

Dependency Theory how relevant is it today?

Amit Jyoti Sen
Indian Institute of Management Calcutta

Introduction:

Basic tenets of dependency theory

Dependency theory is based on the notion that there is a group of wealthy states (core) and a periphery of poor underdeveloped states (Third world).

Resources are extracted by the core from the periphery to sustain their economic growth and wealth. This is an on going process.

According to dependency, theory poverty and underdevelopment in the peripheral states is not the result of tradition or backwardness. It is necessary for the development of capitalism in the core states. In other words the very success of the core states is the cause of underdevelopment of the periphery.

This is because of the coercive and exploitative manner by which the peripheral states have been integrated into the world economy.

Thus underdevelopment is not just a simple descriptive term that refers to a traditional economy. It is rooted in unequal exchange based on imperialism. This unequal exchange has not only enabled the developed world to develop and reach high standards of living but it continues to allow them to do so.

Dependency theory has to be contrasted with free market economics which argues that integration into the world system of production is beneficial.

On the contrary dependency theory sees the global economy is characterized by a structured relationship between the core states which, using political, military and economic power extract a surplus from the peripheral countries. Any attempt by the dependent nations to resist the influences of dependency often result in economic sanctions and/or military invasion and control.

Origins:

There are several variants of dependency theory. One originated in Latin America and can be regarded as that region's original contribution to political economy. Another is the American-Marxist tradition developed by Baran, Sweezy, Gunder Frank and Wallerstein. But the ideas are not new.

The founder of the Latin American school was Raúl Prebisch. It emerged in the 1950s as a reaction to free trade theories. Latin American underdevelopment was seen as being the consequence of excessive reliance on exports of primary commodities, whose prices showed a downward trend in the long run; a case of deteriorating terms of trade. So participation in world trade was seen as a losing proposition. As a consequence most Latin American countries adopted strategies of self-reliance or self sufficiency. They sought to accelerate industrialization through import substitution and diversify exports. High tariff walls were erected. But this model of development ran into problems as it tended to exacerbate balance of payments difficulties.

Analysts such as Fernando Cardoso, Celso Furtado and Theonitio Dos Santos developed this theory further. Their variant did not just focus on the asymmetrical relations between countries. It looked at linkages. It held that dependency was perpetuated by ties among groups and classes both between and within nations. They identified interest networks —business, bureaucrats and the military— that bind the dynamics of local political and economic processes to interests in the industrialized world. They also conceived of various degrees of dependency for different countries, and also allowed for the possibility that the nature of dependent relations could change over time.

Moreover their explanation of underdevelopment was less deterministic than that of the Marxists in the developed countries such as Paul Baran and Andre Gunder Frank. The American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein refined the Marxist aspect and called it the "World-system."

Wallerstein argued that at one time all societies were mini-systems existing in isolation. Then emerged world economies, which are entities with a single division of labour and multiple cultural systems. These came in two variants:

One with a common political system (world empires)

One without such a common system (world systems)

Till the advent of capitalism world economies were unstable. "Countries" more correctly regions were prone to takeover by a group leading to the establishment of world empires.

World empires were characterized by rulers who engaged in excessive consumption, imposed high taxes and had little interest in productive investment. Economic dynamism was throttled. Businesspeople (merchants and traders) were held in low esteem. True there was customary law with property rights but the possibility of abuse was always present. Of course the excesses of the rulers were subject to some check; the absence of good communication meant that local communities were often left in peace and taxes not collected.

By 1500 a new type of world economy emerged; a capitalist one. The state was not the central economic agent. That role was played by a new group the bourgeoisie, who unlike the medieval trader possessed political power and demanded from the state, policies which would further their self interest one of which was to assure favourable terms of trade.

Wallerstein also speaks of core states and peripheral ones. In the early days of capitalism the core states were in Western Europe principally Britain and the Netherlands and peripheral in Eastern Europe notably Poland. Peripheral states need not have been colonies but often they were. When they were, World Systems could be identical to World Empires. However in World systems the driving force was the individual capitalist and whereas in world Empires it was the state.

The years following 1500 saw the emergence of a new system. It also saw the emergence of a new class of merchants and bourgeoisie. Presumably you could have capitalism within a country without much contact with the outside world...an autarkic

capitalist society, but the way capitalism arose in Western Europe, it was tied up very much with overseas trade. In the US a hundred years later capitalism seems to have developed autonomously. America was till recent times a fairly autarkic.

Wallerstein put class in the context of the world economy. There were both capitalists and proletariats in core societies and in peripheral societies but given the pattern of trade, characterised as it was by unequal exchange, the capitalists in the periphery were dependent and weak and the proletariats in the core were privileged.

Unequal exchange was buttressed by political power; either there was outright colonisation or there was neo-colonisation a situation where the states in the periphery, though nominally independent, were subject to the dictates of the core states.

Whether the periphery was colonised or “neo-colonised” there was a set pattern to the form of capitalist development. A major form was the plantation, with some processing activity. In general raw materials were exported and manufactured products imported. An important economic actor was the buyer of raw materials. Generally plantations were owned by capitalists from the core states and the buyers were also from the core states operating through local agents. There was little by way of factory mode manufacturing. Local capitalists were circumscribed and dependent. Even when they engaged in manufacturing the products were for the local market and of indifferent quality.

After WW II the process of decolonisation began which continued for 30 years (till the seventies). Different countries followed different policies. The buzzword was “Development”. This often took the form of state intervention and a policy of industrialisation through import substitution. Politically they claimed to be non-aligned. Other countries followed a different agenda: more market friendly policies and more open to international trade and investment. These states tended to be in the good books of the core nations and were not as vocally anti-western.

To Wallerstein capitalist development implies some form of imperialism. In the early stages it was imperialism within Europe; this then extended to the rest of the world. Wallerstein argued that division of labour is not just people pursuing different occupations; it is also about the distinction between those who do the work and those who manage. Thus to the extent that the interests of managers and owners are intertwined class and division of labour go together. Wallerstein gives an analysis of class relations in an inter-country basis. His key contribution is to argue for and to demonstrate that capitalist development without global exploitation would be impossible. For the core to prosper there has to be a periphery to exploit.

To Wallerstein the period after WW II brought about mere cosmetic changes in the world order. The hegemony of the “north” continues over the south till this day. Writing in 1999 he says:

If we look at the last thirty years, what do we really see? First of all, a greatly increased polarization of the world-system. Never in modern history has the gap between what we call North and South been so great. The gap is economic, social, and demographic. The curve is straight upward. Secondly, we see a greatly increased

polarization within the states of the North. Those who are doing well have never done so well, it is true. (However, as we noted, this varies amongst the triad according to decade.) But the zones of poverty are also escalating.

In a later article he continues with this theme and extends it. The gulf is not only large but getting larger. But this cannot go on any more. The capitalist world is running out of areas to exploit, the environment is getting worse, natural resources are depleted. Thus a collapse of the system is on the cards.

There are points of disagreements among the various versions, Latin American, Marxist (Andre Gunder Frank), and the world systems theory (Wallerstein). Nonetheless, there are some common features shared by most dependency theorists.

First, the international system is seen as being comprised of two sets of states, variously described as dominant/dependent, or center/periphery. It is assumed that economic and political power are heavily concentrated and centralized in the industrialized countries.

Second, external forces are considered to be of major importance within the dependent states. These external forces include multinational corporations, Bretton Woods institutions, foreign aid agencies, media and communications, and other means by which the advanced industrialized countries represent their economic interests.

Third international capitalism is seen as the motive force behind dependency relationships. According to this view, the capitalist system has enforced a rigid international division of labour which is responsible for the underdevelopment of many areas of the world. The dependent states supply cheap minerals, agricultural commodities, and cheap labour, and also serve as the repositories of surplus capital, obsolescent technologies, and manufactured goods.

Thus the economies of the dependent states are oriented toward the outside: money, goods, and services do flow into dependent states, but the allocation of these resources is determined by the economic interests of the dominant states, and not by the economic interests of the dependent state.

The poorer countries of the world are not "behind" or "catching up". They are not poor because they lagged behind the scientific transformations or the Enlightenment values of the west. They are poor because they were coercively integrated into the western economic system.

Dependency theorists believe that the national interest of a country can only be satisfied by addressing the needs of the poor within a society, rather than through the satisfaction of corporate or governmental needs.

The existing regime of exploitation is maintained not only by the power of dominant states, but also through the power of elites in the dependent states whose private interests coincide with the interests of the dominant states. These elites share similar values and culture with the elites in dominant states.

Dependency theory is a rival to modernization theories and development economics. This approach argued that what “Third World” countries needed to do was to catch up by following the footsteps of the rich countries. (W W Rostow) In post-war period both capitalist and communist views agreed that underdevelopment was a direct result of internal characteristics and that third world nations would eventually seek modernization or "westernization".

The most popular criticism to this view was the charge of ethnocentrism, or the assumption that economic and social progress that has worked in certain countries would work equally as well elsewhere. Instead the prescriptions of modernisation theory would lead those lesser nations to become more dependent on wealthier nations, and enhance their inevitable exploitation.

Dependency theory comes bundled up with other positions such as anti globalisation and anti westernisation.

Globalization or more correctly “globalisation from above” can be defined as the integration of economic, political and social cultures. As societies modernize, they become more alike and begin to share the same socio-cultural characteristics. It leads to the development of a global economy and one cultural society making Non-Western societies merge into western culture to become more "modern."

Critics of globalization see it as neo-imperialism or U.S. hegemonism, leading to unfair results, including one-sided gains and negative consequences for cultural diversity and the environment. Ultimately, globalization pushes countries along the capitalist route with consumerism dominating.

In reaction, various social movements emerged to challenge globalization; these movements have been called "anti-globalization" or "globalization from below." Anti-globalization is seen as a critical response to the development of neo-liberalism. It is the political stance of people and groups who oppose neo-liberal policies of unfettered globalization particularly those determined by the organizations such as the IMF or the WTO in imposing the radical deregulation program of free market fundamentalism.

Admittedly the 'anti-globalization' is in many ways a misnomer, since many of the people involved in the anti-globalization movement do support closer ties between the various peoples and cultures of the world.

The critics of globalization typically emphasize that globalization is a process that is mediated according to corporate interests, and raise the possibility of alternative global institutions and policies, which they believe address the moral claims of poor and working classes throughout the globe, as well as environmental concerns in a more equitable way.

Dependency is also associated with anti westernization:

Westernization is a process whereby non-western societies come under the influence of Western culture in such matters as industry, technology, law, politics, economics,

lifestyle, religion or values. The main characteristics are economic liberalization (free trade) and the spread of an individualised culture.

It is often regarded as a part of the ongoing process of globalization. This theory proposes that western thought has led to globalization, and that globalization propagates western culture, leading to a cycle of westernization.

Westernization as globalization is seen by many as progress, as democracy and free trade spread gradually throughout the world. Others view westernization as a disadvantage.

The basic ideas of dependency theory have been said before. For example Dadabhai Naoroji (1825 – 1917) a Parsi educator, cotton trader, and an early Indian political leader who is credited with the founding of the Indian National Congress, along with A.O. Hume, W. C. Bonnerjee and Dinshaw Wacha wrote a book *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, which brought into the limelight the drain of India's wealth into Britain. He was a Liberal Party MP in the House of Commons between 1892 and 1895, the first British Indian MP.

Dutt, Romesh Chunder (1848-1909) a civil servant, politician, political and economic thinker and writer. He was an early member of the Indian Civil Service from which he took early retirement to write on political issues. He was the author of the monumental work the Economic History of India (1757-1857) which was published in two volumes 1902-1904. In it he described the various aspects of the economic administration of British government, de-industrialization of India through unfair competition with machine made goods of England, neglect of industrial and agricultural development, high rate of revenue, the consequent impoverishment of the peasantry, the outbreak of famines, the drain of resources through the payment of 'Home charges', financing by India of expensive wars beyond Indian borders for British imperial interests. Dutt was not the sole exponent of these views, nor was he the pioneer. But his criticisms were the most influential.

II

There are several versions the of Dependency theory and rather than use classifications such as Marxist non Marxist, I would use "home grown" and "western". Example of home grown would be the Latin American versions of dependency and Indian such as Naoroji and Dutt, and certainly many others. By western I mean Wallerstein and Gunder Frank. Significantly the western views are more strident, indeed their views are held as an article of faith, almost as a religion.

Societies are very complex as is the complexity of relations between societies including that between the centre and periphery. It leads to the inevitable question: Is the glass half full or half empty?

Colonial period (1500 to 1950s)

No one can argue the colonial experience led to systematic exploitation

Whether it was all bad is a complex issue; true there was exploitation but the colonial period did see the establishment of certain institutions in many countries which for want of a better term can be described as “modern”. It can be argued that they were an imposition and inappropriate. This would be the view of the anti-Westernisation groups.

True these institutions were imposed but they have been adopted and accepted along with the ideas that go with them. And in most cases the problem is not seen to be the institution but the way they are run.

Why colonisation happened is more contentious - it has to be addressed, the reason may well differ from continent to continent as would the nature of the colonial experience. The dependency theorists argue that that it continues and that it will continue. This is contestable.

To them things are getting worse and every event reinforces their fixed notions. Even if there is a visible improvement it is not regarded as an improvement. So even the rise of China is regarded as ephemeral, never mind that of Taiwan and S. Korea

The basic issues come down to:

In economics: no development possible. If there is growth it is not really beneficial
In politics: Comprador capitalists and collaborating third world elites
In culture: Rejection of modernity coupled with anti-industry/organisation.

Let us take up the issues one by one:

III

Economic arguments: the central point is unequal exchange. Curiously very little is said of low rates of domestic saving leading to dependency on aid.

When is exchange unequal? Difference in power is the most common and obvious reason. This is because of lack of alternatives, namely absence of choice. But it can also arise if there is lack of awareness about alternatives. There may be opportunities but one is not aware of them. At an extreme there could be total ignorance. Such a situation may have existed at the very early stages of colonisation. But soon a stage came when the colonised did know but were unable to do much.

But is this a permanent situation? Must this always be so as the western dependency writers would believe? It assumes a lack of autonomy of decision making and a defeatist attitude. True the peripheral nations are at a disadvantage but given this one can seek maximum advantage.

Nevertheless given the bad experience of the colonial period most countries turned to some kind of state planning involving import substitution and export diversification. Assets were created. In many countries assets were created even during the colonial period notably the railway system in India. Certainly these assets were for the benefit of the west but assets can have dual use. Furthermore knowledge

of how to operate the assets was diffused. This enabled the assets to be adjusted to fulfil local requirements.

The limitations of autarky are that relative prices within a country become out of tune with the trading nations. Because of this exports suffer. And it is also difficult to maintain the quality of products. To be inward looking implies that business is not geared up for exports

From 1990s most of these countries followed a policy of economic liberalisation and sought greater integration into world markets. Have countries done badly since then? The record is mixed.

Value addition and value capture:

The key to understanding why nations do well or badly is to look at value addition, where it takes place and who captures it. Normally one would expect the owner of the asset to do so. In short reap profits. If the assets in the periphery are owned by actors in the core profits will flow to the core. However if the value addition process is disaggregated with ownership of the various stages dispersed then the benefits could accrue to the countries of the periphery.

Furthermore it is possible for firms in the periphery to buy firms in the developed world through leveraged buy-outs etc.

So globalisation makes it possible for a third world firms to exploit opportunities in the developed world.

Behind both is a common approach the new econ does not just exclude, it can include but of course you have to be geared up for it

This approach is in contrast to approaches (and here the neo-classicals and the Marxists come together) that have little role for autonomous action by economic actors.

This leads to the notion of capability. It is closely linked to the idea of organizations. Standard economic theory, in particular standard neo-classical theory does not have a well developed theory of organizations nor does dependency theory. Whatever developments there are have come, as is to be expected, from the management literature.

An organization creates value; by coordinating the activities of a group of individuals more can be achieved than can be achieved by them acting separately.

Porter analyzed this phenomenon and postulated that a firm consisted of a series of value generating activities which he called the value chain. The goal of a firm is to offer the customer a level of value that exceeds the cost of these activities. The firm's profit depends upon effective performance of these activities, so that the amount the customer is willing to pay exceeds the cost of the activities.

A firm can take either of two stances. It can pursue cost advantage: better understand costs and squeeze them out of value adding activities or it can pursue differentiation that is pursue some activities better than their competitors so that the customers are willing to pay more. Whichever stance it takes the intention is to do well and even better.

A firm may specialize in one or more activities and the extent to which a firm performs upstream and down stream activities is the degree of vertical integration. Value chain analysis helps to facilitate outsourcing decisions.

A firm's value chain is part of a larger system (value system) that includes the value chains of upstream suppliers and downstream distribution channels and customers. Linkages exist not only in a firm's value chain, but also between value chains. A firm's success in developing and sustaining competitive advantage depends not only upon its own value chain but also upon its ability to manage the value system of which it is a part.

An important offshoot of value system analysis is the concept of value addition. In a closed economy value addition takes place within the country. But in a globalised economy the value addition can take place in multiple locations. Economic prosperity of a country depends upon where this takes place and who appropriates it.

Neoclassical economic theory shows that vertical integration and outsourcing decisions depend upon transactions costs. The concept of value chain can illuminate the consequences of such decisions.

Consider the manufacture of cars. There are many kinds of economic activity in the making of cars.

Consider GM: If a car is built in the US and sold there by a domestic company the entire value is generated and appropriated in the US. If built in India and sold in the US then some value is created in US (distribution channels) but a great deal of it is created in India. The profit will go to the GM in the United States. It could even be "made" in the US with components from India. I say made in quotes because the making could be just assembly of Indian made parts. The components can be made by Indian firms or in Chevrolets own facilities. The profits will go to the owners of the manufacturing facility but value shall accrue to those who are associated with the manufacturing of components.

Moreover cars are not just about the making of components and sub-assemblies. They are also about design and R&D and about human resource management, accounts and administration generally. So far this has been done at or near the location of the manufacturing facility. Now quite a lot of it can be done just about anywhere

So we return to the question: where is the value addition take place? It is mainly where the economic activity takes place. Who appropriates it? Mainly by those who contribute critically to the activity. It can be the owners of capital but it can also be the suppliers of skills.

A country will not be equally good in all activities. It may be particularly good at some, moderately good at others. Classical theories of international trade proposed that comparative advantage rests on the factor endowments a country may be fortunate enough to inherit such as land and labour.

But a country can create advanced factor endowments such as skilled labour, a technology and knowledge base, management skills and practices and business culture. Some of these are specific to some industries whereas others are general.

Therefore comparative advantage is not fixed. It can change over time and one can create a national comparative advantage in some fields. Just as a firm can have a competitive advantage over its rivals, a country can have a competitive advantage over other countries. In other words the industry of a country can have an edge over the same industry in other nations. By identifying and exploiting the competitive advantage a country can prosper.

What about the macro picture; the economy of a country? Here the savings-investment pattern is of fundamental importance. The countries of the periphery have much higher savings investment ratios.

Dependency theorists such as Wallerstein believe that the world is headed for a collapse.

His main thesis is that the gap between rich and poor increasing. He makes this as an assertion without any backing argument. He then argues that high levels of profit correlates with degree of monopolisation, and so if countries of the south set up enterprises the firms in the north will have lower profits. One way out is for firms in the west to relocate and when that is not possible, profits go down. Of course it is true that profitability is associated with the extent of competition but profits depend not just upon the number of firms but upon successful pursuit of a strategy. This conscious strategy may be one of cost leadership but it could also be one of differentiation. Firms are not inert entities but active players.

Secondly, even if there is an overall decline in profitability of firms in the west that does not mean a collapse of the world. At most, it means economic depression in the west and a relative decline in power and influence. To some extent this has happened in several sectors of manufacturing and one will expect it to continue. The biggest example of this is the decline of Detroit as a manufacturing centre.

Decline in some sectors does not mean the collapse of a system. And the major emerging powers do not want any collapse. The present setup is seen as an opportunity, in particular the United States is seen as the best bet. These countries will put pressures for reform of international institutions WTO, World Bank and the rest and there will be some resistance, but there is no reason to expect that reforms will not take place. The emergence of the newer economies will provide stability.

IV

The second point made by the dependency theorists is political. References are made to “third world elites”. Such elites are said to be oriented towards the core countries.

Even if not overtly agents of first world interests, their upbringing and culture is such that they think like first world elites. Thus they cannot be trusted.

Two points need to be made. First is there a cohesive elite? Any arrangement which allows for articulation of interests (and it does not have to be parliamentary democracy) means that decision makers will have to take interest groups into account

No one individual or group take decisions on its own. Societies are complex and even if there no consensus there has to be compromise at every point. True some groups may fall through the cracks and not be heard.

There is also a subtext here, namely that only some enlightened ones in the core understand and feel for the peripheral countries a “we know best” syndrome. It is an updated version of the White man’s burden.

V

Finally Cultural: this takes off from the westernisation/modernisation debate.

Modernisation gets equated with westernisation and since the West is associated with imperialism, modernisation often comes under a cloud.

Some points are in order:

First one cannot go back to the past. After all, the world has changed since 1500 or 1800 or whatever date we choose. For the third world nations the colonial experience however regrettable is a fact. For the countries of the core, they have had it good (so far.)

Second there have been advances in science and technology. The impact of this may be different in the core and the periphery. True the countries of the core own proprietary knowledge, but much of science and technology is in the public domain. That knowledge can be used.

Third the world today compared to the past is a more liberal place, and this would be true of almost all countries.

The colonial experience for the colonised has two aspects: One was economic exploitation by the ruling power. But along with this certain institutions were established by the ruling power, political (governmental, judicial etc) to economic to cultural (educational). Though these were imposed but they have a certain utility. These very institutions which were imposed can be used by these countries to suit themselves. Of course it has been argued that their basic character is flawed, and at an extreme they should be destroyed, that there should be a cultural revolution. But what the new replacement should be is not clear

I would argue that the basic change from the old order is the much maligned modern organisation first outlined by Weber in his discussion of Bureaucracy. After all how else would one build an aircraft, or a car, or if cars are bad a bus? The advantages of

organisation are obvious. Those who are anti-organisation or anti-technology in the west do not appreciate that this luxury is possible only because of the technological, organisational and institutional infrastructure already in existence. That is what separates Dafur or Somalia from others.

True the rationality of Weber is that of means not of ends. Wallerstein talks of “decommodification” and gives as examples universities and hospitals as examples of decommodified organisations and exhorts the use of this model in other sectors of the economy. The irony is that the world is moving in the other direction.

When it comes to the rationality of ends no matter how much one argues for the relativity of ends there are at every age standards which are considered acceptable and conduct considered unacceptable. I think that we would all agree that racism homophobia discrimination against women is not acceptable as would be restrictions on thought and speech. We all cherish liberalism, a mind open to new ideas and experience. The trouble is that these ideas are perfectly compatible with modernity. By this one means

- (1) a certain set of attitudes towards the world, the idea of the world as open to transformation by human intervention; in other words a positive attitude towards change, and a willingness to experiment; and the encouragement of progress in useful sciences and arts.
- (2) a desire for personal freedoms, and new attitudes towards religion and equality of the sexes in every sphere.
- (3) a complex of economic institutions, especially industrial production.
- (4) certain political institutions, including mass democracy and the nation-state.

Often modernity is considered to be westernisation. Being anti imperialist should not then mean rejection of these ideals.

Conclusion

Standard dependency theory rose to prominence in the 1960s but declined by the mid-1980s. Its claim that development (economic and human) is impossible within the framework of the world capitalist system has not been bourn out by events. The evolution of the East (China, S. Korea) and South-East Asian economies shows that attaining economic progress is very much possible. True there are problems, but are there not problems in the core states? Moreover this has happened via integration with the world economy.

Economic growth is the result of a complex set of factors. Neither uncritical integration into the international economy nor economic autarky ensures economic growth. Dependency theory underemphasised domestic forces of development and only stressed a common international economic environment. Nation-states, however weak and poor, do have some freedom to manoeuvre and can form their own policies. Dependency theory depicted policy-making elites in Asia, Latin America and Africa as allies and puppets of core states. As a result dependency theory cannot explain the different development strategies followed by less developed nations and their success or failure.

Some of the issues raised by dependency theorists have some relevance.

It is true that power relation between core states and peripheral states is asymmetrical. Developing nations often get short-changed in international economic forums. Also changes in domestic policies of the core states bring about changes to the rules of the world economy that developing nations have to take as given. However dependency theorists go on to argue that development is *impossible* without reform in the international trade, monetary and financial regime. At the extreme there has to be a total revolution. While changes in trade and monetary regimes would be of help they are far from panaceas.

One can undertake domestic policies to improve domestic economic conditions within the rules of the current international economic order. A number of internal causes are crucial for explaining underdevelopment. The dependency perspective neglects the causes of poverty attributable to domestic policies and denies domestic actors autonomy of action in steering their economies.

There are two broad approaches to dependency, one indigenous, and the other “western”. Comparing the two we find the first realistic and optimistic and the second strident and opinionated. The first group write from experience, the latter from preconceived notions.

Bibliography:

Banglapedia: R C Dutt

Bhabatosh Datta: Romesh Chunder Dutt

David Moles: *Dependencia* and Modernization January 1999

I. Wallerstein: After Developmentalism and Globalisation, What? Social Forces March 2005

Michael E. Porter: *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*

Michael E. Porter: *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analysing Industries and Competitors*

Michael E. Porter: The Competitive Advantage of Nations. *Harvard Business Review* March-April 1990 pp. 73-93

Sanchez, Omar: The Rise and Fall of the Dependency Movement: Does It Inform Underdevelopment Today? ESTUDIOS INTERDISCIPLINARIOS DE AMERICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE VOLUME 14 - N°2 July-December 2003

Vincent Ferraro: Dependency Theory: An Introduction July 1996

Zoroastrian Trust Funds of Europe: Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji