abstract should identify a topic and some preliminary ideas as to sources that will be used.

(5%) Paper outline/preliminary bibliography: Due on March 30, this outline should provide a clear research question and lay out a structure for the paper. Accompanying this outline should be a briefly annotated bibliography of key sources (it need not be complete at this point) that provides citation information, as well as a brief (1-2 sentence statement) of the significance of this work to the paper.

(20%) Brief classroom presentation: Due on April 27. Students should prepare a 10-15 minute presentation of their paper, and be prepared to field questions from the class and professor.

(70%) Final paper: Due Friday, April 30.

### Required Texts:

Ferguson, J., 1994: *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Escobar, A., 1995: *Encountering Development*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Chambers, R., 1997: *Whose Reality Counts?: Putting the First Last*. Intermediate Technology, London.

Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York.

*All other readings will be available for photocopying during the appropriate week*

### Course Schedule and Readings

#### WEEK 1: INTRODUCTION

12 January 2006

No Reading: Participant introductions and paperwork

#### WEEK 2: DEFINING DEVELOPMENT?

19 January 2006

Esteva, G., 1992: Development. In Sachs, W. (ed.) *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge and Power*, pp. 6-25. Zed Books Ltd., London.

Crush, J., 1995: Introduction: Imagining development. In Crush, J. (ed.) *Power of Development*, pp. 1-23. Routledge, London.

Schuurman, F. J., 2000: Paradigms lost, paradigms regained? Development studies in the twenty-first century. *Third World Quarterly* **21**(1): 7-20.

Blaug, M., 2001: No History of Ideas, Please, We're Economists. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **15**(1): 145-164.

Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 1, pp. 1-12

#### WEEK 3: HISTORIC GROWTH AND STAGES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

26 January 2006

Rostow, W. W., 1959: The Stages of Economic Growth. *Economic History Review* **12**(1): 1-16.

Baran, P., Hobsbawm, E., 1961: The Stages of Economic Growth. *Kyklos* **14**: 234-242.

Gerschenkron, A., 1962: *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Ch 1.

Myrdal, G., 1970: *The Challenge of World Poverty*. Pantheon, New York., Ch 2.

Kuznets, S., 1973: Modern Economic Growth: Findings and reflections. *American Economic Review* **63**: 247-258.

Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch. 2 pp.17-40, Ch 3 pp. 80-83

WEEK 4: MODERNIZATION I: DEVELOPMENT AS STRUCTURAL CHANGE

2 February 2006

- Lewis, A., 1954: Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labor. *The Manchester School of Economics and Social Sciences* **22**: 139-191.
- St. Cyr, E. B. A., 1980: On Lewis' Theory of Growth and Development. *Social and Economic Studies* **29**(4): 16-26.
- Kirkpatrick, C., Barrientos, A., 2004: The Lewis model after 50 years. *Manchester School* **72**(6): 679-690.
- Gilman, N., 2003: *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. chap. 1, "Modernization Theory and American Modernism."
- Figueroa, M., 2004: W. Arthur Lewis versus the Lewis model: Agricultural or industrial development? *Manchester School* **72**(6): 736-750.

WEEK 5: MODERNIZATION II: MODERNIZING PEOPLE

9 February 2006

- Hirschman, A. O., 1982: Rival Interpretations of Market Society: Civilizing, Destructive, or Feeble? *Journal of Economic Literature* **20**: 1463-1484.
- Hirschman, A. O., 1984: The On and Off Connection Between Political and Economic Progress. *The American Economic Review* **84**: 343-348.
- Myrdal, G., 1989: The Equality Issue in World Development. *American Economic Review* **79**(6): 8-17.
- Streeten, P., 1990: Gunnar Myrdal. *World Development* **18**(7): 1031-37.
- Hirschman, A. O., 1992: Industrialization and Its Manifest Discontents: West, East, and South. *World Development* **20**: 1225-1232.
- Hirschman, A. O., 1994: Social Conflicts as Pillars of Democratic Market Society. *Political Theory* **22**(2): 203-218.
- Streeten, P., 1998: The Cheerful Pessimist: Gunnar Myrdal The Dissenter. *World Development* **26**(3): 539-550.
- Santiso, J., 2000: Hirschman's View of Development, or the Art of Trespassing and Self-Subversion. *CEPAL Review* **70**: 93-111.
- Kahn, F. C., 2005: Gender violence and development discourse in Bangladesh. *International Social Science Journal* **57**(2): 219-230.
- Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 3., pp. 76-80

WEEK 6: NO CLASS – ERC AT SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

16 February 2006

WEEK 7: DEPENDENCY THEORY: THE BACKLASH AGAINST MODERNIZATION THEORY

23 February 2006

- Baran, P., 1957: *The Political Economy of Growth*. Monthly Review Press, New York., "On the Roots of Backwardness," pp. 134-162.
- Gunder Frank, A., 1966: The Development of Underdevelopment. *The Monthly Review* **18**(4): 17-31.
- Dos Santos, T., 1970: The Structure of Dependence. *American Economic Review* **60**: 231-236
- Amin, S., 1976: *Unequal Development*. Monthly Review Press, New York., "The Origin and Development of Underdevelopment," pp. 198-203.
- Prebisch, R., 1981: The Latin American Periphery in the Global System of Capitalism. *CEPAL Review* **13**: 143-150.
- Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 4., pp. 107-111

WEEK 8: THE RISE (AND FALL?) OF "DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS"

2 March 2006

- Johnson, H., 1971: A word to the Third World: A Western economist's frank advice. *Encounter* **37**: 1-10.
- Manzo, K., 1991: Modernist Discourse and the Crisis of Development Theory. *Studies in Comparative International Development* **26**: 3-36.
- Hirschman, A. O., 1994: The Rise and Decline of Development Economics. In Kanth, R. (ed.) *Paradigms in Economic Development: Classic Perspectives, Critiques, and Reflections*, pp. M. E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
- Williams, G., 1994: Why Structural Adjustment is Necessary and Why it does not Work. *Review of African Political Economy*: 1-10.
- Lal, D., 1995: The Misconceptions of "Development Economics". In Corbridge, S. (ed.) *Development Studies: A Reader*, pp. 56-63. Arnold, London.
- Krugman, P., 1995: *Development, Geography and Economic Theory*. MIT Press, Boston., "The Fall and Rise of Development Economics." pp. 1-30.
- Stiglitz, J. E., 2002: *Globalization and its Discontents*. Norton, New York. Preface and Chapters 1-3 (pp. ix-xvi; 1-88).

Recommended

- Watts, M., 1994: Development II: The Privatization of Everything. *Progress in Human Geography* **18**(3): 371-384.
- Owusu, J. H., 1998: Current Convenience, Desperate Deforestation: Ghana's Adjustment Program and the Forestry Sector. *The Professional Geographer* **50**(4): 418-436.
- Manzo, K., 1999: The 'New' Developmentalism: Political Liberalism and the Washington Consensus. In Slater, D. and Taylor, P. J. (eds.), *The American Century: Consensus and Coercion in the Projection of American Power*, pp. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.

WEEK 9: NO CLASS – AAG ANNUAL MEETING/SPRING BREAK

9 March 2006

WEEK 10: THE OBJECTS OF DEVELOPMENT HAVE VOICES I: THROUGH THE EYES OF THE POOR

16 March 2006

- Chambers, R., 1997: *Whose Reality Counts?: Putting the First Last*. Intermediate Technology, London.
- Kapoor, I., 2002: The devil's in the theory: a critical assessment of Robert Chamber's work on participatory development. *Third World Quarterly* **23**(1): 101-117.

WEEK 11: THE OBJECTS OF DEVELOPMENT HAVE VOICES II: GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT

23 March 2006

- Shiva, V., 1989: *Staying Alive*. Zed Books, London., "Development, Ecology and Women" pp. 1-13
- Jackson, C., 1993: Women/nature or gender/history? A critique of ecofeminist 'development'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* **20**(3): 389-419.
- Peters, P. E., 1995: Uses and Abuses of the Concept of 'Female-headed Households' in Research on Agrarian Transformation and Policy. In Bryceson, D. F. (ed.) *Women Wielding the Hoe: Lessons from Rural Africa for Feminist Theory and Development Practice*, pp. 93-108. Berg Publishers, Oxford.
- Rocheleau, D., Thomas-Slayter, B., Wangari, E., 1996: Gender and Environment: A feminist political ecology perspective. In Rocheleau, D., Thomas-Slayter, B. and Wangari, E. (eds.), *Feminist Political Ecology: Global issues and local experiences*, pp. 3-23. Routledge, New York.

- Pearson, R., Jackson, C., 1998: Introduction: Interrogating Development: feminism, gender and policy. In Jackson, C. and Pearson, R. (eds.), *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender analysis and policy*, pp. 1-16. Routledge, London.
- Grigsby, W. J., 2004: The Gendered Nature of Subsistence and Its Effect on Customary Land Tenure. *Society and Natural Resources* **17**: 207-222.
- Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 6.

*Recommended*

- Ong, A., 1994: Colonialism and Modernity: Feminist re-presentations of Women in Non-Western Societies. In Crush, J. (ed.) *Power of Development*, pp. Routledge, London.
- Parpart, J., 1995: Post-Modernism, Gender and Development. In Crush, J. (ed.) *Power of Development*, pp. 253-265. Routledge, London.
- Kandioti, D., 1998: Gender, power and contestation: 'Rethinking bargaining with patriarchy'. In Jackson, C. and Pearson, R. (eds.), *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender analysis and policy*, pp. 135-151. Routledge, London.
- Mama, A., 2005: Demythologising Gender in Development: Feminist Studies in African Contexts. *IDS Bulletin* **35**(4): 121-124.

WEEK 12: POST(ANTI)-DEVELOPMENT I: THEORY

30 March 2006

- Escobar, A., 1995: *Encountering Development*. Princeton University Press, Princeton. Chapters 1-4, 6
- Nabudere, D. W., 1997: Beyond Modernization and Development, or Why the Poor Reject Development. *Geografiska Annaler* **79 B**(4): 203-215.
- Escobar, A., 2004: Beyond the Third World: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalisation social movements. *Third World Quarterly* **25**(1): 207-230.
- Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 5.

*Recommended*

- Escobar, A., 2001: Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography* **20**(2): 139-174.

WEEK 13: POST(ANTI)-DEVELOPMENT II: APPLICATION

6 April 2006

- Ferguson, J., 1994: *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. Chapters 1-6, 9
- Mitchell, T., 2002: *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. University of California Press, *Object of Development* Chapter
- Grischow, J., McKnight, G., 2003: Rhyming Development: Practising Post-development in Colonial Ghana and Uganda. *Journal of Historical Sociology* **16**(4): 517-549.
- Ferguson, J., 2005: Seeing like an oil company: Space, security, and global capital in neoliberal Africa. *American Anthropologist* **107**(3): 377-382.

WEEK 14: THE BACKLASH AGAINST ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

13 April 2006

- Little, P., Painter, M., 1992: Discourse, politics, and the development process: Reflections on Escobar's "Anthropology and the Development Encounter". *American Ethnologist* **22**(3): 602-616.

- Agrawal, A., 1996: Poststructuralist Approaches to Development: Some Critical Reflections. *Peace and Change* **21**(4): 464-477.
- Lehmann, D., 1997: An Opportunity Lost: Escobar's Deconstruction of Development. *The Journal of Development Studies* **33**(4): 568-578.
- Corbridge, S., 1998: 'Beneath the pavement only soil': the poverty of post-development. *Journal of Development Studies* **34**(6): 138-148.
- Storey, A., 2000: Post-Development Theory: Romanticism and Pontius Pilate Politics. *Development* **43**(4): 40-46.
- Pickles, J., 2001: Development "deferred": Poststructuralism, postdevelopment, and the defense of critical modernism. *Economic Geography* **77**(4): 383-388.
- Ziai, A., 2004: The ambivalence of post-development: between reactionary populism and radical democracy. *Third World Quarterly* **25**(6): 1045-1060.
- Kapoor, I., 2004: Hyper-self-reflexive development? Spivak on representing the Third World 'Other'. *Third World Quarterly* **25**(4): 627-647.

*Recommended*

- Simon, D., 1998: Rethinking (post)modernism, postcolonialism, and posttraditionalism: South - North perspectives. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **16**: 219-245.
- Veltmeyer, H., 2001: The politics of language: Deconstructing the discourse of postdevelopment. *Revue Canadienne D Etudes Du Developpement-Canadian Journal of Development Studies* **22**(3): 597-620.

WEEK 15: A WAY FORWARD?

13 April 2006

- Esteva, G., Prakash, M. S., 1998: Beyond Development, What? *Development in Practice* **8**(3): 280-296.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J., 1998: My paradigm or yours? Alternative development, post-development, and reflexive development. *Development and Change* **29**: 343-373.
- Blakie, P., 2000: Development, post-, anti- and populist: a critical review. *Environment and Planning A* **32**(6): 1033-1050.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J., 2000: After post-development. *Third World Quarterly* **21**(2): 175-191.
- Curry, G. N., 2003: Moving beyond postdevelopment: Facilitating indigenous alternatives for "development". *Economic Geography* **79**(4): 405-423.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K., 2005: Surplus Possibilities: Postdevelopment and Community Economies. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* **26**(1): 4-26.
- Peet, R., 1999: *Theories of Development*. The Guilford Press, New York., Ch 7.

*Recommended*

- Hart, G., 2001: Development critiques in the 1990s: culs de sac and promising paths. *Progress in Human Geography* **25**(4): 649-658.

WEEK 16: CLASS PRESENTATIONS

27 April 2006