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SUMMARY

This study is geared at an open systems critique of the macro theories of development. It is highlighted in this study that we are living through the realities of the open systems, and yet much of development thought is based on closed systems philosophies, principle and ideologies. The first chapter gives an orientation into the origins of both the closed systems and open systems paradigms respectively. Included in this orientation chapter, is the literature review of the various research contributions of the major trends in development thought. The second chapter expands on the evolution of the closed systems paradigm and its influences on development thought. This chapter further explains the attendant philosophies, principles and ideologies that underlie the closed systems paradigm.

The third chapter captures the open systems paradigm and its influences on contemporary development discourse. Further to the discussion on the closed systems paradigm, the chapter elaborates on the philosophies, principles and processes that underlie this paradigm. The fourth chapter is on a discussion of trends in development thinking, traced from the traditional, through the medieval to the modern, right up to the contemporary. This entails tracing the theory to its ontological background right up to its implications for social reality in contemporary development thought and experience. The fifth chapter is on the open systems critique of the trends in development thinking, while the sixth chapter revisits the open systems paradigm and its implications for development thought. In the seventh chapter is the recapitulation of the findings in the study and recommendations for both development thought and practice.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

With development as a natural process that manifests itself in the universal order of things (Ramose, 1996:1), we have various commentators on the notion, interpreting it in various ways. Most of the attempts at understanding the concept of development are carried out in the everyday life world and the world of science (Mouton, 1996:8). This chapter serves as orientation into the background to the study in general, the closed and open systems paradigms, the problem statement, the rationale, the research design, and the literature review.

In the everyday life world, people come with what (Mouton, 1996: 17) refers to as "lay knowledge" to deal with development related issues. This is with reference to the stocks of knowledge that people use in their everyday life to cope effectively with their daily tasks. This type of knowledge, according to (Mouton, 1996: 17) is acquired through learning, experience and introspection. People make use of these types of knowledges to enable them to live a human and better life. Development is also conventionally perceived to be concerned with the improvement in the quality of a people's lives.

Apart from the everyday life world conceptions of development, there are also the scientific approaches. These approaches tend to reflect on phenomena in the world of everyday life and turn it into objects of inquiry and investigation (Mouton, 1996:18). The world of science is however not a homogenous world. The concept of development in the natural sciences for instance is accounted for in cosmological terms, with the universe conceived of, as a developing orderly system, following universal laws of nature (Neuman, 1997:64). These are some of the paradigms that were later on adapted to development theory in socio-historical contexts. The dominant approaches in development studies are the studies in development as a social science. This is with reference to the development theories and discourses that continue to influence our
understanding and practice of development. Most of the development theories tend to emphasise part or partial elements/dimensions of determining the occurrence or non-occurrence of development (Burkey, 1993:35). Theories guide action by pointing to or requiring some state of character, virtue or some type of life, if a claim is to be made as to whether development is taking place or has taken place. Theories, therefore, do contain significant normative elements that are meant to guide us as to the route/s to follow toward development (Martinussen, 1997:15).

Different philosophies of development lead to different models and practices, as Toffler (1990) avers that development is invariably linked to the prevailing political and economic ideologies or theories of the time. For Esman (1991), many governments are informed by some neo-conservative ideologies which impact in certain ways on the development processes, but generally, policies and actions are influenced by ideas, as to what we would like to see happen, as it is the case with some of the theories.

At the close of the Second World War and the resultant subsequent establishment of the Bretton Woods Institutions in 1944, geared at reconstruction, development and peace, the world witnessed the onset of theorisation on development. This development heralded and inspired greater confidence in humanity in so far as taking care of itself is concerned. As a concept, "development" rose to ascendancy on the international scene and agenda in the late 1950's and early 1960's contemporaneous with the decolonisation of much of the Third World (Tapscott, 1997:86).

The Modernisation theory of development, is associated with Talcott Parsons of the United States, predicated on the primacy of the North and postulating progress as economic growth evolved (Swanepoel, and de Beer, 1997:17). The basic tenets of this theory come across as an attempt to provide a theoretical framework of their developmental evolutionary destination (Coetzee, 1996:39). They entail the idea of the transition that a traditional society has to undergo to become modern. This notion of transition and transformation is found to be incorporating concepts like democracy, civil society and capitalism (Coetzee, 1996: 39).
This theory has already, in practice, taken root in the socio-economic and the political systems of the countries of the North and also of the South. With the advent of the colonial traditions, systems, as envisioned by this theory were transferred to the then colonised countries, largely influencing their socio-economic and political systems, prior and even during the "post-colonial" era (Hallowees, 1993:4).

Modernisation theory, as a theory that prides itself with the salvation of humanity from the throes of traditionalism onto the course of development, and as under-girded by capitalism, continues to dominate many countries' socio-economic systems. Certainly the modernisation agenda did bring with it improvements to mankind and the world in general. Contemporaneous with the acceleration of the modernisation project, was the deepening and consolidation of the development related problems that go with the process. Fewer people's quality of life improved and the ranks of the marginalised kept on swelling, with a deteriorating quality of life (Gorostiaga 1995:12).

This class-related developmental disequilibrium of the rich few and poor many gave credence to the Marxian logic of the problematic of exploitative power relations that are characteristic of the attributes of a capitalist system (Belsey, 1992:37). Although the evolution of the Marxist philosophy is traceable as far back as the 1920's, its variant perspectives remain popular with the spokespersons of the underdog population groups of both the countries of the South and the North respectively. The vestiges of Marxian thinking in the development discourse shine through, with and in the Dependency Theory of development. Dependency as a concept in the context of development, and its encompassing perspectives points towards inequality and exploitation within and among countries (Coetzee, 1989:53).

Despite the demise of the communist establishment throughout the world, Marxist thinking in broader terms still remains the salvation philosophy of the particularly marginal communities (Melsome - Richards, 1990:117). Articulated through the various communist parties of the world, Marxism is still regarded in Marxist circles as a theory of
motion and development. In the context of development, the voice of the socialists is still heard in the debates dealing with the present socio-political situations and the past as well as the present international economic environment. The Marxists are often at the forefront when it comes to challenging the morality of the markets. The application of this theory as manifest in the surviving pockets of communist regimes is never without problems. The effects of Marxist systems on human, social, economic and political development as a result of the application of closed systems ideologies like democratic centralism, are another reason for a serious rethink in development thinking, more especially in relation to the Marxian concept of development.

In the early 1980's, the "new paradigm" in the social sciences evolved. The notion of the "new paradigm" was used as an umbrella term for covering issues such as action research, collaborative investigation, indigenous research, experiential research, reflexive science and dialectical research (Mouton, 1996:31). This paradigm postulates notions of involvement and participation of the researched subjects in the knowledge production process. This was with a view to bring into harness in this paradigm, the dimension of power sharing. As a paradigm with strong political attributes, it further postulates for democratisation of the research process and the liberation of the domain of discourse (Mouton, 1996:36).

The application of the participatory model in knowledge production and development practice is never without its own problems. Evidence in most development research and programmes in the South bears testimony to the reality that in most instances, project managers only put participants on board after they had already done the planning (Bliss, 1999:20). Elements of closed systems paradigm and thinking still find their way onto the plains of development discourse and practice on the back of the participatory "new paradigm".

In the period round-about the late 1980's a new frontier in development theory and practice, in the name of Sustainable Development Paradigm, began to dominate the worlds of development discourse and praxis (Martinussen, 1997:4). Brundtland
describes sustainable development as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising those of the future generations (Brundtland, 1987: 5).

This paradigm is predicated on the recommendations enshrined in the Brundtland Commission report of 1987, which calls for a global agenda for change; which calls for the revival of growth, change in the quality of growth, meeting essential needs, conservation and enhancement of the resource base, and a political system that serves effective citizen participation in decision making (Hinrichsen, n.d.:7). After the submission of the report, development debates were subsequently dominated by considerations and concerns about the impact of growth and socio-economic change upon the physical environment. Environment sustainability, as a leading principle, has since gained widespread approval over remarkably few years. In consort with the spirit of this approach, central development programmes based on the concept of "another development" are the notions of participation, human and organisational capacity building, and sustainability, now plays a key role in most discussions about development both in the industrialised countries and in the Third World. The ideals of sustainable development are further developed into a strategy for a sustainable economy. More premiums in this regard are placed on the values of sustainable living (Brundtland, 1987: 8). This is with reference to the imperatives of improving the quality of life and conserving the vitality and diversity of the earth. This perspective of sustainable development further postulates that a framework be put in place to guide the integration of development and conservation (Hattingh, 2001: 5). Furthermore, there is the anthropocentric interpretation of the sustainable development paradigm. This dimension is largely traceable to the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 documents. This dimension brings to the sustainable development debates issues of inter-generational justice (concern for the well being of future generations) and the development imperatives for the poor people (Hattingh, 2001:8).

As a liberatory development paradigm with its attendant concerns for the environment, the sustainable development paradigm is not without its contradictions. The notion of sustainability as interpreted by various commentators on the approach could in some
instances be seen as a justification for the sustenance of some elements of closed systems thinking in development. The afore-mentioned approach/paradigm continues to influence and dominate the world of development theory and practice in a multiplicity of forms and dimensions (Hope, 1992:345). The influence is observable in some of the dominant traditions in the domains of development theory and practice.

At a political level, development related problems emanating from the closed systems paradigm, continue to manifest themselves at international, national and even local levels of many a society's body politic. The industrialised nations of the North continue to politically dominate the development scene, more especially with the influence they have on the Bretton Woods Institutions. The United States for instance, is regarded as the international policeman of global organisations like the United Nations Organisation, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Mkhondo, 1999:9). If it does not host them, it holds sway over them, wherever the institutions are. Across the world, the United States is involved in subtle or open politics of protecting its own interests. The United States of America tends to, in a subtle way, engage in politics of destabilisation in the countries that are hostile towards it and its interests, and also openly supporting forces that are in agreement with its interests. Nothing gets done unless the United States assumes a leading role. Globalisation, according to Nzimande (1998:46), is reproducing a division of the world into "winning" and "losing nations".

In various countries throughout the world, the development facilitation and implementation scene is still dominated by the state, whereas at much more local level, the poor are still "left out" of the development process. The majority of the Third World countries is still ruled by small and powerful elites, who determine what development strategies to follow (Okuni, 1998:23). This scenario, leaves the bewildered "little man" in the grip of the impersonal all-powerful machine.

With what is referred to as "development", the wealthy and the powerful strengthen their own self-protection and self-preservation. The capitalists, according to Himmelstrand (1994), continue to pauperise the working class. World poverty still stands firm in the
face of all the Bretton Woods Institutions' policies, which have since proved to be harmful to development (Haffajee, 1999:38). Some countries of the North came with the idea of installing the left of centre governments, trying to bridge the gap between the public and private sectors, between an enterprise economy and the attack on poverty and exclusion (Geary, 1998:35). We are living in the era of the market, and yet we do not have a market society. In an endeavor to deal with these imbalances, there today are movements that are challenging and calling for the reformation and transformation of the global economy to maximise the goal of equitable, sustainable and participatory development (Jordan, 1996:76).

Because of the closed systems character of the systems that influence and guide development processes, humanity finds itself living in "One World" physically, and unfortunately in "Two Worlds" socially (Hallowees, 1993:3). The world of the powerful rich and the world of the powerless poor. Systems continue to deprive people of their dignity and identity, through the humiliation of the under-privileged classes by the privileged (Etuk, 1982:203).

Despite the above-mentioned thought patterns and practices in development, new ideas in the domain of development are evolving (Kotze, 1998:8). New concepts in development nomenclature like, people before things, learning processes, recognition of local knowledge, empowerment of communities and participatory rural appraisal, have gained widespread usage. But, as Kotze (1998) develops his argument, if the new ideas are implemented with a mindset that analyses cause and effect, that believes in influences and control, that isolates factors and aspects, it will not be long before they are relegated to the trash heap of development concepts.

Today, the world is in various ways described as undergoing processes of change. In the descriptions of these processes of change, words like, revolution, transformation, reform, reconfiguration, re-thinking, globalisation, and so forth, are found to be in use. Social transformation processes continue to afflict society, the economy and even the polity we live in. These transformation processes have heralded the inevitability and the
imperative of having to re-think our understanding of the world. One academic
discipline after the other engage in the re-thinking exercises in an attempt to retain their
relevance and reality value.

In the wake of "globalisation", which is threatening to become a new name for
development (Holtz, 1999:14), the domain of development thinking and practice finds
itself faced with the challenges of a continually changing world. The imperatives of
transformation in development have been widely accentuated by various traditions in
development thinking and discourse. But transformation into what, remains a daunting
challenge to a number of disciplines and practitioners.

Development studies are currently undertaking a significant rethinking, suggestive of a
reconsideration in train. In the process of trying to sketch an alternative account for the
future, some evolving approaches still remain trapped in the closed systems
epistemological paradigm from which they are trying to escape.

1.1. Problem Statement

Much of development theory and practice from the inaugural phases, up to the present
moment, has been replete with the attributes and vestiges of closed systems thinking.
As development thinking and practice evolved in the mould of being anti-thetical to the
preceding ones, elements of closed systems thinking, principles, ideologies and
practices keep on re-surfacing, with their attendant development related problems.

In some instances, some development thought traditions tend to claim that they are
open systems in form and character, and only to find that they are still predicated on the
epistemological ontology of the closed systems paradigm. Further to these are
development related problems like the "marginal" communities continually being driven
to the periphery, and lack of cooperation by industrial countries (Messner, 1999:4).
Individual loneliness of modernisation, uneven distribution of power, retreat into
fundamentalism, global village inequalities, uncritical embrace of anachronistic
worldviews, and ignorance of other development related variables like, quality of life and alienation, continue to characterise most systems.

In the mould of the closed systems paradigm principle of verticalism, governments continue to play a large part in defining both the content and the units of development (Dower, 1992:109). In the North-South continuum, the South continues to remain a weaker party, as the gap between the North and South continues to grow. In the arena of civil society, we find larger non-governmental organisations dominating the weaker and smaller ones, with some still paranoid with their independence (Hinrischen, n.d.:5). The marginalised communities as a consequence of the afore-mentioned tendencies continue to live their lives of and at the periphery.

As a result of the exploitative relations between and within countries, in consort with the closed systems principle of self-directedness, the gap between the rich and the poor countries remains wide. The world continues to witness the global economy of the many in misery led by the few in opulence. Hundreds of millions of human beings are unable to escape poverty and hunger, as a result of the complex closed social and economic systems and theories (O’Neill, 1986:1). People end up seeing the world as negativity and deadness, as closed systems breed a lack of hope and the breakdown of values that lead to a sense that life is without meaning. People are still subjected to experiences of domination, subordination, greater poverty and ignorance.

Development thought, discourse and macro-theories are directed by a closed systems paradigm, causing an impasse in the debate. The problem to be addressed is how to break the impasse with the aid of an open systems approach. In addressing this problem, this thesis endeavours to apply the principles of the open systems approach in analysing and critiquing the closed systems paradigm as expressed in contemporary development thinking and practice.
1.1 Reasons for selecting this problem

As stated in the background to the study and the statement of the problem, the being there or occurrence of development is still replete with the elements of closed systems thinking and even practice. Attempts have been made at reforming certain systems and practices related to development, and the resultant rewards are the intensification of misery, borne of the closed systems ways of doing development. As such, development has come to mean impoverishment and disempowerment (Cooper, 1993:16). Society can truly develop when and if it is humanised and rehabilitating true values, for the salvation of people out of alienated existence.

Further to highlighting the problem of the closed systems approaches to development, the study introduces the open systems paradigm as an additional epistemological frontier and paradigm to the world of development theory and practice. In this way, the study, through the use of examples, indicates how the experiences of alienation for instance, emanate from the closed systems paradigm and its attendant principles as manifest in some theories of development. The open systems paradigm captures and illustrates the contemporary social reality, and yet development theory, practice and policy-making on the other hand, is in most instances predicated on the closed systems' Newtonian paradigm (Wheatley, 1997:6). The application of the open systems paradigm to the understanding of development is also an attempt to illustrate the images of contemporary society's experiences in the name of development. As it is the case in most disciplines, we constantly are in search for better models for the better future.

If societies we are living in are uncivil republics, riddled with crises, then one needs to know how they landed in the mess that they find themselves in (Chachage, 1994:58). It is required of a theory that the normative premises and political priorities it embodies are thoroughly exposed. There is a need to re-examine the philosophical foundations and of determining the limits and directions for achieving development in a manner which does not abuse the human being (Sabato, 1977:319). Given the problems that
go with the closed systems way of doing development, we find ourselves confronted by
the need for change of the course of development. Development cannot ignore the role
of other variables like; quality of life, alienation and other development related problems
borne of the closed systems paradigm.

Development as conventionally perceived can in some instances lead to some
roadblocks to other types and dimensions of development (Dower, 1992:98). For
humankind to experience development there is a need for overcoming of starvation,
malnutrition, domination, subordination, greater poverty and ignorance. For this to be a
reality, we need action-guiding theories that have to provide principles and even guiding
principles. It is impossible to be a true development agency without a theory that directs
action to the underlying causes of underdevelopment (Fitzgerald, MacLellan and

1.1.2. Research Objectives

1.1.2.1. To identify the elements of closed systems thinking in development theory
and practice.
1.1.2.2. To engage in the open systems reflections on the current trends in development
theory.
1.1.2.3. To explain and elaborate on the open systems paradigm as a framework for
future development theory.

1.1.3. Research Questions

1.1.3.1. To what extent do we still have elements of closed systems thinking systems
thinking and practice in current development discourse?
1.1.3.2. How relevant is the open systems paradigm to development discourse
and practice?
1.1.3.3. Whither development theory?
1.1.4. Scope of the Research

Further to highlighting elements of closed systems thinking in development discourse, the study introduces the open system paradigm with its attendant philosophical principles, with a view to integrating such principles into future development theory. As a form of digression from convention, and in conformity with the open systems paradigm, the study takes on the whole and full range of relationships in the domain of development. This is to be done through the use of the philosophy of metabletics, as one of the main philosophies of the open systems paradigm.

1.1.5. Terminology

1.1.5.1 Paradigm

The word "paradigm" is derived from the Greek work "paradeigma", which means, "model" or "pattern". In his The structure of Scientific Revolutions (1970), Thomas Kuhn broadens this meaning of the concept. He maintains that scientific research is determined by a set of paradigms.

Paradigm means the whole system of convictions, values, techniques and conceptual models that are generally accepted as valid and workable by a circle of experts in a specific field for the purpose of investigation and research. As scientific revolution takes place, frameworks are replaced by others, meaning that paradigms are to be situated in a historical context. A paradigm consists of all the theoretical and methodological assumptions and operations that prevail in a period of "normal science" during which scientists usually do not disagree about their conclusions (Himmelstrand, 1994:1)

In the open systems context the word paradigm stands for the total framework of concepts, principles and values which determine the fundamental human situation and condition in a particular period in history. Through this existential framework, man
constitutes, organises, constructs, and structures his activities and basic human relationships for a meaningful existence. A radical and fundamental revolution takes place when one paradigm is replaced by another. A totally new world emerges, a new man, new matter, new social, political and economic structures and systems and new human relationships.

1.1.5.2. Closed Systems Paradigm

My preliminary studies indicate that the Closed Systems paradigm was established round about the 1700. This was a change of utmost importance in the history of mankind. It was the birth of the mechanistic Newtonian worldview. Alvin Toffer, the author of influential books on change (e.g. Future Shock, Third Wave, Power Shift, etc), says in his introduction to Ilya Prigogine’s (winner of the Nobel Prize for his work on the thermodynamics of non-equilibrium systems) book on the changing nature of matter and things "Order out of Chaos" (1984).

"The Newtonian System arose at a time when feudalism in Western Europe was crumbling, when the social system was, so to speak, far from equilibrium. The model of the universe proposed by the classical scientists, was applied, because an emergent industrial society provided a particularly receptive environment for it. The machine civilisation, in searching for an explanation of itself in the cosmic order of things, seized upon the Newtonian model."

This worldview impacted significantly on the modernisation theory of development and the subsequent traditions that go with it. The following philosophies, principles and values underlie the Closed Systems:

- The metaphysical philosophy of being and permanence.
- The philosophy of continuity.
- The philosophy of inner-directedness.
- The philosophy of reversibility (Prigogine, 1984:6)
Today, 300 years later, in our theory and practice of development, we still want people and organisations to behave like machines, in the mould of the Newtonian Paradigm (Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers 1996:18). When it first appeared, Newtonian science lifted people's perspective out of the mysticism, fear and fatalism of the medieval world.

1.1.5.3. Open System Paradigm

A search for a new paradigm for a New World order started roughly round about 1900. The fundamental philosophies, principles and concepts took root in 1900, manifesting themselves clearly in the everyday life-world in 1950 and have become living and lived realities since 1980. The open systems paradigm is in most respects the opposite of the closed systems paradigm.

Newton's clockwork universe was replaced by a world in which the future is open, and is characterised by unstable and non-linear systems. In this new inquisitive view of reality, linear processes are being replaced (Kotze, 1998:8). The open system paradigm points to the importance of interacting with the external environment (openness) in order for humanity to survive. The external environment in the context of the open systems paradigm is an environment that is unstable, chaotic, and also characterised by the processes of empowerment, horizontal relationships and consensus-building (Daft, 1995:13). These are the experiences and processes that also affect the world of development. The processes of re-structuring and "opening out" are the order of the day. The following philosophies, principles and values underlie the open systems paradigm:

- The philosophy of change and becoming.
- The philosophy of discontinuity.
- The philosophy of outer and other directedness.
These are the philosophies and principles that also impact on the development processes in a multiplicity of respects, as people begin to demand their dignity back, and seeing themselves and the world in new ways.

1.1.5.4. Alienation

Before the development theories can make any prescriptions on the best and ideal ways of doing development, they conventionally tend to commence with a description of the socio-economic scenario that is often replete with the attributes of alienation. In development nomenclature this condition is depicted in experiences of poverty related disadvantages as in notions like the weak, the poor, and also the people in the deprivation trap. Existence, to the alienated people is wholly unresponsive to their ultimate questions and deepest longings. A constantly reiterated theme in modern fiction, drama and poetry, of a people alienated from themselves and other members of society (Gill and Sherman, 1973:250). The faces of alienation are many. They also entail the hopelessness of the poor, loss of human dignity, lack of freedom and in a broader context, human misery. For Nielsen (1992), the notion alienation means domination, subordination, poverty and even ignorance.

For the purpose of this study, the notion alienation will be approached from Burkey's (1993) conceptualisation of development into the four lenses of understanding development, that is, defining development as entailing human, political, economic and social development. Looking at the concept of alienation from a personal (human) level, we establish that it entails an inability to achieve a standard of living allowing for self-respect, and for full participation in society. If development does not touch on the individual person, the individual ends up being subjected to self-depreciation (Burkey, 1993:35). In this context, alienation breeds a lack of hope and the breakdown of values that leads to a sense that life is without meaning.

At the social level, alienation takes the character of human beings as collectivities taking on the appearance of objects (Wilson, 1983:185). As a sequel to a number of factors,
ranging from traditionalism, class relations, social status, education, physical abode and so forth (Kotze, 1998:6). At the economic level, alienation, according to Etzioni-Halevy (1987), did not vanish with the decline of the industrial (modern) society. The notion of alienation at the economic level is well captured in the Marxian concepts of development. For the Marxists, capitalistic class relations of the dominant and the dominated, produce experiences of alienation in the dominated and the exploited. Today, as the globalisation process grows, the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer and more alienated. The result of this development is the alienation of the rich from the poor, largely attributable to the closed systems ways of thinking. The rich have a tendency of insulating themselves from the poor and also ensuring that their interests are always protected. This is usually achieved through the application and observance of the closed systems principles and ideologies. On the political front, alienation exists where there is inadequate freedom to enable people to develop and use their potential and to have a reasonable chance of leading productive and creative lives (Ahlburg, 1994:128).

According to Etzioni-Halevy (1987), today's alienation is much more encompassing, resulting from subordination to technical control, eroding the very basis of what was formerly perceived as the necessary conditions for human, socio-economic and political self-realisation. Alienation in development is a result of many factors. The open systems approach to understanding development will assist in establishing the underlying factors leading to alienation. The relevance of the use of the notion alienation in this study is in keeping with the character and type of people targeted by development. Development projects and programmes in most instances are endeavouring to get people out of alienated forms and types of existence.
1.2. Method of Research

1.2.1. Research Design

The research methodology followed in this study is the Theoretical approach, meaning that the study is largely based on literature study. Although empirical and case study approaches are popular in development research, the significance of the theoretical approach cannot be discounted. This is justified on the grounds that the practice of development itself is guided by some sort of theory. Apart from their explanatory role, theories also do provide normative models of group behaviour, as they contain significant normative elements (Martinussen, 1997:15). It is therefore required of a theory that the normative premises and political priorities it embodies are thoroughly exposed. Martinussen (1997) further argues that the concepts and theoretical propositions elaborated within frameworks in question should be compatible with their basic assumptions and should of course feature a high degree of logical consistency.

There are a number of factors to take into consideration before beginning a research. A fundamental consideration is the researcher’s philosophical orientation (Merriam, 1998:3). This entails what the researcher believes about the nature of reality, about knowledge, and about the production of knowledge. Linking research and philosophical traditions or schools of thought helps to illuminate the special characteristics of different research orientations or paradigms. This is why the researcher in this study settled for the open systems paradigm for the critique of the theories of development, and assisting in terms of adding knowledge to the multiplicity and proliferation of the bodies of knowledge in development discourse. Wheatley (1997) argued that in the open system’s new science, we are beginning to see ourselves in new ways and as such we need new images and metaphors for thinking about our experiences, in order to herald a new science research. This is done with the full knowledge and acknowledgement of the fact that all research methods have their strengths and weaknesses and that no one method or combination of methods is suitable for all research (Lewis and Munn, 1987:18).
1.2.2  Data Collection

As this is mainly a literature study, data was collected from a wide variety of sources. 135 texts from a multiplicity of disciplines were consulted. This is with reference to the disciplines that in various ways commented on the problems of development. Furthermore, 48 Periodicals, 33 Journal articles, 37 Magazine articles, 29 Newspaper supplements on development and 15 Internet sources were used.

1.2.3  Data Analysis

It is an undeniable fact in research that one can criticise one tradition only in terms of another. There can be no criticism without something to criticise and something to criticise with. The open systems paradigm was used to critique elements of closed systems thinking in development theory and practice. Theories, trends and practices are reflected upon from the open systems perspective. In the course of the discussion, the positive elements of the said theories and trends are first highlighted and then discussed. This is followed by an open systems reflection on the theories, trends and practices as they manifest themselves in development discourse and social reality, making use of examples.

1.3 Literature Review

In reviewing the research literature that forms the background for the study, the task is to indicate the main directions taken by workers in the area and the main issues of methodology and interpretation that have arisen. Particular attention in this regard is given to a critical analysis of previous methodology and the exposition of the advantages and limitations inherent in various alternatives. Close attention is therefore given to conceptual and theoretical formulations that are explicit or implicit within some studies.
1.3.1 The Positivist Approach

The positivist approach arose from a 19th century School of thought by Auguste Comte (1798-1857). Positivism is associated with many specific social theories like, structural functionalism, rational choice, exchange theory frameworks, and so forth (Neuman, 1997:63). Researchers of a positivist motivation and approach, prefer precise quantitative data and often use experiments, surveys and even statistics, in their search for rigorous, exact measures and even "objective" research. These approaches test hypotheses by carefully analysing numbers from the measures administered on the units of analyses. The majority of the disciplines dealing with the development related problems stem from an overwhelming Western ontological, epistemological and methodological basis (Coetzee, 1989:152).

The positivistic tradition conceives of social science as an organised method for combining deductive logic with precise empirical observations of individual and group behaviours. This is usually done in order to discover and confirm a set of probabilistic causal laws that can be used to predict general patterns of human activity even in the realm of development (Neuman, 1997: 63). Consonant with the basic tenets of the modernisation paradigm, human events can be explained with reference to causal laws, which describe cause and effect.

With the onset of the modernisation theory, humanity in a number of respects was liberated from the orthodoxy of medievalism and traditionalism. Critical thinking illuminated and highlighted the problems associated with the subsequent traditions disabling development. The problem with the subsequent approaches of modernisation, borne of the positivist traditions, is with its narrow concentration on economic development (Rodney, 1972:21). With most discourses on modernisation predicated on Western empirical epistemological traditions, the subject is forever divorced from the object (Edwards, 1989:21). As Coetzee (1996) also noted, modernisation theory pays too little attention to the relationship between the concepts of modernisation and alienation (Coetzee, 1996:59). Some aspects of the neo-liberal
doctrine based on neo-classical economics can be found in the now often repeated references to "sustainable growth" and emphasis on the benefits of a market economy (Himmelstrand, 1994:1). This emphasis seems particularly salient in the donor perspective. Today's re-definition of democracy is contemporaneous with the resurgence of the modernisation paradigm, which in the Marxian philosophy is referred to as bourgeois sociology.

1.3.2 The Marxian Approach

To the Marxian commentators on development, development can only take place with socialism in place under the leadership of the working class and the poor people in the rural and the urban areas through a thorough-going revolutionary transformation programme (Ncqakula, 1998:10). There are however a myriad variants of Marxist analysis and prescription for the elimination of underdevelopment. As an approach antithetical to positivism, Marxian epistemology sees positivist science as narrow, anti-democratic and non-humanist in its use of rationality (Neuman, 1997:74).

Research is seen as not neutral social facts but seen to be containing within it, interpretations arising from the social positionings of the researchers, who are social actors in their own right (Seidman and Anang, 1992:204). Arguments issuing from the positivist paradigm of modernity are regarded as serving the interests of those who are on the more powerful side of the unequal power relations and who do not wish to see this inequality subverted (Belsey, 1992:45). There still are orthodox socialists throughout the world calling for the nationalisation of finance and industry, and even the knowledge production and transmission processes.

According to the Marxists, knowledge produced in a capitalistic context is full of illusion, myth and distortion. These illusions, they argue further, allow some groups in society to hold onto power and exploit others. With its activist orientation, research must be used to critique and transform social relations, thus providing people with a resource that will help them understand and change their world (Neuman, 1997:77).
The problem with this approach is that of the centralisation of both the socio-economic functioning and also knowledge production (Bunsee, 1998:12). Knowledge ends up being made part of the party machine, and also used as a restricting device. Those in command end up knowing what others should know (Toffler, 1990:415), as most Marxist traditions continue to do. All of these dimensions are found to be in diametrical opposition to the imperatives of development. The open systems paradigm on the other hand is into the "opening out", and de-centralisation of both socio-economic systems and knowledge production processes.

1.3.3. Sustainable Development and Participatory Research Paradigm

Drawing from the problems and shortcomings of the positivist and Marxian paradigms, the sustainable development and participatory research emerged and acquired the label of alternative development research paradigm. Participatory research aims at various types of change. Among others, it is the development of a critical consciousness of the people involved in the knowledge production process. Added to this is the improvement of a people's life conditions and the transformation of the social structure in which they operate (Van Vlaenderen and Nkwinti, 1993:213). Participatory research offers a critique of, and challenge to dominant positivist social science research as the only legitimate and valid source of knowledge. It is a radical alternative to conventional knowledge production processes and projects (Maguire, 1987:10).

As seen from the open systems point of view, the following shortcoming of these paradigms are noted, that:

- researchers in these schools have a tendency of calling on people to participate and yet not allowing subjects to participate, more especially at the planning phases.
- the not so clearly defined concept of participation is the one concept that is open to various interpretations (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997:xi).
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- some alternative paradigm theories are not easily accessible to ordinary people. The language and concepts of their theories often create barriers to understanding (Maguire, 1989:26).
- even within the alternative paradigm, power and authority come from being able to understand and discuss alternatives using "accepted" terminology and concepts (Maguire, 1989:26).

1.3.4. Conclusion

From the foregoing observations on the major directions taken in development, it becomes clear that the traditional approaches' concepts embody a series of attitudes that contribute to the problems of much of their output to the problems of the world in which we live. The closed systems theories are failing to give a comprehensive picture of social reality as captured by the open systems paradigm. This is because much of the theory construction in development studies has been introduced with no explicit considerations concerning basic ontological, epistemological and methodological positions. This explains that there are always influential conditions and principles in theory building (Martinussen, 1997:345).

The fundamental reason why different paradigms appear "incompatible" is that they are based on the recognition only of a certain limited class of human predicaments and the non-recognition of other human predicaments which however are recognised by some "incompatible" paradigms (Himmelstrand, 1994:7). Different human predicaments constitute different objects of knowledge which call for at least partly different methods of research and application.

As the old closed systems paradigm continues to re-emerge in the new ones and in a different disguise, people are, in the open systems mould, continuously constructing, developing and changing their everyday interpretations of their worlds (Mouton, 1989:393). Today power is steadily but surely going to the people (Toffler, 1990:10), necessitating the need for us in our research to recognise the full human, historical and
social dimensions of development. We are today challenged to take on the full range of relationships between people and their environment, and not the partisan (and not clearly defined) approaches. To help create a paradigm for human orientation, participation by the poor masses and sustainable development (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997), we need to integrate our existential experiences in our research and planning. With all these concerns expressing the imperative of the open systems paradigm for development thought, the study, is following the open systems path, en route to adding another pillar to the cathedral of contemporary development thought.
CHAPTER 2

THE CLOSED SYSTEMS PARADIGM

Development theory, to a large extent is found to be endeavouring to answer questions about the conditions which will promote development, and also about conditions which are likely to obstruct, delay or detract progress towards development objectives (Martinussen, 1997:14). Further to the aforesaid, development theory tries to determine the causal relationships and laws of motion that apply to the societal change processes. All of these are often done within the contexts of particular epochs and paradigms, as they contain significant normative elements (Martinussen, 1997:15).

The closed systems paradigm is also found to be an underlying idea for some of the past and current development thought traditions (Roxas, 1996:1). That is why Martinussen (1997) postulates that it must be demanded of a theory that its ontological and epistemological assumptions are explicitly stated. This, he further notes, implies indication of fundamental conceptions of reality, of the nature of society, and also of how this reality can be analysed and comprehended. Before highlighting the manifestations of the elements of the closed systems paradigm in development thought, it will be proper and fitting to elaborate on the ontological and cosmological genesis and evolution of this paradigm.

The closed systems philosophies and ideologies are traceable to the period around the years 1700, wherein the scientists and philosophers set out to formulate general and universal schemes. On the other hand, the period preceding the revolutions of the period around 1700, as in the scientific, intellectual, spiritual and material domains, was agrarian and hinged on rural and traditional modes of thought. In Europe during the medieval period, a person belonged to one social level, as either a serf, a crafter, a lord, or a king (Curran, 1977:143). Prospects for development in the above-mentioned period at the individual, social, economic or political level, were non-existent. People in
this period relied on and were subservient to the feudal lord and the uncontrolled divine
powers or a God above. The everyday life of work and leisure was closely linked with
religion. God or a supernatural being was conceived of as the guarantee of order,
balance and justice; as people experienced their life as being subjected to uncontrolled
higher powers. God was regarded as the source of all power as the monarchs saw
themselves as ruling by the grace of God (Neuman, 1997:6). Such thought traditions
still pervade some societies and peoples’ lives even today, and impacting in several
ways on development (Baradat, 1979:15).

With the onset of the 1700 scientific, intellectual and material revolutions, as was also
caracterised by the spirit of Newtonianism, the world was viewed in mechanistic terms,
as everything was explained in terms of reference to the machine (Davies and Gribbin,
1991: 7). Things in motion were found to be moving in accordance with strict
mathematical laws. This is observable in the modern metaphysical doctrines like
idealism, materialism, dialectical materialism and so forth. These metaphysical systems
are found to have undergirded the ideologies which also emerged in this period and are
still being applied in the contemporary period. The following are the philosophies that
served as the foundation for the closed systems paradigm:

2.1 Philosophies of the Closed Systems Paradigm

2.1.1 The Metaphysical Philosophy of Being and Permanence

A question which runs through the history of science and philosophy is the question of
the relation between being and becoming, between permanence and change. The
notion of development in several respects relates to these metaphysical notions.
Becoming is related to the concept of development in the sense that, by becoming,
people are endeavouring to become what they are not (as yet). In so far as the notion
of change is concerned, we get to realise that we cannot talk about the concept of
development without mention of the notion of change (Baradat, 1979:9).
The metaphysical system that underlies the closed systems paradigm is made up of the philosophy of permanence, immutability, constancy, continuity and stability. According to this metaphysical theory, behind and beyond observable and changing phenomena, there is a permanent, true and immutable reality with its own inherent and unchangeable properties and qualities (Wheatley and Rogers, 1996:18). The concept of development on the other hand is about change. The notion of permanence therefore refers to and implies a milieu of non-development.

2.1.2 The Philosophy of an all-embracing world scheme: monadology

In search of an all-embracing world scheme, Leibniz (Stumpf, 1988:110) introduced the concept of monads; the non-communicating physical entities that have "no windows through which something can get in or out". These monads cannot be directly influenced from the external world and they exist independently from each other without any relationships. Each monad has its own internal purpose, perfectly self-determined and reflects the state of the whole system down to the smallest detail. Monadology thus becomes the most consequential formulation of a universe from which all becoming (development) and openness are eliminated. The monad in actual fact is a closed unit, an individual elementary being reflecting within itself the whole universe, society or nation. For the human condition, monadology implies for instance, all forms of ideological individualism. In the philosophy of individualism, a philosophy that is fundamental to the modernisation development thought, the individual is viewed as endowed with native or natural rights in isolation from any association (Etuk, 1982:203).

2.1.3 The Philosophy of Individualism

Renè Descartes, the father of modern philosophy is associated with the philosophy of individualism, as a sequel to his dictum; "I think, therefore I am". This Cartesian concept was subsequently reduced to the notion "I am because I am" in John Locke's (1700) concept of a self-determining people. Locke's liberal nationalism is based on the principle of society's obligation toward protecting the freedom of the individual. The
concept of freedom of the individual in the modernisation approach towards
development is regarded as a pre-condition for "development". In the economic
domain, Adam Smith intimated that when individuals follow their own self-interest, this
will automatically translate into development for the benefit of the whole of society (Etuk,

2.1.4 The philosophy of Materialism and Mechanism

The relations between man (humankind), matter (environment) and God determine the
basic human condition, that is, life itself. A change in the relation with one of the
counterparts results in a change in the relation with the other counterparts. With the
onset of the scientific revolutions, the material world gradually lost its spirituality that it
previously contained. This development heralded a new concept of humankind and
materiality through the machine civilisation that was reinforced by a mechanistic view of
man and things. This view was subsequently embraced in the modernisation paradigm
and Marxist socio-economic analyses (Preston, 1987:2).

2.2. Closed Systems Principles

The following principles are found to be underlying the closed systems philosophies.

2.2.1. The Principle of Immutability

The metaphysical philosophies of being, more especially as influenced by
Newtonianism, reflect the unchanging nature of the universe. These neo-Thomist
traditions in the closed systems philosophies project a dead and passive nature that
behaves as an automaton. The philosophies that simply enumerated the essences of
things in a static and unchanging universe of being rather than becoming. This
metaphysical conception of things as permanent and immutable also impacted and had
a bearing on human experience, as it produced ideologies like determinism and
mechanism, which manifested themselves in social, political and economic systems. In
capitalistic liberal systems for instance, certain things must not change and yet the concept of development is fundamentally about change. The Marxist paradigms are also opposed to certain forms and types of change in relation to the Marxist conception of "development". The same obtains in cultural preservation approaches, more especially conservative understandings and attitudes towards development, as these are opposed to meddling or tampering with traditional institutions (Baradat, 1979:74-75). Change in this respect is regarded as disruptive, and yet development is about change.

2.2.2. The Principle of Continuity

In the year 1704, the philosopher Wilhelm Leibniz, in keeping with the spirit of the period about 1700, formulated the law of continuity (loi de la continuité), which was subsequently embraced as a general principle for the whole of reality (le principe de l'ordre général). It is in the provisions of this principle that all things in the material world as well as humanity, were seen as subject to the universal laws, wherein once programmed, things continue to follow the rules inscribed in the programme (Prigogine, 1984:6).

In terms of this law or principle, it was also possible for people in the human condition to establish fairly continuous relationships with fellow human beings, the environment and the supernatural. The ideologies that issued out of this principle, ideologies like gradualism and linearism, are of the view that development and human history in general proceed form certain propositions that must be accepted as immutable truths. Capitalistic and liberal societies adopt a gradual approach towards development, hence their opposition to radical and revolutionary conceptions of development. From the Marxist domain, development is also conceived of in continuity terms along the paths of dialectics and party thinking. Any form of digression from the fundamental Marxist-Leninist terms or line of thinking is viewed as reactionary and therefore "anti-development". In conservative and fundamentalist circles, people are said to be living the life of dignity and quality if they subscribe to the doctrines of the system that does not need to be changed (Daft, 1995:63).
2.2.3. The Principle of Reversibility

The closed systems philosophies tend to rely heavily on some views of how the universe and even the human societies have come to be. In these philosophies, there is continual reference to the past, as in closed systems ideologies like traditionalism and historicism. In traditional communities for instance, it is believed that a people’s lives and well being will improve if things could be reversed to the “good old days”. The neo-Nazi movement for instance is one case in point. The resurgence of the right leaning movements all over the world gives credence to this claim (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:35).

In the Marxist circles, the advocates of this philosophy are of the belief that, development can only occur if for instance former communist states can revert back to socialism as capitalism did not salvage the poor but instead worsened their conditions. This is with reference to the reinstatement of the economic equality of communalism (Rodney, 1972:19), that is, the rebirth of a socialist synthesis. A socialist society that is based on a macro socio-economic project as it was known in the Marxist past. Development therefore can only take place in a society free of “exploitation”, as it had been the case with the Soviet Union regime and its satellite states (Nzimande, 1999:1).

Time in this outlook is taken to be reversible. In some situations people retreat into rigid religious and political fundamentalism as in trends like; racism, xenophobia and fundamentalism (Gorostiaga, 1995:12).

2.2.4. Inner-Directedness

The closed systems principle of inner-directedness is traceable to and well depicted in the metaphysical theories of Descartes. In the Cartesian philosophy, it is argued that the laws and rules that are in operation in nature or in the material world as well as those affecting the interactions between people, are subject to the control of the system's internal processes and programmes. The Cartesian concept of “Cogito ergo
Sum" (I think therefore I am) and traditions of Cartesian legacy like solipsism, conceive of the "I", the inner "I" as the sole existent, and that the world outside this "I" exists only as an object or content of my consciousness (Stumpf, 1988:210).

In the world of historical relations, this tradition was sustained by ideologies like centralism and interiorism as applied in systems like liberalism, Marxism and national socialism; with power flowing from outside (from the people) to the inside (bureaucrats). Development is about the improvement of the quality of life of a people and their environment. In the context of this principle of the closed systems philosophies, the ruling elites at the centre or inner circle determine the nature and character of the life of dignity of a people. They also determine how development of and for a people will come about. Disciples of the Marxian concept of development read into the principle through the ideology of democratic centralism\(^1\), wherein decision making becomes the sole preserve of the communist party leadership cadre. The rest of the community is left at the mercy of the "party leadership" decree, whereas on the other end, Amartya Sen (2000) finds the concept of development inextricably bound up with the notion of freedom. The atmosphere of freedom is always in demand of the requisite spaces that people need, in order to make development possible.

2.2.5. The Principle of Self-Directedness

The closed systems principle of self-directedness can best be explained with reference to the metaphysical theory of the Leibnizian monadology. This theory conceives of the universe as being made up of substances that are independent from each other, and yet living in a pre-established harmony between them. It is from this metaphysical theory that the eighteenth century philosophers like Thomas Hobbes were influenced to subscribe to the belief that human beings are simply isolated atoms. The atoms that are shut up (closed) in their own worlds, trapped by the laws and rules of the Newtonian world outlook wherein material things, as well as human beings are seen as individual entities.

\(^1\) Refer to discussions in chapter 4, subsection 4.2.2.
This metaphysical theory dovetails with the neo-liberal theories' ideology of individualism. In this ideology of individualism, the self or the individual system is seen as its own focal point. In the modernisation theory, individualism is one of the main ideologies of the kind of society or system envisioned by the theory. Taking a look at the many traditional societies we have in the world, we find that they are closed systems as they more often have little or no commerce with the outside world (Etuk, 1982:211). Added to this, such communities do even go on to look for self-determination as the only way through which ideal conditions for "self-improvement" can be made possible (Hawthorne, 1998:21).

2.2.6. The Principle of Verticalism

Verticalism is another principle of the closed systems philosophies in which the being of species is not only studied by merely enumerating the essences of substances, but the hierarchical and pyramidal stratification of species is also given emphasis. This outlook on the world and the human community that inhabits it, evolved into closed systems ideologies like authoritarianism and totalitarianism. These ideologies endorse the notion of the class stratification of society in social, economic, and political systems (Harding, 1998:4). The upward vertical line dominates the constitution of the political, economic and social systems that have a bearing on development.

High on the ladder of socio-political and economic stratification of society are people of rank and dignity, the noble, the educated, as well as the rich. On the lower rungs of the ladder are those who are found to be those who are wanting, lacking, poor, weak and alienated, and as such in need of development. In the realm of development, the Bretton Woods Institutions, in an authoritarian fashion, continue to determine and influence what they conceive to be the right way to pursue the development processes and agenda to and for the developing countries. Traditional and conservative systems continue to make development difficult, with their metaphysical justifications for keeping things as they are, in an authoritarian context. The surviving socialistic regimes
conceive of their authoritarianism as a necessary transitional evil en route to a "good life" in the communist utopia. This is a view still upheld by the Marxist development theorists and also the right wing approaches on development that either the party elite or the leader, will give direction on the course of development.

2.3. Closed Systems Ideologies

Further to the principles that underlie the closed systems paradigm are the ideologies that are related to these principles. Some of these ideologies are also found to be manifest in some of the frameworks and characteristics of some of the development thought.

2.3.1. Determinism

As an ideology issuing from the closed systems principle of immutability, it is held in this ideology that since the natural laws of the Newtonian world are on course, there is no need for the alteration of the socio-economic and political institutions in the systems. Social systems informed by this position and perspective are of the view that there shouldn't be "changes", as the situation that people find themselves in is conceived of as either the product of God, the revolution, evolution or even culture (Hollis, 1994:14).

Absolute patterns and structures are regarded as a given of human reality and therefore need to be retained in the interest of order. Any attempt at bringing about changes (in the interest of development) is regarded as a threat to societal order. Some of the arguments advanced to justify this view are that the system should not only be protected but further than that, needs to be cemented, giving more credence to the principle of immutability or no change.

In the closed systems ideology of determinism, no change is encouraged, as the destinies of both the advantaged and disadvantaged members of society are regarded as pre-destined. This is either by impersonal forces or by certain laws of nature (as in
the dictum: “there is development and unfortunately it is not for everyone”). Edmund Burke, a neoclassical liberal of Irish extraction believed that there should be no interference with the existing socio-economic and political institutions. Burke further argued that the state as a political personality should not be changed, instead, it should be preserved and modified since there is value in the existing institutions (Baradat, 1979:74-75). The concept of development on the other hand is about change.

In the National Socialistic systems, as evidenced with the resurgence of the neo-Nazi movements the world over, the state, or the head of state is regarded as the bearer of the collective will of the people, as it is believed that in his will, the will of the people, is realised. The head of state determines the people’s will to development and what is right or good for them (Baradat, 1979:75).

2.3.2 Mechanism

Mechanism as a closed systems ideology traceable to the Newtonian mechanical way of looking at things both material and human, explains the interactions between people in mechanical terms. This is regarded as a consequence of and in observance of mechanical laws, influenced by the belief that the world is operating like a cosmic machine.

Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679) a classical liberal, having been caught up in the rising tide of scientific inquiry, also caught on the spirit of the times. He was deeply impressed by the precision of science and the certainty of scientific knowledge. As a consequence of the influences of the scientific method, Hobbes, just like his contemporaries, sought to recast the whole gamut of knowledge in accordance with the geometric-mechanical paradigm (Daft, 1995:15).

According to Hobbes, in agreement with the metaphysical doctrines of his times, physical nature, the nature of man, and that of human society, were to be reflected upon from a mathematical and mechanical point of view. This viewpoint conceives of human
beings as merely bodies in motion, since and simply because all of knowable reality consisted solely of mobile bodies. This perspective ended up relegating even the social, economic and political studies to some of the variations of the science of physics. The adoption of the mechanical model of reality was and is not only applied to metaphysical reflection but also is used for guiding humankind to a better life. The modernisation approach to development also has its metaphysical account traceable to this paradigm (Daft, 1995: 63).

The Marxist theories of development on the other hand are also traceable to the Marxist metaphysics of dialectical materialism. The dialectical materialist metaphysics is of the view that the world is by its very nature material and that the multifold of phenomena of the world constitute different forms of matter in motion. Dialectical materialism is also used in the study of the most general laws of the development of nature, society and human thought. Karl Marx alongside his contemporary and friend, Friedrich Engels extended the principles of dialectical materialism, as the fundamental logic of history to the understanding of social, economic, and political life of society (Melsome-Richards, 1990:117). Marxist theorists continue to make use of this theory in their explanation of why development is impossible in societies that are characterised by class exploitation and oppression (Nzimande, 1998:9). This mechanistic view later on evolved into the theory of historical materialism which continues to constitute the Marxist commentators’ so called "scientific ideology" (Melsome-Richards, 1990:117).

2.3.3. Gradualism

The ideology of gradualism, the ideology that is informed by the Leibnizian "loi de la continuité" (continuity in the development of things), is of the belief that things proceed by gradual degrees to desired ends. This is believed to be as a sequel to their being pre-determined by the pre-given needs and demands of the system (Stumpf, 1988:110)

Systems, in so far as this ideology is concerned, should not be overhauled or changed, as in the spirit of the today’s transformation imperatives. In capitalistic systems for
instance, particularly where interests of capital are concerned, only gradual and not radical modifications of the system are encouraged and that there should be no tempering with the basic tenets of the system. The justifications underlying this conviction are said to be that any form of radical development or change is likely to be disruptive of a gradual mutation toward the desired goal of development.

James Madison, the father figure of the philosophy of federalism and neoclassical liberalism, in agreement with the ideology of gradualism, argues for the institution of “controlled” economic, social and political systems. This is with the purpose and aim of ensuring that the changes that are likely to take place within the system are gradual and within the limits of the “tradition’s” convention (Baradat, 1979:74).

2.3.4. Linearism

Linearism is another ideology that issues out of the Leibnizian principle of continuity. This ideology dovetails with that of gradualism. It is argued in this ideology that gradual development should occur in the form of quantitative changes and also rectilinearly. This doctrine is based on the idea of a straight line as the shortest distance between two points (Engelbrecht, 1992:10).

The fixed and straight line in the closed systems ideologies serves as the center for adaptations, adjustments and alignments. The straight line of development or growth, as in the positivistic ethical postulates and political doctrines, gives no room to curves and deviations. Through the manipulation of people as completely as science manipulates physical nature, people are socialised into specific forms of life that have little to do with development (Rennie, 1998:315).

Social reality in this ideology is not random, but it is patterned and it has order. Human events can be explained with reference to causal laws that describe cause and effects, based on a system of general laws (Neuman, 1997:64-65). Today there are attempts at the homogenisation of the world under a capitalist market system driven only by profit.
and gain motives (Gorostiaga, 1995:12). Donor institutions are increasingly rigorous in

Development on the other hand has to occur in an environment of freedom. The
ideology of linearism presents a state or milieu of unfreedom, wherein people inevitably
will have to lead an alienated existence.

2.3.5. Traditionalism

The principle of reversibility points to the past. It puts more premiums on the virtues of
traditions or traditionalism. Traditionalism undergirds most socio-economic and political
systems. In this ideology, the arrow of time is directed towards the past, outside the
flow of time. The systems underlain by this ideology are tradition-directed, as reference
is always made to the past. Traditionalists are known to be sceptical of utopian
blueprints or even the grandiose reform projects. They trust in a concrete and historical
reason that is embodied in tradition (Hagopian, 1978:77). In Marxist development
thinking, for development to occur, society and the systems need to stick to those
“revolutionary” traditions as linearistically determined by the party elite, in the mould of
“democratic centralism” (Harrison-Barbet, 1990:297). In the sustainable development
paradigm, preservation of local traditions and cultures is encouraged. Some traditions
have so far proved to be inimical to the development imperatives as enshrined in the
notion of freedom. Sustenance of culture in some communities means loss of right to
meaningful life under usually patriarchal regimes. Traditionalism does impact on a
people’s subjective humanity as it is on most occasions opposed to digressions from

2.3.6. Centralism

In consort with the closed systems principle of Inner-directedness, the ideology of
centralism in systems decrees that power, authority, information and activities flow from
the outside to an inner centre. In capitalistic socio-economic and political systems,
power is concentrated in the hands of the dominant and propertied few. By virtue of their influence on the economies, the propertied classes of society also influence and dominate the state's workings and other institutions of society. Today, the rich nations of the north influence and dominate the international courses and forces of development.

In the socialist fraternity, most of the socialistic traditions are modelled on the Marxist-Leninist scheme. Procedures and rules are such that centralised forms and patterns of state are put in place. The party makes all decisions in a Marxist state and within the organs of the Communist party elite. The central party executive always comes with the final decree. The nature, pattern and pace of development is also determined centrally by this organ. In agreement with the closed systems principle of inner-directedness, the external environment in this ideology is interiorised, reshaped and translated into internal structures, functions and conceptual frameworks. The center in turn becomes the source of influence, commands, and central measures, and thus making the system to be entropic. That is why the Marxist development theorists have a tendency of insulating their theories and approaches from empirical testing (Graaff, 1989:47). An environment like the afore-mentioned makes development difficult to realise. Human advancement is only possible when the mind is freed from the shackles of dogma (Venson, 1997:278).

2.3.7. Individualism

The closed systems ideology of individualism is closely related to the closed systems principle of self-directedness. Drawing from the Leibnizian metaphysics of monadology and Hobbes' concept of atomism, John Locke's concept of individualism is manifested in the socio-economic systems like capitalism (Honer, Hund and Okholm, 1992:214). In this ideology, the individual system creates conditions for its distinct existence and in most instances, the conditions that tend to either make development possible or difficult. For the rich few, there will be experiences of development, whereas for the poor many, there will be experiences far from development.
Early liberalism is found to be forthrightly individualistic and has greatly influenced the modern forms of the ideology of individualism. John Locke (1632-1704), for example, saw the very substance of government in the protection of individual rights. Just like the many theorists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Locke wrote of the hypothetical "state of nature", which antedated the foundation of civil society. This was seen as a paradise of individuals, with each individual having the God-given Natural Law, which regulates relations between people. Each individual did not only possess the rights of "life, liberty and estate" (private property), but the individual was also the judge and the executioner of the natural law. The rationale behind the founding of the state was to protect the individuals' rights of life, liberty and estate. The state was supposed to serve as the agent of the people, protecting the rights of the individuals (Hagopian, 1978:479).

Modern liberalism placed the individual more firmly in the social context. To modern liberal theorists, freedom was and still is seen as self-realisation with more emphasis on the individual. The ideology of individualism undergirded the several variations of the modernisation approaches to development thought.

The individual system is seen as an end in itself. The concept of self-interest is conceived of as the guiding principle in the ideology of individualism. This makes both the individual and the individual systems to be unavailable to others (Hagopian, 1978:471).

2.3.8. Egoism

The ideology of egoism is found to be an ideology dominated by the belief that human action and behaviour, ought to be motivated by self-interest, a culmination of the influences of the closed systems principle of self-directedness. It is stated in this ideology that, everyone should always act in his own self-interest, regardless of the interests of others, unless their interests also serve those of the individual.
It is further argued in this ideology that in case "I am not acting in my own self-interest, then everyone else should or ought to act in my self-interest". As also noted in the ideology of individualism, the self-interest is also conceived of as the guiding principle for development (Thiroux, 1980:37). The problems that affect the domain of development as in problems of corruption are found to be as a sequel to issues of self-interest rather than the interests of the people deserving of the development programmes and processes. Behaviours of this nature tend to continually condemn the disadvantaged communities to continued lives of deprivation and alienated existence (Kotze, 1983:21).

Elites of the South are today joining forces with the elites of the North to reap the benefits of all of the free trade benefits inspired by self-interest (Gorostiaga, 1995:12). Adam Smith, one of the revered godfathers of capitalism, proclaimed three hundred years ago that social progress can be achieved based on human frailties like; acquisitiveness, greed and self-centeredness (Henderson, 1996:105).

2.3.9. Authoritarianism

The closed systems ideology of authoritarianism is closely linked to the closed systems principle of Verticalism. As was stated in the description of the closed systems principle of verticalism, the being of species is not only the question of the enumeration of the essences of substance, but also acknowledges the hierarchical and pyramidal stratification of species. Application of this view to humankind, as in the mythopoeic content of some approaches like traditionalism and to some extent liberalism, presents an authoritarian and rigid authority more especially with regard to the elitists' right to control. Authoritarian practices in systems cannot facilitate or make development possible. Various states in the world today embark on authoritarian methods for "development" facilitation, and still their communities, in situations of unfreedom, find the notion of development alien to them. In socialism and the liberal right for instance you need an extremely strong and authoritarian government to facilitate development
Traditional social environments are not seen as promoting development, when taking into account the authoritarianism of those in command (Melsome-Richards, 1992:102).

2.3.10. Conclusion

In conclusion, it becomes self-evident from the fore-going presentation of the closed systems paradigm that a closed system does not depend on its environment. It is enclosed from the outside world, and thus an impediment toward development, as it will later on be illustrated in the open systems paradigm.

For us to be able to engage in development, we need to have knowledge of what we are trying to bring development to. Certain philosophies, principles and ideologies inform all forms of knowledge. Philosophy is the study of ultimate reality, the fundamental principles of existence, and ideologies to regulate and influence human action (Harrison-Barbet, 1990: 1). A paradigmatic take on the world of development discourse and praxis, reveals that, in some areas, development is still, in more ways than one, informed by closed systems philosophies, principles and ideologies. On most occasions, this leads to the non-occurrence of development. The open system paradigm, with its philosophies, principles and their attendant processes, is presenting a liberatory and enabling framework to facilitate what can as well be referred to as "authentic" development.
CHAPTER 3

THE OPEN SYSTEMS PARADIGM

Further to the assertions made in the previous chapter that, for a paradigm or conceptual framework to make sense to the readers or practitioners engaged in development discourse or praxis, the paradigm's ontological and epistemological elements warrant an explanation. An exploration of new epistemological frontiers in development discourse (Kotze, 1998: 8). This chapter will focus on the philosophies, principles and processes that underlie the open system paradigm in a similar way to the closed systems paradigm.

The end of the Nineteenth Century saw the slow collapse of the certainties that science had embodied in earlier decades. Much of this development was progressive, liberal and democratising, using new knowledge to free ordinary people from misery and degradation (Jay and Neve, 1999: 50).

Around the years 1900 onwards, Newton's deterministic machine paradigm was replaced by a shadowy and paradoxical conjunction of waves and particles governed by the laws of chance rather than the rigid rules of causality. This means that Newton's clockwork universe was replaced by a world in which the future is open. The hallmarks of this development are manifest in the philosophies of becoming like phenomenology, existentialism and metabelletics. It is in this era, in the history of humanity, that we come across the being of the world as constituted by subjectivity, rather than objectivity (Dallmayr, 1984: 24). These will further be explained in the unpacking of the aforementioned philosophies and their attendant principles and processes. Contemporaneous with this development, is the evolution of the mainstream development discourse toward a broad pragmatism (Wolfensohn, 1999: 2). Existence was viewed at the ontological level of intersubjectivity, where the consciousness of the subjects (people) is essentially engaged in the structures and mechanism of their social
interaction. The universe in the context of the open system paradigm is looked at in new and subjectivity terms. Today various traditions and perspectives are calling for a paradigm shift, so that humanity was placed at the centre of social change and development (Satgar, 1997:23).

The open systems paradigm brings with it its own form of science. Science, according to Neuman (1997) refers to both a system for producing knowledge and the knowledge produced from that system. Neuman further averred that systems evolved over many years and are slowly but constantly changing. In the process of this evolution, a system combines assumptions about the nature of the world and knowledge, an orientation toward knowledge, and sets of procedures, techniques and instruments for gaining knowledge (Neuman, 1997: 60). It is visible in the social institutions called the scientific community. There is therefore, a need to invest in the new knowledge in order to understand the world we are living in, and busy trying to develop or bring development to. The new knowledge or approach referred to is that which issues from the open systems paradigm in guiding knowledge production processes.

3.1. **Philosophies that underlie the Open Systems Paradigm**

The philosophies of round about 1900 like phenomenology existentialism, metabletics and everyday language philosophy, revolutionaryised speculative thought. Newton’s clockwork universe was replaced by the all-embracing —philosophies, natural and holistic philosophies and world-views. The natural and the social sciences had come to realise that the world is in a process of becoming (development). These philosophies symbolised a rebellion against the atomistic ways of looking at nature and man (Luijpen and Koren,1969:19). The traditional concerns of religion, philosophy and science started to lose their general appeal. Mainstream development discourse also evolved and began to gravitate in the direction of broad pragmatism (Wolfenson, 1999: 2).
3.1.1. Phenomenology

According to phenomenology, the philosophy associated with Edmund Husserl, existence means to be in and at the world, in the everyday life-world. Humanity and things in the universe, according to this philosophy are viewed in their totality. That is why in some circles, phenomenology is regarded as a philosophy that takes on the totality of all that there is (Beck, 1975: 555). This paradigm shift provided a new anchorage in the release of both humanity and nature from the predominance of the reductionist analyses and rationalism, stirring in the scientific community, a re-evaluation of the traditional problems of mankind. This development heralded a new and inquisitive view of reality. As a holistic way of looking at the world, phenomenology was also regarded as an alternative way of looking at this complex world, that is, alternative ontology (Kotze, 1998: 7).

Contemporary discourse in development also alludes to the imperatives of the kind of development that embraces all aspects of all existence (Burkey, 1993: 36). This is more so with the phenomenological notion that, the one meaningful way of understanding the universe, is to look at it in its totality. Any understanding of social practices must of necessity be couched in the categories of consciousness, intentionality, rationality, meaning and subjectivity. All of the afore-mentioned attributes lie at the heart of phenomenology. The aim of social sciences is conventionally defined as primarily directed towards understanding; that is, the understanding of human actors in terms of their own interpretation of reality, and understanding of society in terms of the meanings which people ascribe to the social practices in that society (Kotze, 1998: 26). Viewed from this perspective, mankind is found to be an openness and a possibility to become. Humanity in this philosophy is looked at in the context of being intentionally directed towards the world and as an openness. Mankind's consciousness in this thinking is found to be entangled with the world. It is active and allows the world to be what it is. Mankind is not closeness, but openness (openheid) directed towards the world and phenomena (Mahlangu, 1987:95). Man as a living subject, and an embodied consciousness, is an openness to the world, because the human world is an open world.
This is with reference to the world that invites mankind as a meaning-giving subjectivity to construct open systems. After all, people always want to transcend any form of alienation and impoverished existence. They are always engaged in an endeavour to lead a humane existence; and development by itself is a humanising process (Singh, 1999: 472).

Human beings as subjectivities and consciousness, live their social lives as they experience it and give it meaning. They inhabit the world of meaning and value (Rennie, 1998: 317). Valuing always occurs from the viewpoint of a conscious valuer and humans are the valuing agents. There is no value without an experiencing valuer (Rolston, 1994: 13). People as valuing agents, always want to inhabit a world of meaning. Development is one way through which people can be able to live the life of value and meaning. The open systems paradigm through this philosophy, for development, postulates an all-round individual and community that is devoid of all elements of alienation. This philosophy takes on the individual and society in their totality. If a claim on development is to be made, according to this philosophy, it must be such that it touches on the whole and not solely on some of the parts.

3.1.2. Existentialism

Existentialism is not a single philosophical system, but typified by certain attitudes and its name derives from the proposition that existence preceded essence. This philosophy further postulates that one becomes what one is by virtue of the decisions made rather than being determined by nature, society or even reason. Further to the holistic concept of reflecting on the world, as in phenomenology, existentialism puts more emphasis on the real living man of flesh and blood in concrete human situations. Existentialism came about in reaction to a loss of meaning and the rise of alienation (Wiser, 1983: 385). These are the very same human conditions that multiple development endeavours are trying to eradicate. Added to this, existentialism is also viewed as a reaction to certain features of modern Western civilisation, which were perceived as threatening the very meaningfulness of life itself (Wiser, 1983: 385).
In existentialism (The philosophy of this worldly existence), emphasis is placed on the real living man of flesh and blood in concrete human situations in his/her totality. Man, in this philosophy is not the subject of physiology, as it is the case with some of the metaphysical and mechanistic systems of the closed systems paradigms. Man in this philosophy is conceived of as an existent subject and a project. In his/her subjectivity, man also goes through experiences of absurdity, emptiness, anxiety and alienation. This is particularly more so, with the lack of development, and also that most development initiatives are geared towards removing such kinds of experiences in humanity’s existence. For man to live the life of dignity, man must confront these kinds of experiences (Van Schaik, 1980: 265). In keeping with this existential postulate, is the notion that existentialism conceives of man as an openness and freedom to realise him/herself, by establishing fundamental and meaningful relationships with the self, fellowman, the material world and God. Existentialism’s concept of man as an object is comparable to mankind’s experiences of non-development as in those of the deprivation trap. In the words of Jean-Paul Sartre, a philosopher associated with this movement, a person who continues to live the life of an object, is regarded as a being-in-itself. This kind of being is regarded, in existential nomenclature as that of a lack, emptiness and alienation (Sartre 1982: 250).

In these kinds of experiences, man lacks most of the requisites that are enabling for development to occur. Principal among these attributes is that of the lack of freedom. Without freedom, there are minimal chances for development to take place. At the base of the existential philosophy and movement is the notion of freedom. Development is nothing more than the realisation of the people’s right to freedom, self-determination, participation, shelter, education and good health (Deutscher, 2000:27).

That is why, in the Sartrean mould, it is believed that, for development to occur, man must acquire all the attributes of a being-for-itself, both at the individual and social levels. People as a "being-for-itself" are characterised by freedom, self-determination, continual transcendence of all experiences of alienation and the perennial self-creation.
and re-creation initiatives. With this freedom from want, ignorance, and bias, goes the initiatives of humanity’s retotalisation, and restoration, of the erstwhile-detotalised selves. This will inevitably entail the reorientation and reorganisation of development (Etuk, 1982: 18). Existentialism as a philosophy that takes on man in his/her total existential situation, seeks to disclose the essences of man in his/her concreteness, whose essence is his/her existence. It endeavours to create a milieu in which the possibility for development, renewal and a decisively new beginning exists. The basic elementary criterion is whether or not the society is a being-for-itself (Burkey, 1983:30). In this context, development must not only increase a people’s freedom, but more than that, it must bring freedom (Nyerere, 1999: 28). Political freedom is itself part of development (Sen, 2000: 112). For the purpose of this study and in the open systems context, it is expected of development initiatives that development produce an individual and society as envisioned by the philosophy of existentialism.

3.1.3. Metabletics

Metabletics is a very recent trend in philosophy. It is a study of man and his/her world in their close and changeable relationships. It is found to be drawing heavily on both existentialism and phenomenology, as it takes on reality, in its totality. Change and becoming in metabletics, as in phenomenology and existentialism, are seen as the fundamental idea of all history (Claes, 1971:270). Metabletics originated in Europe around 1950, the time when the fundamental principles of open systems were manifesting themselves openly. As a philosophy of change, metabletics studies new systems arising from new things, new man and new God, arising from the new human condition (Engelbrecht, 1992:15). In agreement with phenomenology and existentialism, metabletics takes on man and things in their completeness, and as they change. Metabletics, as a philosophy, is embedded in the specific view that the life of man is open, discontinuous and ever new. Man is seen as ever renewing in the ever changing times (Claes, 1971: 272). As a theory of change, metabletics engages in the historical study of the changing nature of the human condition. As a study of the always-new conditions and relationships in human experience, it is established that, new
inventions and discoveries are aspects of one single change in the relationships between man and his/her surrounding world. Metabletical research indicates that systemic change is global and that the whole world is in transition from closed to open systems (Claes, 1971: 274).

Metabletics is a philosophy characterised by both theoretical and practical principles. At the theoretical level metabletics is in agreement with phenomenology on the principle of non-interference. This is a pointer to the fact that reality is best understood when looked at in its completeness. This is in diametrical opposition to the exact and hard sciences' principle of reductionism. In agreement with this view, Burkey (1993) avers that development has got to embrace all aspects of life. The most pronounced of the theoretical principles of metabletics, is that of change /mutability (Engelbrecht, 1992: 51). The notion of change, from a multiplicity of epistemological landscapes is associated with that of development. Even within the closed systems paradigm, we come across varied conceptions of change. In metabletics, the concept of change takes on a wide and full range of relationships in a wide and holistic way. We live in a world of constant evolutionary activity. Development agencies ought to be adaptive, flexible, self-renewing, resilient, learning and intelligent (Wheatley and Roger, 1996:18). The relevance of this philosophy in this study is in its concerns with the whole question of having to revisit and change the nature of change itself (Harsch,2001:12).

Further to the afore-mentioned philosophies that underlie the open systems paradigm, there are principles that are also found to be the pervading these philosophies.

3.2. Open Systems Principles

The following principles are derived from the philosophies that are found to be underlying the open systems paradigm:
3.2.1. The Principle of Change/Mutability

With the onset of the open systems thinking, the traditional essentialism, which has characterised the philosophies, which have underlain the closed systems paradigm, is being replaced. In essentialism, philosophers and scientists tended to interpret the fixed and closed systems accounts of the world as more fundamental and more valuable than anything changing. The philosophies of becoming and change have shattered the closed systems paradigm. The fixed and unchanging world of the closed systems is now replaced by change and becoming as they manifest themselves in the open systems philosophies. There is a constant reference to the principle of change in all of the open systems philosophies (Engelbrecht, 1992: 52). According to this principle of mutability, systems are ongoing processes of what they do toward the future and that no social system is unalterable as there is also no permanent situation in the world (Maguire, 1987: 15). Throughout the world, change, is found to be creeping in unannounced and also coming from all directions at once and it interweaves and never really stops (Harding, 1998: 4).

In the last thirty years, the old Newtonian "comfortableness" has been challenged on several fronts. Change in systems has become ever present. The world today is characterised by surprise, change and efforts at adaptation to continual evolution of new environments (Daft, 1995: 12). Organisations today are finding new ways of designing themselves to survive in an ever-changing world. People throughout the world, for their own development's sake, are demanding serious changes from the largely closed systems institutions that have on most occasions made development unrealisable (Macleod and Maoveni, 2000: 71). The change that is in most instances referred to here, that is, that of the open systems paradigm, is that which must be comprehensive and interrelated (Kotze, 1983: 17). In the context of this principle, development is a continuous process of change that must not come to an end (Buhler, 1999: 8). This implies that systems must, as a matter of necessity, (re)conceptualise and also (re)contextualise themselves into the concrete environments that are forever precipitated by the open systems milieu. The concept of change in this study will be used in the
same manner that it is conceived in the open systems philosophies, as it takes on the changing nature of things and their relationships in their totality.

3.2.2. The Principle of Discontinuity

According to Leibniz's law of continuity, every form of change is a gradual process that is going on in degrees from the infinitesimally small to zero. The influence of this Leibnizian metaphysics contributed toward the heralding of the closed systems ideologies like linearism and gradualism. Round about 1900, this law, which also served as one of the principal principles of the closed systems paradigm, was replaced by the principle of discontinuity. Max Planck, the German physicist, stated in 1900 that energy is given off through radiant energy in finite quantities, in packets, in quanta which are not divisible, that is, taking place discontinuously (Engelbrecht, 1990:18). In 1901 Hugo de Vries, the plant physiologist, stated that varieties of plants originated in leaps from the mother plant and gradually evolved into different species. William Bateson in 1894, stated that the discontinuity of species results from the discontinuity of variation. The principle of discontinuity was at the same time also stated in the biological sciences, as Louis Dollo declared in 1893 that the evolution of species takes place in a discontinuous fashion.

The principle of discontinuity is today radically affecting the human condition. Man establishes fundamental relationships with matter and fellowman on a discontinuous basis. In his works Alvin Toffler speaks of the death of permanence, of transience, of the flow of the situations, on Monday to Friday friends, of new Nomads, and so on (Toffler, 1970:55-60). Peter Drucker describes today's world as the "Age of Discontinuity" as it is impossible to work out long-term strategic plans (Drucker, 1994:20). Change in the open systems does not move in straight logical lines, it loops and spirals around (Harding, 1998:5). This study will be focussing on the implications of the afore-mentioned discontinuous relationships for future development theory and practice.
3.2.3. The Principle of Irreversibility

In the closed systems paradigm, everything is placed outside the stream of time, and only the initial conditions of a process, that is, the causes of first principles, are the determining factors. The arrow of time, in the closed systems paradigm is directed towards the past. The mechanistic model of Newton serves as the initial condition and point of reference for most of the systems predicated on the closed systems paradigm.

In the period round about 1900, for the open systems, existence was placed within different flows of time and the future, as the determining factor of human existence and activities. Without a future no meaningful existence or becoming is possible. In existential phenomenology for instance, the basic concept of human time is that the future is directing us (Engelbrecht, 1992: 54). With his Relativity Theory, Einstein brought time back to the life-world of man. Discontinuous and relative time became an important dimension of human existence and of human systems. With the rediscovery of time, the arrow of time is now directed toward the future, and as a consequence, we begin to have a glimpse of the road that leads from being to becoming. This is because the milieu in the open systems is intentionally pointing towards the future. The future-directed real life experiences of today are both educating and guiding us (Schumacher, 1974: 205). The open systems philosophies are concerned largely with the future, and as such, the notion of irreversibility in this study assists in terms of engaging various perspectives in relation to their postulates for the future.

3.2.4. The Principle of Outer-Directedness

The onset of the philosophies that underlie the open systems culminated in the turning of the metaphysical arrow from the inside to the outside. This principle is manifesting itself in processes like decentralization and exteriorisation. There is a movement toward a global society and communications technology is one of the most important factors driving the human race towards global integration (De Kock, 1994: 5). Development cannot only be done on the domestic front alone, but also in partnership with other
development fellow-travellers in other parts of the world. Integrated systems are fast emerging, as popular movements are linking arms across borders and continents in an endeavour to democratise the embryonic global economic state. Organs of civil society are getting on board the global bus, meaning that, global issues are no longer the sole preserve for corporate dominance. Other players, as with the organs of civil society, are now making a forceful entry into the arena of determining the nature and direction of the rapidly evolving global economy. In reaching out to the outer world in the development crusade, we today have world citizens and global civil societies that are already in existence and collectively engaging global developmental challenges (Herzog, 1999: 23). Politics has become the politics of thousands of concerns and interests, as there is an increase in cross-cultural contact (Nchabeleng, 1994: 3). This study, in the context of the open systems paradigm, takes on the implications of the principle of outer-directedness for development thought and practice.

3.2.5. The Principle of Other-Directedness

Brentano’s student, Husserl, coined the phenomenological concept of “back to the things”, meaning, going back to the things in their totality and completeness. To exist, according to this thinking, is to be at the things and also at and with fellow human beings. There today are manifestations of a transnationalising civil society, as organs of civil society are endeavouring to reach out to others elsewhere in the world (Kappel, 1998: 21). Development enriches the lives of the people by widening their horizons and reducing their sense of isolation (Stiglitz, 2000: 2). In this context, we need to let the cultures of all lands be blown about as freely as possible, since the community context is the only possible framework for any meaningful relationships between people in their development crusade (Kotze, 1998: 8). This implies the importance of the “other” for me. I experience development because others are also experiencing it. We cannot “talk” of development while others are left behind. Today, even in the so-called industrialised and developed countries of the North, there are shows of development concerns for “others” in the developing countries, more especially in the South. The open systems
principle of other-directedness in this study highlights processes of challenge on the self-directedness tendency in some trends in development thought and practice.

3.2.6. The Principle of Horizontality

The principle of verticality dominates most of the closed systems institutions. In the closed systems, there is on most occasions a monopoly in the distribution of resources by a few at the top at the expense of the many on the lower rungs of the social ladders. With the replacement of the closed systems by the open systems, verticality is also being replaced by horizontality. Civil society, more especially from below, is already facilitating horizontal learning in development discourse and relationships (Stiglitz, 2000: 11). There is a growing demand for the democratisation of development institutions, with the worldwide demand by people to have a more direct say in matters affecting their daily lives. These are the processes suggestive of a need for a transition from independence to interdependence based on symmetry and mutual accountability (Mazrui, 1975: 134). Development after all, requires a synergy between the top and the bottom. More liberty anywhere implies more liberty everywhere. Without these much sought after liberties, you cannot have development, as life without liberty is no life at all. Liberty is not only a political ideal, it also appears in biology as an inalienable condition of life (Wheatley and Rogers, 1996: 7). The processes of the flattening of hierarchies are in the main informed by the quest for freedom. For Sen, there is no way that we can have development without freedom (Sen, 2000: 10).

3.3. Processes that go with Open Systems Principles

The following processes that manifest themselves in the world of development and the every day life of humankind are found to be in more ways than one traceable to the principles that underlie the open systems philosophies:
3.3.1. Reconceptualisation

The history of the closed systems paradigm tells us that people, as in the epochs of human history, think and do according to the meanings, functions and powers they attach to the basic concepts of their conceptual framework. A people's conceptual framework is their environment and as circumstances change, so should their conceptual framework. This can be realised through finding new concepts befitting the new circumstances in league with the imperatives of the open systems principle of mutability. The new existential realities, as in the open systems paradigm, are such that, a people's way of thinking and doing must be undergirded by relevant concepts. These shifts are forced upon us by shifts in the directions of major trends in social reality (Zwick, 1998:4).

The problem of development is essentially the problem of social change and more particularly the problem of establishing a tradition of critical examination of the framework of social traditions. This entails changing traditions through a critical attitude towards the whole framework of traditions and paradigms. There must be a transformation of frameworks so that they are in tune with the changing reality and responsive to the challenges of development. This entails a reconsideration of the function and usefulness of each existing development paradigm (Kotze, 1998: 8).

Numerous systems throughout the world are found to be engaged in the processes of re-conceptualisation. New concepts in the world of politics for instance are in use. There is today a talk of the "mixed economy", "The Third way" and so forth, which have serious implications for development discourse and praxis. All of these are suggestive of the gradual demise of closed systems ways of thinking within systems and the closing in of the open systems ways of doing things. The processes of reconceptualisation come across as a revelation of the meanings, values, interpretive schemes, and the rules of living used by people in their daily lives. These processes are also seen as a search for new forms of social organisation which require
reconceptualisation of values that would form the basis in creating new ones (Tindifa, 1998: 207).

3.3.2. Relativisation

As a sequel to the influences of the principle of discontinuity, relativism and non-linear processes are making systems to be relatively placed to their changing temporal and spatial environment. Systems are going through processes of translating themselves into the changing micro and macro environments in order to create conditions that allow for change and growth.

As institutions become responsive to new challenges, human cooperation and association are becoming a world of complex relationships, interconnectedness, processes and uncertainties rather than linear relationships between forces and bodies of accurate predictions as it obtains in the Newtonian sciences (Kotze, 1998: 7). Linear processes are also being replaced in development planning and implementation. By opening out, the systems are becoming involved in non-linear processes of change and development in different flows of time. In this case, development means qualitative change that takes place in terms of non-linear processes directed towards different time horizons. These processes are in diammetrical opposition to the closed systems principle of continuity with its attendant ideologies of gradualism and linearism (Engelbrecht, 1992: 61). Development, in this context, is then informed by social reality on the ground rather than the specifications of the grand narratives of modernity (Melsome-Richards, 1990: 103)

3.3.3. Futurisation

Not having a future is not only a psychological disease, but it also affects all spheres of human existence and activities, be it social, economic and political. The future in the discontinuous process of changes is found to be the orientation point in the systems. In metabletics for instance, the pictures and images of the future for the human and
physical realities are presented. In development discourse too, the concern with the future of mankind and the resource base that will sustain humanity have become issues and questions of development exigency. Real development implies a consciousness of the future and an attempt to influence the future (Kotze, 1998: 11). Futurisation is a consciousness that is based upon interpretations or prognosis about future reality. It recognises the making of the next historical period, which in development terms will have to be different from the previous ones that have been characterised by the conceptual dichotomies of the rich and the poor, the developed and the developing, the advanced and the less advanced, and so forth. It entails the identification of the beliefs, knowledge and values, which are deemed to be realisable in the future.

The future in the open systems context keeps on pulling us toward the new understandings with an insistent and compelling call (Wheatley and Rogers, 1996: 24). In the processes of futurisation, as indicated in the discussion on the principle of irreversibility, some governments and the civil society sector about the future of either the poor or the environment are raising a lot of concerns.

3.3.4. Decentralisation

The open systems principle of outer-directedness and the open systems paradigm reflection on systems, reveals processes of decentralisation on course. Development was found to have been forestalled and slowed by the centralisation of control over the resources in the hands of a few at the expense of the many on the fringes of the socio-economic fabric. Today, ordinary people are organising to regain control over their lives and the local economies, with the potential of bringing about literal disintegration of the most powerful and oppressive systems and institutions (Korten, 1991: 34). People are mobilising toward a global movement for transformational change.

Decentralisation’s objective is to maintain political stability and reduction of the risk of violent conflict, by bringing a wide range of groups together in a formal, rule bound bargaining process. People are demanding a larger say in the way their governments
are being run, as governments are key agencies of development co-ordination. The demands for decentralisation of power often accompany democratic trends (Wolfensohn, 1999: 8). This movement toward a globalised and localised world with many more important players and voices from both above and below, is offering new opportunities for development and its new challenges. There is a dramatic increase in the number of actors on the international stage of development contestation (Bradlow and Grossman, 1996: 32).

Decentralisation, just like development, is about widening people's options (Schuftan, 1998: 12), as decentralisation is also viewed as a principle of development (Venson, 1997: 280). This study also takes on the processes of decentralisation as they manifest themselves, in the varied frontal attacks on the dominant forces in development by the resurgent forces that are closing in from the margins.

3.3.5. Exteriorisation

The advent of the open systems paradigm more especially with the onset of phenomenological traditions, heralded and translated into the turning of the metaphysical arrow from the inside to the outside. In consort with the open systems principle of outer-directedness, the processes of exteriorisation illustrate systems exteriorising, shaping and even translating themselves within and in terms of the external environment. Narrow parochial boundaries of ethnic loyalties are being extended and transcended, endeavouring to put in place a spirit of mutual assistance, love and tolerance (Venson, 1997: 278).

People are developing transnational affiliations and the ability to operate internationally, more especially in the domain of civil society functioning. Systems are endeavouring to create conditions for a dynamic process of interaction and self-regulation. Systems are becoming more and more engaged, communicating, open and actively involved, as they become extropic and increasing their synergy.
3.3.6. Interpersonalisation

The processes of interpersonalisation are found to be traceable to the manifestations of the attributes of the open systems principle of other-directedness. The paradigm shift from the closed to the open systems changed man's being from a mere being-in-itself and being-for-itself in an individualistic sense to being-for-others. The outside world and fellow human beings have become the precondition of man's being and existence. The closed systems principle of self-directedness and its attendant ideology of individualism, are found to be postulating that people become unavailable to one another on the bases of the class, race, interest or cultural group they belong to.

The crumbling of the barriers of isolation and the fading sense of individuality reinforces the collapse of the closed systems paradigm (Harrison-Barbet, 1990:19). The processes of inter-personalisation demonstrate that people are today attaining themselves in the presence of others (Sartre, 1982: 45), in acknowledgement of the significance of the being there of the other/s, (people and systems) for development. This is suggestive of the reality that at no level of existence is man or any other system absolutely alone. The open systems paradigm tells us that existence is co-existence (Luijpen and Koren, 1969:145). People have decided to no longer remain as strangers to one another. The world is today witnessing a "culture of helping others". This is not an alien notion to the domain of development discourse and praxis as people are going around systems to make critical connections (Wheatley and Rogers, 1996: 23). In agreement with this observation, Gorostiaga avers that we must begin to devise concrete ways to implement the common values of all humanity. To do this, he further argued, we need to overcome the civilisation of antagonisms, as in the North-South dichotomy (Gorostiaga, 1995:12).

People are today, contrary to closed systems thinking, having unbounded access to one another. World citizens and global civil societies are already in existence (Herzog, 1999: 23). People are demanding opportunities to make connections with others within and outside the systems. When people have access to one another, the system expands to
include more and more of them as stakeholders. Many powerful forces are already reshap ing the development landscape as a matter of historical necessity. We need to be open to outside influences and knowledge, as stated elsewhere in this chapter that we need to let the cultures of all lands be blown about as freely as possible (Stiglitz, 2000: 30).

3.3.7. Affirmation

In affirmation, another process traceable to the open systems principle of other-directedness, we come across people who have been exhausted by their enmity and are replacing it with more rational considerations. People are transcending the barriers of entropy and thereby increasing both their energy and the energy of others, opening possibilities for mutual growth, suggestive of a movement toward the life of subsidiarity. People are developing a democratic consciousness, as they get to recognise their own situations of alienation. The alienated through their own efforts are pushing for the restoration of their dignity and affirmation of their existence (Neuman, 1997: 69).

The excluded are beginning to take control of their own lives and destiny, in search of a truly liberating development that is characterised by genuine participation that makes people feel affirmed (Carmen and Sobrado, 2000: 217). In affirmation of a people's being, civic movements are on the rise and articulating people's aspirations and also pressuring governments to respond, as they demand socially-oriented policies. People are demanding the freedom to author their own life (Wolfensohn, 1999: 43).

In this spirit, Kotze (1998) argues that development should lead to a society where to be "human" means "to be more" rather than "to have more" (Kotze, 1998: 12). No matter how terrible the oppression, that always makes development possibilities difficult, people always find ways to assert themselves. Affirmation, as man's authenticity project, arises from the idea that closed systems ideologies produce in mankind, a divided creature that it is separated from itself and others. The open systems project like affirmation is for a rehumanised self who is also humanising others. The processes of
affirmation are meant to enable people to affirm each other positively, that is, a habilitation of human beings as subjects (Carmen and Sobrado, 2000: 212).

3.3.8. Democratisation

Since development goes with political power, an enabling milieu in development facilitation and implementation needs to flourish. There must be genuine participation, which would give people a transformative, rather than a fatalistic outlook toward the world (Schuftan, 1998: 44). If people become owners of development, it means that they have political power over the process (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997: 48), as gaining access to available resources is itself a political act. Satgar (1997) says that one ray of light this century was the development of mass movements and the growth in power of the grassroots formations. There is a strong grassroots based development movement (Cooper, 1993: 15). People are creating structures for participation and dialogue, drawing on the experiences of the poor, and for the freeing of their imaginations (Brauer, 1997: 26). They engage in campaigns for a new global ethics geared at countering that of globalisation for a better world based on solidarity, social justice and ecological sustainability rather than the dictates of globalisation (Brauer, 1997: 27).

The desire of social groups for political participation is going over the political parties' heads and this kind of development is even showing in the traditional communities (Thesing, 1997: 19). Concerns for involvement and participation on matters and issues affecting the communities, particularly in relation to development, keep on deepening. There are notable manifestations of the transformation of the development landscape (Wolfensohn, 1999: 1). There is a confrontation of the traditional power structures geared at allowing beneficiaries to have a handle on the control of the development transactions and processes.
3.3.9. Affirmative Action

The history of development is dominated by accounts of varied forms of historical, racial, gender, cultural, class, and religious inequalities, most of which are predicated on the closed systems ways of thinking. Histories of many countries in the world reflect the impact of these kinds of thinking and practices on development, more especially as we reflect upon it through the lenses of the open systems paradigm. The open system tradition brought with it the need for affirmative action. Affirmative actions are universal processes aimed at combating inequalities wherever they arise (Rodee, Anderson, Christo! and Greene, 1983: 91). It means the upgrading of the lot of women of all races, physically disabled people who are otherwise mentally capable of doing their work and the religious minorities cramped out on account of their beliefs. Furthermore, it means the promotion, on ability of people, whose beliefs differ from those of the government of the day (Qwelane, 1999: 2). It means redressing past wrongs where for example, it can be proved beyond doubt that, one was kept out of processes on account of ideological leanings. It is regarded as a reversal of the morally wrong. Past, and some current practices in development, warrants the implementation and encouragement of this process and approach, if development is to become a reality.

3.3.10. Conclusion

Through the lenses of the open systems paradigm, we get to realise that a new type of society is coming into being. This is a society, which multiplies the definition of rights (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987: 45). This paradigm is demanding of the development community to broaden its concept of development, and also looking at the full range of relationships. In this paradigm, we get to realise that freedom of thought constitutes the basis, for any meaningful development (Chachage, 1994: 58). Development, in this paradigm comes across as integrated change of social institutions through conscious human action.
In the new development order, marginalised people will have to acquire a status and a stature, which transforms them from objects of international compassion into subjects of right. Meeting development goals requires a comprehensive approach to development as the open systems paradigm postulates, and the sustenance of a momentum toward greater openness and integration. Genuine development requires a commitment to social-philosophical principles and to the effort that is needed to link development activities. The open systems paradigm is hereby suggested as the enabling framework for development praxis. Its principles ought to pervade our approaches and practices in dealing with the challenges of development.
CHAPTER 4

TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT THINKING

A hermeneutic take on the domain of development discourse reveals that there are multiple perspectives in development discussion (Coetzee, 1989:152). In this chapter, major trends in development thinking and practice are discussed. This chapter goes back to the evolution of the positivist tradition and its resultant influences on the modernisation/neo-liberal and the Marxian approaches. This chapter further traces the onset and development of the sustainable and participatory approaches to development thinking.

Throughout human history, people all over the world had a diversity of ideas in so far as bringing about change, improvements, transformation and healthy lives of dignity is concerned. Some of these development ideas are expressed in structured and scientific theoretical forms, whilst others draw their influence from unstructured conventions, as in popularly held beliefs that survived multiple forms of challenges and empirical testing. Today, in several parts of the world, there are a number of traditional institutions that still influence the directions of development discourse and implementation.

Drawing from the afore-mentioned ways and means of expressions, it is further noted that several perspectives are revealed in the forms of texts (books, research, reports, and journal articles), symbols, multiple genres of arts and literary forms. These revelations and disclosures present accounts of why things are as they are and prescriptions of the way things can go (Mouton, 1996:21). At the descriptive level, we come across descriptions of both the development-related physical and social realities. This on most occasions is about factors contributing toward the non-occurrence of development as a consequence of the physical factors, social factors or both.
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Beyond the description of the contributing factors for non-development, under-development and maldevelopment, there are the normative elements in the myriad of development thought traditions (Mouton, 1996:21). Implicit in these traditions are beliefs and assumptions about the social world, as they incorporate philosophical assumptions about the social world (Mouton, 1996:22).

The approaches to be discussed in this chapter, express specific notions of human beings and societies, and each approach has a particular notion of the way things can go in order to bring about development. It will further be observed that, despite the diversity of the various development thinking traditions, their points of convergence are in; the choice of specified development objectives to be promoted, the investigation of the causal relationships and laws of motion that also trigger the societal change processes. Added to this, is the investigation of the roles played by the dominant actors and also the interests that they have (Martinussen, 1997:14).

In the processes of discussing development thinking from a multiplicity of perspectives, we will come across the influences of the macro narratives of modernity and those of the traditional institutions that survived the overlay of modernisation.

4.1. Liberalism

Liberalism\(^1\) is one of the intellectual by-products of the development of the scientific method. During the medieval era, people looked heavenward for divine relief from their wretched earthly existence. Faith in human potential, as well as esteem for humankind in general, was very low (Baradat, 1979:9). Gradually, people like Copernicus, Galileo and Bacon, made discoveries that revolutionised society's attitudes toward itself and its function in life. Through use of the scientific method, people began to make improvements in their material existence. They began to develop confidence in their

\(^1\) Liberalism can be understood as political philosophy, encompassing a theory of value, a conception of the person and a moral theory. The liberal tradition in politics has centred on religious toleration, government by consent, personal and, especially, economic freedom. It is found to be more sympathetic to capitalism but often less enthusiastic about civil liberties.
ability to solve many problems that they had previously borne with little complaint. There was a movement towards the rational and logical forms of social organisation (De Kock, 1995:8).

In Europe before 1700, a person was born, lived and died at one social level, as a serf, a crafter, a lord or a king (Curran, 1977:143). It was not long before people began to conclude that if technological problems could be solved through the use of human reason, the same could be done with social and political problems. It was believed, in the context of this conceptual evolution, that, if light could be cast on nature by a rational method which revealed a rational order, it could also be shed on human nature and society (Hollis, 1994:4). This speculation led to the philosophy of liberalism, the philosophy that points to a people’s ability to solve their problems. It stems from a fundamental faith in human reason. Everything according to the philosophy of liberalism can be changed for the better.

Discourses on development are about bringing about the new and removing the old, or bringing about improvements to what is already in existence. According to liberalism, nothing is sacred and anything can be changed for the better.

Historically, the most important of the social influences on the evolution of the philosophy of liberalism were the wars of religion and the rise of modern science, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the passage from feudalism to capitalism (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:25). At the political level, the philosophy of liberalism heralded the today’s much avowed democratic traditions. In contemporary development discourse, more premiums are placed on the imperatives of democratic institutions, environments, and practices. Traditionalism in liberal thinking is seen as an obstacle to development, hence the need for breaking linkages or ties with the outmoded traditional ways of seeing the world (Smith, 1996:79-80).

At the economic level, liberalism is in agreement with the basic principles of the capitalistic economic system. The invisible-hand mechanism of the laws of supply and
demand promoted the harmonisation of individual life plans. Economic liberals believe that order, stability and traditional family values are essential for the rule of law and the development of a free but disciplined free market economy (O’Leary, 1995:270). Much of Western development thinking continues to reflect vestiges of the capitalist system and of the principles on which it rests (Schuftan, 1998:17).

The evolution of the philosophy of liberalism is also traceable to the classical democratic thinking. In both liberal and neo-liberal thought, development is believed to be possible only in a democratic dispensation, that is also under-girded by capitalistic economic systems. In John Locke’s concept of the “Social Contract”, the concept of freedom, and the individual’s right to private property, is essential to a people’s well-being. These are the views that are still being embraced by some contemporary commentators on economics and development. According to Locke, development occurs when accumulation of private property allowed people to provide for themselves and their families the necessities of life. Once people are freed from the pressures of survival, they could turn to the task of developing their characters as responsible citizens (Baradat, 1979:59). Private property in this case is seen as a means to an end.

In classical democratic thinking, people are believed to be having the capacity to develop themselves in a democratic milieu. Locke avers that, democracy is a very old idea, dating back to ancient Greece. Out of his concept of the state of nature, Locke believed that, people created a society through the “Social Contract”, and then government was created as an agent of the society. The most basic idea in democracy is that political power must come from the people and that government is legal, only by the consent of the governed. This means that, for development to be possible, people should keep most of their freedoms, and not surrender all of them to the central authority (Baradat, 1979:63). The state, Locke argued, should not be more powerful than the individuals it served. This concept of freedom is still a highly contested notion in contemporary development discourse. The point of convergence for many development perspectives is that of development being possible in a milieu of freedom, even if interpretations of this concept remain diverse. Classical liberals however do
concede that there are certain basic public goods and services essential to the working of society which were best provided by the state (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:32).

Beyond the optimism demonstrated by the classical liberal thinking, there is the modern liberal thinking. The modern liberal thinking gravitated significantly to the right of the political spectrum of attitudes. Neo-classisist democrats like Edmund Burke and his fellow travellers, were apprehensive and guarded on humanity's capacity and rationality for self-development. In their neo-classical thinking, they were more in favour of Thomas Hobbes' concept of society, as his views are closer to conservatism (Baradat, 1979:57). This type of thinking evolved into right-wing thinking within the liberal fraternity. Traditional right-wing thinkers support capitalism (which is the fundamental economic system of the liberal philosophy) because they see it as a means of preserving order, hierarchy and property rights. This tendency is replete with most of the attributes of the closed systems paradigm, as in linearism and self-directedness (O'Leary, 1995:271). This in contemporary socio-economic history and human experience is being referred to as the "New Right". This kind of conservative thinking, as in the thinking of the economic disciples of Margaret Thatcher of Britain, and Ronald Reagan of the United States of America, share with all liberals, a firm commitment to individuals' rights to private property (O'Leary, 1995:271). Contemporary liberal thinking, which integrates elements of justice, as articulated by social liberals like John Rawls, is of the view that people should be at liberty to hold different moral and material priorities and preferences. Added to this, they should live peaceably and profitably together. The dimension that they add to the conceptual landscape of liberalism is that of endeavouring to combine the liberal values of liberty and equality with a concern for social justice (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:43).

Still in the contemporary period, there are the contemporary liberal thinkers who continue to give credence to the socio-economic projections of the "New Right". With their conservative bias, they tend to reinforce the neo-classical rightist liberal defence of the free market (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:44). This category of liberals is affirming a commitment to the concepts of equality, liberty, and individuality. In this context, we
further get to realise that the conceptual, socio-economic and political elements of the liberal doctrine are inextricably interconnected (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:29). Liberal views continue to pervade and dominate today’s many a development debates and discourse. Leftist activists continue to attribute the development and globalisation of poverty to neo-liberalism and application of neo-liberal economic policies. In conventional development thought, the modernisation development paradigm draws heavily from the various tendencies and schools of thought located within liberalism.

4.1.1. The Modernisation Paradigm

The modernisation idea of development incorporates several ideas of the grand-narrative of modernity, liberalism included (Coetzee, 1989:20). For the realisation of development, there must be a total transformation which takes place when a so-called traditional or pre-modern society changes to such an extent that specific forms of technological, organisational, social and other characteristics of the so-called advanced society are revealed (Coetzee, 1989:20). In the modernisation paradigm of development, tradition (the universal original state) is associated with undevelopment and non-development, whilst modernity (the universal end state) is associated with modern forms of economic systems, particularly capitalism, modern social and political systems. Modernisation theory was constructed by sociologists and scientists involved in a rapidly expanding research and teaching programmes in the United States of America. Its take on the distinction between the “traditional” and the “modern” societies was derived from Max Weber via Talcott Parsons (Leys, 1982:332).

Development taking the modernisation character is associated with a movement in the direction of a new technology and a new organisational unity. Modernisation is also seen as a process through which the modern world unfolds itself. To develop or to become modern, points in the direction of scientific, technological, economic, educational and all other forms of progression. Modernisation, it is believed, can assist in facilitating mankind’s movement away from the dark world of magnets, miracles and
superstitions, towards the rational and logical forms of social organisation (De Kock, 1995: 8).

Historically, modernisation is the process of change towards those types of social, economic and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America. These are the processes that are aimed at the South American, Asian and African continents (Smith, 1996: 64). The modernisation paradigm is a descendant of the ideas that are both quantitative and qualitative. It has its intellectual roots in the European traditions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For the so-called developing countries, modernisation means transition towards a condition corresponding to the industrial capitalist societies of the West, and acquiring characteristics common to more developed societies (Smith, 1996: 64).

The underlying idea in the modernisation paradigm is that of the need for the transformation of a traditional society into a modern one, and as a consequence, this transformation will translate into development. Coetzee (1996) concludes that in the context of the modernisation paradigm, a society can be called modern and developed when it displays specific characteristics. Some of these characteristics are; increasing social complexity, control of the environment, increasing specialised adaptation, production and knowledge absorption and social maturation. This entails the weakening of the traditional cultural values, as they are seen as impediments to development (Coetzee, 1996: 50). Central to modernisation thinking is the contrasting of tradition and modernity. Massive industrial development in modernisation is seen as the way to growth and progress for the so-called backward communities. This was one of the dominant views in the earlier contributions to the theory as postulated by Rosenstein-Rodan of Poland (Martinussen, 1997: 57).

This line of thinking was followed by the dimension that was added by Hirschman and Kuznets, who were of the view that as a matter of inevitability, economic growth under average circumstances would lead to increased inequality in the beginning. They further claimed that this tendency would flatten out and to some extent turn to steadily
increasing equality in income distribution. There therefore would be a need to maintain and accentuate these imbalances in the initial phases of this development route, particularly in backward economies, as there were other barriers to growth than the limited market and the lack of capital investments. The developing countries should therefore aim at selected key sectors which had many links backwards and forwards in the economy, and therefore could later on pull together other parts of the economy along (Martinussen, 1997: 59).

The other most pronounced school in the modernisation paradigm is that of the patterned stages of growth. The leading protagonists of this dimension were W. Arthur Lewis of the West Indies and the American, W.W. Rostow. The views of these economists of the 1960's continue to influence some of today's basic notions of economic development. They believed that there is a need to establish a core capitalist sector that is entrepreneurial, to give leadership and constitute a driving force behind economic growth in particular, so as to get the modernisation process on course.

Lewis argued that, as soon as a core capitalist sector was established under conditions of unlimited supply of labour, the capitalists will, with their skills and acumen for economic development, reinvest at least a part of their profits and in this way increase the total amount of capital available. This arrangement would attract more workers from the subsistence sector, where their productivity would be higher than in their low wages bracket, and subsequently, the final outcome would be sustained economic growth, driven by capitalists.

W.W. Rostow, who formed his basic theory during the 1950's, argued that there is a need to lift the economies of the world's communities out of the low-income stagnation and into sustained growth (Rostow, 1960:64). Rostow was more interested in describing the whole process through which a society develops in different stages. Rostow presented the five stages as those of the traditional society, the preconditions for take off, the take off stage, the drive to maturity and that of the epoch of high mass consumption (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:36).
The first stage, the traditional stage, as seen by Rostow, is that of stability, and is mainly agricultural. Many a perspective in the modernisation paradigm largely targets this epoch in human history. This is the stage that humanity has got to be liberated from; in social, economic and political terms, as it is seen as an impediment to development. The second stage is that of the change of ideas toward economic progress. This change of ideas is contemporaneous with the emergence of an enterprising elite that is willing to take the risks in the interest of profit. This was with a view to lifting people out of the throes of a traditional society. In modernisation nomenclature, this is referred to as a stage of establishing preconditions for the take off (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:36).

The third stage, the stage of economic take off, will entail a dramatic increase in the rate of investment. This take-off stage will be followed by the fourth stage, the stage of the drive to maturity, whilst the last stage, will be that of the epoch of high mass consumption, that will still make space for continued economic growth (Martinussen, 1997:64). These five economic stages were loosely substantiated generalisations based mainly on experience from a few industrialised countries. The developing countries, according to Rostow, would have to follow this development pattern, as was experienced by the industrialised countries (Rostow, 1960:67). At the drive to maturity stage, a country reaches maturity when it attains the technological and entrepreneurial skills to produce whatever it chooses. The age of mass consumption is reached when incomes rise sufficiently. This will be characterised by a situation where goods which were once thought to be luxury (goods like automobiles, television, suburban homes, and so forth), become normative throughout the entire society (Lewellen, 1995:56).

Practically, the modernisation theorists, as with the likes of Gabriel Almond, Edward Shills, Lucien Pye and Samuel Huntington, envisaged modern values being diffused through forms of social organisation. The starting point of Samuel Huntington was with the rejection of the concept of “political development”, as according to him, it had no clear meaning (Leys, 1982:334). According to Huntington, some of the Western socio-political models do end up leading to decay, violence, corruption, coups and social
breakdown (Martinussen, 1996:174). In the place of political development, as was initially proposed by Almond, Huntington proposed to discuss merely political change. For society to be released from the clutches of traditional political institutions, there must be a political change through a revolutionary struggle (Leys, 1982:336).

Revolution, as an aspect of modernisation, entails the overthrow of the old regime. It is regarded as the ultimate expression of the modernisation outlook. As a form of political modernisation, it involves the creation of political institutions that are sufficiently adaptable, complex, autonomous, and coherent. This is with a view to absorb and to order the participation of new groups and to promote social and economic change in society (Huntington, 1968:266).

The end point of Huntington's revolution was envisioned as the creation and institutionalisation of a new political order. The revolution in this context is regarded as a form of political change that results from a severe discrepancy between the scale of the forces newly participating in politics and the capacity of political institutions to assimilate or contain them. This also entails having to pressurise citizens into behaviours which are appropriate for promoting economic development (Martinussen, 1996:75). This approach, as was also supported by Christopher Clapham, inevitably warrants a strengthening of political institutions before development implementation, so that these institutions are in step with economic and social changes.

4.1.2. Summary

Both the liberal philosophy and the modernisation paradigm are in agreement on the problems posed by traditional values and also on the imperatives of modern values. Both approaches articulate the significance of the transcendence of the feudal and the semi-feudal low levels of technology, archaic socio-economic systems and the embrace of the dynamic and growing modern systems.
Both approaches show some elements of leanings to the left of the socio-political spectrum of attitudes, as in the thinking of social liberals like John Rawls, that tries to combine the liberal values of liberty and equality with a concern for social justice. In contemporary discourses on issues relating to development, there is talk of giving capitalism a humane face, rather than the profile of a ruthless socio-economic system that has the capacity to devour its own disciples as well.

The leanings to the right, as articulated by Robert Nozick, with his defence of the hegemony of the market and a minimal state, is also another pedestal of the “New Right” for the justification of conservatism. Usually, if taken to the extremes, it tends to gravitate to the “far right” and a strong state. Such a state is in most instances and respects replete with elements of closed systems thinking. Problems of development in several countries, even in the so-called developed countries, have precipitated a resurgence of the right wing movements. Such movements also have a perspective to add to the development discourse, particularly on what they consider to be the causes of the decline in the quality of lives of certain nations or races. This is in line with the closed systems principle of reversibility. Their contributions do not veer far away from the importance of property rights factor, which lies at the heart of both liberalism and modernisation.

4.2. Marxism

Marxism is another philosophy that added another perspective on the development discourse landscape. It is a philosophy that is found to be anti-thetical to liberalism, capitalism and their attendant schools of thought. Prior to its postulates on development, Marxism also has its take on the metaphysical descriptions of both the physical and the social realities. A look at Marxism after Marx, reveals various Marxian traditions that also impacted on the development discourse in a multiplicity of ways. The Marxist and neo-Marxist conceptions explicit alternatives to the normative theories about liberalism and modernisation (Martinussen, 1997:39). Marxists and neo-Marxists respectively believe that the problems of underdevelopment and dedevelopment are as
a result of the ills of the capitalistic systems and the imperialistic crusade. Marxists therefore believe that a socialist revolution is the only solution to the problems of capitalism (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:42).

Marxism's objective is to provide solutions to concrete problems that beset society, particularly the socio-economic problems of the oppressed and the working class, coupled with a challenge to the morality of the markets that are currently dominating the development domain. The Marxist arguments are still in use in dealing with the present socio-political and economic situations as well as the present international economic environment (Melsome-Richards, 1990:117). Prior to taking on the political economy domain, Marxism metaphysically conceives of the universe as a material one, subjected to forces that move in a dialectical pattern to translate into development in both the physical and the social worlds. This conception evolved into the metaphysical theory of dialectical materialism. In the theory of dialectical materialism, the dialectic is regarded as the fundamental logic of all human history. Following on the dialectical process and pattern, humanity would eventually reach the end of the process of change (Baradat, 1979:157). This is incongruous with the open systems principle of change, as the end of change would entail the end of development. This end point of the Marxian utopia alludes to the claim that through the dialectical development process, as manifest in the class struggles, society could develop a perfect social and political existence.

Just like W.W. Rostow's stages of economic growth, Karl Marx also averred that humanity passed through several stages of human development before entering the last and final stage of communism. For Marx, the first stage in the history of all communities of the world is that of primitive communism. At the primitive communism level, people, according to Marx, were, in socio-economic terms, unorganised, unsophisticated and they shared their produce with one another. The primitive communism stage was followed by that of slavery. Social stratification of classes, in consort with Marx's concept of the dialectic, will bring about social change and development as a sequel to the inherent socio-economic contradictions of capitalism and neo-liberalism (Mathema, 1987:19).
The stratification of the slavery era society, was characterised by the dichotomy of slave-owners class and the class of the slaves. The Marxian dialectic avers that the dominant class (the thesis), will, as a matter of inevitability, be negated by the dominated (the antithesis), and this conflict will lead to or evolve into a new society (the synthesis). In the era of slavery, the thesis is the slave-owners, the anti-thesis being the slaves. The synthesis (new society) that evolved was feudalism. The oppressed and dominated class, the slaves, were in no way going to experience or witness development, for so long as they remain in the clutches of the dominant and oppressive class of the slave-owners. The feudal stage also went through the similar pattern and the synthesis that emerged as a result, was that of capitalism (Baradat,1979:159). The capitalist system as seen by Marx, is made up of the dominant bourgeoisie or capitalist class and the dominated class of the workers or the proletariat. The capitalistic system according to Marx makes development difficult for the oppressed and the dominated classes of society. Development can only occur after a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist class by the proletariat. The taking of power, in this philosophy, is regarded as only the beginning of a socialist revolution (Kader, 1985:56).

Marx gave prime importance to the forces of production and also the relations of production in an economic system. According to Marx, classes are defined with reference to ownership of the means of production. Prospects for development in a classless society that will be delivered by the proletarian revolution are maximised, as the proletariat take the means of production away from the capitalists and transfer them to public ownership. The economic system will, as a sequel to this process, come under communal ownership (Baradat, 1979:159). In the closed systems nomenclature, this process and tradition is comparable to the principle of inner-directedness and the ideology of centralism. Karl Marx theorised this process in the economic sphere, and proceeded to add that, to safeguard the revolution, there will be a necessity for a strong role of the state (public sector) in the economy. The working class will constitute a socio-economic and political force, challenging the ideological hegemony of the
capitalist class, in the process of leading mankind to a classless society of material abundance (Lodge, 2001: 22).

With the demise of the capitalistic system, a new social order called socialism will evolve. This type of society will also bear elements of class relations of a special type. The new "benevolent" dominant class of the proletariat will take leadership of society until all members of society are socialised into the virtues of a sharing classless order. In this system, there will be a society free of exploitation and also a society that is able to meet the social needs of the majority on a sustainable basis. This can be reinforced with the socialisation of the means of production which will include nationalisation, formation of cooperatives and other forms of collective ownership of the means of production, in order to forge a humane, tolerant and self-critical path to socialism rooted in a "democratic order" (Satgar, 1997:23). Development in this view, can only take place under the leadership of the working class and the poor. Socialism's three basic features are those of the public ownership of the means of production, the welfare state (caring for the needs of its needy members) and the goal of creating a society of abundance, equality, and sharing that will free people from material want (Baradat, 1979: 199). Socialism will subsequently give way to a classless society in a communist order. All of these cannot be achieved without the application of the closed systems ideologies like linearism, traditionalism, authoritarianism and centralism.

In Marxian nomenclature, the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Each stage of human development, brings about changes in technology and the organisation of the economy, and also a change in the balance of power between the different social classes (O'Leary, 1995:269). Marx's explanation of social change and development accorded privilege to the economic factor over other factors. This is out of keeping with the open systems paradigm as it takes on the full range of relationships and on things in their totality. The Marxist philosophy in later years, often referred to as Marxism after Marx or the Socialist Theory after Marx, diversified into three distinct Socialist doctrines that continue to influence discussions on development.
These traditions are those of the Orthodox Marxists, the Marxists-Leninists and the Revisionists/neo-Marxists (Baradat, 1979:186).

4.2.1. Orthodox Marxism

The idea of Orthodox Marxism or Orthodox Socialism is traceable to the thinking of Marxist scholars like Karl Kautsky (1854-1938). This line of thinking is popularly held in the scholarly domains, particularly in the human sciences, and in the institutions that have a strong Marxist influence or culture. The disciples of this tradition tend to cling tenaciously and rigidly to the original Marxist theory. They continue to maintain that the dialectic, as it is, is the logic of human history and in its unadulterated form and character, will inevitably lead to the demise of the capitalist system. Such single-minded devotion to a set of ideas stifled imaginative thinking and ultimately spelled the doom of the orthodox school among the Marxist intellectuals (Baradat, 1979:187).

4.2.2. Marxism-Leninism

Vladimir Illyich Ulyanov, otherwise known as Lenin (1870-1924), came to grips with the reality that Marxism in its traditional form would be difficult to actualise and or operationalise. To make Marxism more realistic to the realities and challenges of his era, Lenin devoted himself to developing a revolutionary doctrine and applying Marxism to real life situations. In doing so, Lenin made four important contributions to Marxism.

Lenin restored to Marxism the revolutionary spirit and urgency of the early thought of Marx. He modified it significantly, trying to satisfy questions arising from historical events that seemed to contradict Marx's theories, further amending it so that it would apply to the developing countries and also adjusting it in such a way that it would function in a real state.

Lenin further stated that the proletarian class by itself is not sufficiently sophisticated to deal with the socio-economic and political complexities of the state. Lenin argued that the proletariat needed an enlightened revolutionary group "The Vanguard of the
Proletariat”, that would serve as the principal revolutionary agent which was later on named the Communist Party. This vanguard agency would trigger the revolution long before the conditions that Marx anticipated actually existed. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, socialism will be imposed on society by a minority. This dictatorship of the proletariat, guided by the Communist Party, would last much longer, because a huge percentage of the population would have to be “proletarianised” before the utopia as envisioned by Karl Marx could be realised. The governing of this small, “disciplined”, “totally dedicated” group will be that of democratic centralism, in consort with the closed systems’ principle of inner-directedness (Baradat, 1979:194).

Numerous Marxist-Leninist traditions came and went, as they could not withstand the onslaught of social reality and history. The Soviet Union came and went, followed by its erstwhile satellite states. Instead of delivering an enabling environment for development, Marxist-Leninist states unleashed some of the most ruthless and totalitarian states in living memory. The Marxist-Leninist concept of development is still with us in the New Millennium. Today’s Marxist thinkers, as in the myriad Communist parties all over the world, attribute the growth and globalisation of poverty to the onslaught and globalising totalitarianism of the market forces. The revolutionary forces must, according to Marxist-Leninists, advance the struggle for socialism in order to counter neo-liberal ideologies (Nzimande, 2000:2). The logic behind this kind of thinking is that neo-liberalism is a theory that advocates market-driven economic policies, including the privatisation of state assets, leading to increased retrenchments.

Marxist-Leninists believe that development for the classes of society that have historically been disempowered as social echelon, is only possible through the broadening of the socialist transformation, to bring about de-alienation and creation of spaces for collective ventures (Nzimande, 2000:53). An active role of the state and popular mobilisation of the poor people must accompany development, according to this line of thinking. This will entail, in the spirit of the closed systems principle of inner-directedness, the strengthening of the role of the state in directing major economic resources towards meeting the basic needs of the people (Galli, 1992:5). In the open
systems context, a stronger state tends to lead to weaker or weakened people. This process will be accompanied by the reinstatement of the economic equality of communalism and the rebirth of a new socialist synthesis, toward building a socialist society that is based on a macro socio-economic project as it was in the past (Bunsee, 1998:12). South Africa has one of the world’s most active Communist Party since the demise of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, inspired by the Marxist-Leninist approach. The South African Labour movement too is also ensnared and influenced by the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, as a pathway toward the elimination of the exploitation of man by fellow man (Bunsee, 1998:12). History shows that today, communist parties are thriving even in liberal social democracies (Lodge, 2001:22).

4.2.3. Revisionism

Edward Bernstein (1850-1932) thought that the only way to save the socialist theory from the moral sterility of the scientific socialism approach was through the revision of the socialist theory. This was in response to some of the developments that were not foreseen in the original Marxist thinking. Revisionists believe that Marx misjudged the development capacity and magnitude of capitalism, in that, the capitalist class was increasing rather than decreasing. Millions of people were entering the capitalist class and fraternity at an increasing rate as capitalism is manifesting a capacity to adjust to new circumstances (Baradat, 1979:188). Socialism, in the context of this approach also ought to change, adapt to new circumstances, and abandon dogmatic doctrines and start supporting pragmatic policies.

This approach influenced the emergence of the New Left and the neo-Marxist schools of thought. The Neo-Marxist theories of underdevelopment and development appeared during the 1950’s, partly as a reaction against the growth and modernisation theories, and partly as the outcome of a long-standing debate concerning the impact of imperialism (Martinussen, 1997:85). The early Neo-Marxist theories were primarily known as Dependency theories. They were to a large extent influenced by the Latin American structuralists and their analyses of the trade relations between the
economically backward countries and the highly industrialised countries. The Latin American research workers on development directed their attention to the problems of underdevelopment within the realm of the structuralist school of thought (Coetzee, 1989:53).

4.2.3.1. **Dependency Theory**

As early as in the 1960’s, a number of Neo-Marxist and Marxist development conceptions were elaborated as explicit alternatives to the normative theories about modernisation. Dependency as a concept in the context of development and its encompassing perspectives, points towards inequality and exploitation among countries. This focus on exploitation and inequality is intimately related to the theory of Marxism (Coetzee, 1989: 58). It is argued in this theory that the disequalising factors work not only on the supply side but also on the demand side, and unequal distribution of incomes and of activities combine with each other to inhibit economic development. These disequalising forces have molded the fate of the backward world and still exercise a powerful impact on the prevailing conditions (Baran, 1982:105).

The Dependency Theory is also found to be having its roots in the crisis of the United States of America’s liberalism in the late 1960’s. The other influences were the Cuban revolution led by Fidel Castro, the de-Stalinisation process, the Maoism of the Chinese Revolution, and the Latin American Marxist economists (Smith, 1996:142). The Dependency Theory at the outset mirrored the Third World countries’ concerns. The main points of focus in this concern were; the problem of the hierarchy of states, the problems of underdevelopment, the effects of capitalism and the imperatives of the political economy in terms of analysing development (Chazan, Mortimer, Rauenhill and Rothchild, 1998:16). Imperialism, as led by the Western countries, is said to be leading to impoverishment, and as such a constraint on development. Theorists from Latin America provided the initial impetus for this view, and these ideas were subsequently quickly taken up in Africa and Asia (Hope, 1992:336). In consort with the Marxian concept of the socio-economic factors leading to the problems of development,
dependency theorists are also of the view that the state is serving the interest of the bourgeoisie. The capitalist state is believed to be only interested in keeping the capitalist system healthy. Legislation in such states is also structured to serve capital (Webster, 1990:132). Underdevelopment is said to be the result of the developing countries’ ties with the capitalist metropoles, with the centre continuing to dominate the periphery (Amin, 1982:209). A movement toward “genuine” development entails a delinking and dissociation of ties with capitalism, and the challenge of international capitalism. Development in this line of thinking implies gaining real national independence and self-centred economic progress (Martinussen, 1997: 39). This on the other hand entails an embrace of the elements of closed systems thinking, particularly with reference to the principle of self-directedness.

The final objective of the varied strands of the dependency approach was the introduction of Socialism. In this view, the only mode of production that could ensure the economic progress attained was transformed into improvements for the suppressed classes and the many marginalised and extremely resource-weak groups is socialism (Martinussen, 1979:39). There was to be a reduction of dependence on the industrialised nations by the Third World nations, and this was supposed to lead to a new form of dependence; the Third World countries depending on their own efforts (Hope, 1992: 336). With this process goes the challenging of the defects of the existing international economic order, which, it was argued, had resulted in an economic crisis perpetuating poverty and inequality, both between and within countries. The varied approaches of the dependency school of thought presented two types of objectives for the development process. Emphasis was either on the developing countries’ position in the international system or on the internal conditions in the Third World societies. With regard to the former, colonial powers and imperialism have actively underdeveloped the Third World or at least impeded independent development in the affected areas (Martinussen, 1997:39). In so far as the latter is concerned, all forms of exploitation and neo-liberal tendencies must be replaced by a socialist system. A socialism that is state-controlled and a centrally planned economy as a step to reorganising the production structures in the interest of the poor and the marginalised. But then again,
centrally controlled closed systems entail a loss of freedom that is necessary for any society's development, in the open systems context. All of these give credence to the understanding that Socialism, with all of its components, is a closed systems dispensation.

Paul Baran, who emigrated to the United States of America from the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics before the Second World War, wrote on the historical accounts of underdevelopment and an analysis of the "morphology" of contemporary development or underdevelopment. Baran proceeded to observe that the backward countries were characterised by dual economies. These were the rural based large agricultural sectors characterised by low productivity and the urban based industrial sector (Martinussen, 1997:86). For Baran (1992), growth and employment potential lay with the industrial sector. But its expansion was constrained by the small size of the domestic markets as well as by competition from the highly industrialised countries. The rich are found to be opposed to industrialisation as this, they believe, will lead to the undermining of their dominance. There therefore is a need for state intervention to promote nationally controlled industrialisation. This is a view also shared by some modernisationists on both ends of the spectrum, to its left and to its right. This perspective takes on the internal conditions in the backward countries that contribute toward underdevelopment and dependency. State-owned heavy industries are seen as a pre-condition for the evolution of the other industrial sectors.

For Andre Gunder Frank, the capitalist systems permeated the whole of the countries of the periphery (Riggs, 1995:1). In capitalist systems, the underprivileged minorities and majorities are bound to become increasingly marginalised. This is attributable to the three contradictions that characterise capitalist development and the development of underdevelopment. The first is that of the expropriation of economic surplus from the many and its appropriation by the few. The second is the polarisation of the capitalist system into metropolitan centres and peripheral satellites. The third is in the continuity of the fundamental structures of the capitalist system throughout the history of its expansion and transformation (Frank, 1975:13). Within the said systems, there are
pyramidical structures and there also are the regional economic elites who serve as the agents of capitalism (Martinussen, 1997:89). The metropoles often actively underdeveloped the backward areas further. The satellite countries therefore need to dissociate themselves from, or totally break links with the industrialised countries. Delinking from the world market was the best development strategy, particularly with the introduction of some form of socialism in the peripheral countries (Hope, 1992:336).

Samir Amin of Egyptian extraction, came with his notion of the ideal types of societal models. Amin (1982) postulated an autocentric centre economy that will determine the society’s development possibilities and dynamics. This is without doubt a closed systems standpoint. Development possibilities and prospects in this milieu will be with the peripheral states breaking links with the metropole or centre countries. This would have to be followed up with the expansion of regional cooperation and an internal pursuit of a socialist development strategy (Martinussen, 1997:91). The Brazilian Social Scientist, F.H. Cardoso, saw the causes of underdevelopment in developing and peripheral countries as the extensive development of capitalism in the dependent economies. The growth of capitalism as it manifests itself in the internal conditions of the developing and dependent countries, presents elements of class division and inequitable distribution of power. For a better understanding of these relations and their impact on society, there is a need for a political economy analysis. This entails reflections on the socio-political nature of the economic relations of production and taking on the economy as political economy (Cardoso and Faletto, 1979:54).

Cardoso further noted, as characteristic of the revisionist traditions, that, there can be development even in the milieu of dependency. According to Cardoso, there can be development in the dependency set up if the national bourgeoisie can take leadership of the development process and also in shaping its direction. Development in this context can put on a progressive character, particularly when undergirded by democratic forms of regimes for societal development, in a direction that would benefit the majority (Martinussen, 1997:95). This was seen as a methodological movement constituting
what is called the passage from an “abstract” style of analysis into a “concrete” form of historical knowledge.

The American social scientist, Bill Warren established and concluded that imperialism has led to inequality and exploitation. Warden further argued that imperialism has created the condition for the spreading of capitalism to the Third World countries. Capitalism is found to have grafted onto the economies of the periphery by the metropoles and industrialised countries (Martinussen, 1997:99).

4.2.4. Summary

The various Marxist approaches to development are in agreement on the imperatives of the democratisation of society’s political life, the centralisation, in some instances, of decision-making, the formation of cooperatives and more equal distribution of development benefits. Added to this, the general empowerment of the local people, collective ownership at community level and cooperative societies. These are aimed at creating a world in which affluence, peace and social justice prevail, through the socialisation of the means of production, reinforced by a more equal distribution of development benefits (Toffler, 1990:422).

To the surviving Marxist-Leninists, as with organisations like the South African Communist Party, with the growth of poverty, that is threatening to equal the globalisation process, socialism has become even more relevant than ever before (Ngcakula, 1998:12). The Communist remnants of the deceased Soviet socio-economic system, in the likes of Yevgeni Primakov, are still passionate and strong believers in a strong state. A strong state on the other hand entails implementation and application of the closed systems principles and ideologies (Quinn-Judge, 2001:30). The implementation of closed system thinking in development implies erection of impediments and obstacles in the ways of development. Only a united front, according to the Marxists, can effectively challenge and break the Bretton Woods institutions' domination and arrest the “barbaric” decline of society, and take society forward on a
cooperative and democratic socialist basis (Harvey, 2000:23). The influences of Neo-Marxism continue to manifest themselves in some Latin American states. In Brazil, the leftist revolutionary movement called the Sem Terra (Landless), a movement of the landless rural workers, on a neo-Marxist platform, continue to campaign toward a socialism that was envisioned by the Dependency paradigm thinkers of the past years (Padgett, 1998:32).

The dependency approach as part of the structuralists school of thought, on the whole, attributes the non-occurrence of development to the dependency cultures that took root in the developing countries.

These Marxist commentators seem to be oblivious of the fact that socialism is losing its reality value even within the socialist/marxist fraternity. The proletariat of the developed countries is now having a share in the riches of their countries at the expense of the poor people and their fellow proletarian "comrades" in the less developed countries.

4.3. Sustainable Development

Sustainable Development is conventionally defined as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs (Hope, 1992:350). The evolution of this approach in development discussion is traceable to the observations on the burden that the human economic activity was placing on the earth's ecosystem. The aforesaid burden is found to be exceeding the limits that the ecosystem can sustain (Korten, 1991: 2).

Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway was commissioned to investigate the impact of various economic activities on the environment. Brundtland put together a team of researchers that finally produced a report that was called the Brundtland Report, named after her. This report captured a number of contributory factors leading to environmental degradation (Brauer, 2000:3), and also made recommendations on how best to bring economic activity into balance with the limits of
the ecosystem (Korten, 1991:3). The Brundlandt Commission Report was later on translated into a text called *Our Common Future*. This text brought the environment to the centre stage as a public policy issue, and rapidly become the foundation document in the sustainable development debates (Korten, 1991: 3-4).

The report, and the subsequent commentators on the effects of development on the environment were in agreement on the assertion that development is doing more damage to the environment and that the carrying capacity of the earth has been reached (Martinussen, 1997: 150).

*Our Common Future*, identified several environmental trends that threaten to radically destroy the planet, and the many species that are found on it. The report observed that there is a rapid loss of productive drylands that are gradually being transformed into a desert, contemporaneous with the rapid loss of forests. The greenhouse gas emissions are leading toward global warming and also a loss of the atmosphere’s protective ozone shield. The report further observed that there is a pollution of both the surface and ground water (Brundtland, 1987: 50).

The report explained how some forms of development eroded the environmental resources upon which they are based, and how environmental degradation undermines economic development (Brundtland, 1987: 3). The earth’s environment was exhibiting stresses at the current era and growth is found to be frequently conflicting with the environment (Pearce, no date: 1). It has virtually become impossible to separate economic development issues from environmental issues (Brundtland, 1987: 3).

The report, or *Our Common Future*, postulated numerous recommendations for a suitable utilisation of resources in development. At the social level, there was a reaffirmation of the brief of development as the satisfaction of human needs and aspirations, hence the need for a change in the content of development (Brundtland, 1987: 52).
The likelihood existed that if development policies were informed by the principles that underlay the sustainable development paradigm, people's options for earning a sustainable livelihood were going to be widened. Development agreeably, should lead to the improvement of the quality of human life, so far as it is possible, within the boundaries of the carrying capacity of the ecosystems on which it is dependent (Hattingh, 2001:1).

At the economic level, it was argued that a sustainable economy would be the result of sustainable development. To be able to achieve this, there must be, in the process of improving the quality of life of a people, a respect and care for the community of life. Environmental degradation can undermine economic development, as the economy relies on the environment, as its resource base. The way we manage the economy impacts on the environment and also the understanding of the ways in which economies and their environments interact (Pearce, Markandya and Barbier, nd: 1).

Sustainable development can be achieved through major changes in the ways in which the planet is managed, by way of conserving and enhancing the resource base and the reorientation of technology. This means a new kind of economic growth that is environmentally friendly (Dower, 1992:94). An economic system that is able to generate surpluses and technical knowledge on a self-reliant and sustained basis, in the process of the satisfaction of human needs. At the political level, central to development programmes based on the concept of sustainable development are the notions of participation, human and organisational capacity building, and psychological empowerment (van Vlaenderen and Nkwinti,1993:212). For Swanepoel and de Beer (1997), development is part of the local politics, and as such, the local development effort must be in harmony with the local ecology. But then again, on most occasions, we get to realise that the local politics by themselves tend to be closer to the closed systems ways and patterns of thinking. For Bohnet, a global sustainable development prescribes that three main objectives that must be pursued are those of productive economic growth, social justice and ecological sustainability (Bohnet,1999:10).
It is demanded in this context that, only a radical transformation of thought, policies and institutions will allow humankind to reverse the present course toward social and ecological breakdown (Korten, 1991:3). There must be an empowerment of the local communities to sustain themselves and their ecologies. Sustainable development requires meeting the basic needs of all and extending to all the opportunity to fulfil people's aspirations for a better life. Effective participation in decision-making processes by local communities can help them articulate and effectively enforce their common interests. Many problems, after all, arise from inequalities in the accessing of resources (Brundtland, 1987:3). Sustainable development implies self-reliant and cost-effective development, facilitating access to health, shelter, clean water and food. This implies the need for a political system that secures effective citizen participation in decision-making (Fitzgerald, MacLellan and Munslow, 1995: 5).

4.3.1. Summary

Instead of following on the path of the preceding thought patterns in development discourse, the sustainable development paradigm is gaining momentum in all sectors and institutions that influence development thinking, implementation and practice in one way or another. Immediately after the Earth's Summit and the subsequent conferences on the impact of development on the environment, numerous countries worked on legislation geared at protecting and regulating the use of physical resources. The South African government in 1998, promulgated a National Environmental Management Act geared at a fair usage and distribution of natural resources.

The corporate sector also caught on with the spirit of the imperatives of a responsible utilisation of resources and sustainable development thinking. Numerous companies introduced the environmental management departments and sections to ensure a responsible utilisation of resources and also monitoring of the disposal of toxic waste material coming out of the heavy industries. Some in the corporate establishment proceeded to sponsor nature conservation projects and initiatives.
The sustainable development paradigm is found to be popular with the organs of civil society. Advocacy civil society agencies are taking on the governments and corporates on the resource utilisation, more especially where irresponsibility is detected. The sustainable development paradigm calls for sustenance of the social, economic and cultural systems of the communities but is not coming out clear on the closed systems elements in some of these systems.

4.4. Participatory Development

Many a development initiatives were launched and rapidly collapsed because of the lack of participation on the part of the beneficiary communities. This in the main is also found to be attributable to elements of closed systems thinking on the evolution of the participatory models in development thinking. We establish that the classical type of "participation" entailed the imposition of problem analysis on the target group/s, derived mainly from large scale data analysis. Marxists and capitalists had shared evolutionary, unilineal, universalistic, positivistic and utilitarian assumptions and a fervent belief in progress. By the period round about 1970, many observers had discovered that economic growth in the aggregate did not necessarily eliminate poverty. Growth that did not lead to the fulfillment of basic needs was regarded as a travesty of development. This led to the formulation of the basic needs approach; an end product of the Cocoyoc Declaration at the Cocoyoc conference in Mexico. Delegates at this conference affirmed the imperatives of development having to be need-oriented (Burkey, 1993:57).

It was further affirmed at the above-mentioned conference that, if development is to be regarded as anything to go by, it should be measured through the delivery of the basic needs to society. Participation, as an essential part of human growth was also regarded as a basic need. In so far as this approach is concerned, meaningful participation is achieved when the poor people's level of consciousness is raised and they become aware of their situation, and they get to have the power to influence the decisions that affect their livelihood (Burkey, 1993:57).
4.4.1. **Rapid Rural Appraisal**

With the growing discontentment with the questionnaires, surveys and their results, a search for alternative and cost-effective methods became more evident. This search was contemporaneous with the recognition of the knowledges of the rural people. Instead of the conventional paternalism of the outsiders coming to teach the local people, the local people become instructors to the researchers. This was geared at deviation from the traditional methods of knowledge search (Chambers, 1994:956).

The rapid rural appraisal approach is found to be more concerned with the methods and the capacity of the rural people to provide information to the so-called experts. Scholars in the orthodox epistemological traditions were apprehensive of the credibility and the merits of this approach. The University of Khon Kaen in Thailand adopted this method and proceeded to host the International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal in 1985. This method was later on adopted in twelve African countries, eight countries in South East Asia and three in Latin American countries. In the 1980's the Rapid Rural Appraisal approach spread to London and Australia (Chambers, 1994:95).

4.4.2. **Participatory Rural Appraisal**

In the late 1980's, the Rapid Rural Appraisal evolved into the Participatory Rural Appraisal approach. This evolution was characterised by the transition in terms of the shifting of the initiative from the outsider to the villagers. This development was geared at encouraging the poor people to undertake their own analysis and action. This also meant that through a democratic orientation, people would be able to acquire ownership of processes and resources (Stiglitz, 1998:12)

Participatory Rural Appraisal is characterised by the quest to alter behaviours and attitudes, which would lead to the local people becoming the teachers. This approach is further characterised by the sharing of experiences and knowledge between the local people among themselves and between the local people and the outsiders.
This approach spread rapidly in the non-governmental organisations sector, more especially in India.

Participatory approach attempts to introduce a bottom-up style of development in order to remedy the government-led approach's shortcomings. This is an approach in development that is designed to enhance sustainability and self-reliance and to achieve social justice through improvements in the quality of people's participation (JICA, 2001:2). This means qualitative enhancement of participation in local societies, which can be defined as groups of rural communities, and as administrative and developmental units. In the process of the enhancement of the people's capability to have a role in their society's development, people should be willingly involved in a wide range of development activities, as agents and beneficiaries of development (Stiglitz, 1998:12).

Some of the tendencies that characterised this approach were practices like, quick countryside visits that are close to the urban areas, brief communication with the local male elites by high profile experts and government officials. As a sequel to this process and tendencies, specific local realities were largely ignored. This did not encourage the targeted beneficiaries to develop a sense of ownership and commitment for development projects and made sustenance of such projects difficult (Kuhn, 2000:21).

This line of thinking was geared at giving more responsibilities to the local people in development management. This development translated into a growing family of approaches and methods, enabling the local people to share, enhance and analyse the knowledge of life and conditions, to plan and to act. Irene Guijt and Robert Chambers in this approach, consider the behaviours and attitudes of the outsiders and their ability to learn from the local people as important (Kuhn, 2000:21). The outsiders, in this regard are expected to demonstrate; a critical self-awareness, embracing errors, sitting down, listening and learning. The local people also have a story to tell about what they think can bring about improvements in their lives. Instead of lecturing, the outsiders must learn to hand over the stick to the local people who then become the main
teachers and analysts, having confidence that they can do it and in relaxed and open-ended inventiveness.

In recent times, donor agencies, governments, non-governmental organisations, training institutes, consulting groups and universities are using the Participatory Rural Appraisal methods and techniques in almost every domain of development management. This approach is today used in natural resource management, soil conservation, drinking water and sanitation projects, health projects, savings and credit projects, animal husbandry, disaster preparedness, emergency aid, food security and so forth. The Participatory Rural Appraisal focuses in particular on visual tools in order to overcome language and communication difficulties between outsiders, facilitators and the local people. Resource mapping, matrices well-being ranking, causal and linking diagramming are among the most common techniques (Kuhn, 2000:21). But Robert Chambers warns that, conflicts in the projects are likely to occur, as participants come into these projects with their own individual and group interests, that easily dovetail with the attributes of closed systems thinking.

The practice of participation is found to be always connected to the “doing” by communities, groups or individuals, of things related to the development, improvement or change of an existing situation, to something presumably better. Swanepoel and de Beer (1997) conclude that, there are two ways of looking at the concept of participation. The one way of doing it is by way of maintaining the system or that of systems-transforming processes.

The system maintaining approach to participation is characterised by conservative interpretations of what the notion participation entails. The involvement of the beneficiary communities or the local people, has to do with co-option, and is determined at the top. This brings into the picture the closed systems notions of linearism and verticality, as the people being co-opted are usually those not opposed to the thinking of those exercising power over or on the resources. In apartheid South Africa, people were co-opted into participating in the separate development initiatives through
homeland systems and the local councils. The co-opted, do not initiate, but are simply co-opted into institutional initiatives either by governments or aid agencies (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997:129). These institutions identify the needs, plan actions to be executed, give leadership in the management of the projects and also the mobilisation of the communities and groups to become involved.

The system-transforming process in participation is characterised by the poor people taking control of their own development, and a radical interpretation of the concepts of participation and empowerment. The beneficiary communities by themselves become the instruments of transformation, so that they, by themselves, can be free and a self-reliant people (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997:130).

4.4.3. Summary

The participatory development facilitators and practitioners are expected to understand the existing social and political dynamics in the project environment. There must be a genuine participation of those who have traditionally been excluded from important decisions. If this imperative is not honoured, we will continue to have closed systems tendencies even in the so-called “participatory” development practices. The conservative system maintaining approaches are heavily laden with the attributes of the closed systems paradigm, as they are guarded, in relation to the transformation process, like change for instance. The radical approaches too, are not unassailable, as they also tend to carry with them, closed systems tendencies like democratic centralism and the uncritical embrace and following of the “party line”.

No government or any other development agency, should make use of the resources on mass development and mass welfare unless the poor population majority is sufficiently powerful to also guide and influence development policies that are meant for them. People should not be made passive recipients, as the closed systems paradigm would have it, but as the knowing and active citizens. People should be able to achieve a deeper understanding of the social reality that shapes their lives and they should also
be aware of their capacity to transform that reality, in consort with the spirit of the open
systems paradigm. For participation to be a genuine one, particularly in development,
there needs to be the breaking down of the many barriers that obstruct people's
participation and prevent the poor, in particular, from exerting their influence on decision
making and allocation of resources. This is the scenario demanded of, by the open
systems paradigm. Participation is not just a means to an end in the development
process, but it is a goal in itself.

4.4.4. Conclusion

The afore-mentioned development thought traditions made important contributions to
the plains of development discourse. The onset of liberalism with its attendant scientific
traditions helped to open the doors of enlightenment for humanity from the thralls of
mysticism and metaphysical accounts of the dark ages. Humanity's horizons of
development possibilities were broadened by this development. Liberalism and
Modernisation, with their vast contributions to the development discourse landscapes,
were not without their inherent attributes (of a closed systems nature) that would
impede development.

These were taken note of by the Marxists, who also made significant contributions to
the debate, by way of postulating frameworks for development through socialism en
route to communism. This tradition too, also has closed systems elements that
diminished prospects of development for society. The sustainable development and
participatory development paradigms also added epistemological pillars in this
knowledge quest. They too, despite the significance of their contributions,
demonstrated vestiges of the closed systems thinking, that, as illustrated in the previous
chapters, narrow development possibilities for mankind.
Multiple perspectives and reflections on development engage in conversations with each other, issuing diverse messages on how best development could be facilitated and realised. These perspectives come with frameworks for guiding the processes of development. The point of confluence for these perspectives is their agreement on the imperatives of development in general. Despite the enumeration of the development stories in several parts of the world, nearly a quarter of the global population lives in absolute poverty. World communities continue to find themselves in what is referred to as the deprivation trap, as in; poverty, isolation and powerlessness. The brief of this chapter is to critique trends in development thinking and practice through the lenses of the open systems paradigm. This will entail going back to traditional institutions, through the medieval traditions into modernity, as they continue to manifest themselves in contemporary development thought and experience.

Deprivation takes many different forms. At the political level, it is often characterised by the states of the absence of freedom. Today in some communities in the world, people are still denied political liberty and civil rights. At the social level, deprivations take forms of lack of basic health care, unequal attention to the elementary interests of women and the young, and illiteracy which ought to assist in facilitating access to economic resources (Sen, 2000: 62). Development is expected to bring with it, renewal and hope, in the form of economic justice and political freedom, within an environmentally sustainable framework, where the worth of every person is recognised. People are instead deprived of their livelihood in the name of development and the so-called competitive efficiency. With development, we are witnessing the growth of poverty, that leaves in people, the scars of humiliation and terror (Gibbs, 1997: 50). Poverty tends to relegate people to the depths of powerlessness. Once people are edged to the margins
of deprivation, they always make an effort of finding their way back to the center. In South Africa for instance, the marginalised populations are moving in on the metropolitan centres, as poverty exiles. They are closing in on the centres that are having the basic needs for a healthy living, to the disdain of those who have been historic beneficiaries. In the past years, the apartheid government had a way of regulating this kind of movement, but still people found their way back through either the legal or illegal means (Carmen and Sobrado, 2000: 13). With the inauguration of a democratic government in South Africa, the process has been exarcebated by the illegal immigrants. This is putting a lot of strain on the environment, as there is a limit to its carrying capacity. This will in all likelihood lead to a conflict between the included (resourced) and the excluded (under-resourced). This scenario gives credence to the fact that without development, there is no prospect for lasting peace (Martinussen, 1997: 190).

There still are problems that continue to undermine progress. If an ideal framework is put in place, prospects of transcending these problems will be maximised, as the ideal framework to guide contemporary development thinking to authentic development is long overdue. This should be a framework that has got to be enabling, in order for people to be able to live the lives of dignity, as human dignity is advanced when people begin to live healthy lives (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997: 119). Instead of theory conventionally guiding the doing of development, social reality, as projected by the open systems paradigm, must guide development endeavours, as there currently is a growing demand for social justice in development (Sen, 2000: 63). People are already demonstrating that the improvement of the human rights situation is a pre-requisite for the success of development (Deutscher, 2000: 27). What the poor have been lacking for years, is the power to secure their development needs. Through the open systems paradigm, society can truly develop, as this paradigm calls for humanisation and rehabilitation of a people's authenticity or authentic existence. This chapter, through the lenses of the open systems paradigm, reflects on current discourses and practices in the domain of development.
5.1. The Open Systems Paradigm

The metaphysical and epistemological accounts of the open systems paradigm take on the totality and the full range of relationships between humanity and the rest of the environment. This refers to fellow human beings, the physical environment that constitutes the resource base and the whole full range of relationships. On the epistemological pedestals, there is an evolution in train of the "new science research". This evolution is suggestive of a movement toward holism, toward understanding the system as a system and giving primary value to the relationships that exist among seemingly discreet parts (Wheatley, 1997: 8). The world as described by the new science of the open systems paradigm is changing our beliefs and perceptions in many areas, and not only in the natural sciences (Wheatley, 1997: 11). With these new ways of thinking and new ways of perceiving the world, society is beginning to see itself in new ways, as development in the open systems context is viewed as embracing all aspects of life (Burkey, 1993: 35). The concept of change, which lies at the heart of the open systems philosophies, is also viewed in its totality.

Integrated systems are emerging and challenging conventional research, which traditionally considered the populations being studied as a passive source of information. Conventional research regarded people being studied as incapable of analysing their own problems (Boterf, 1983: 168). In these circumstances, research is regarded as the exclusive province of specialists such as sociologists and economists, and that they alone are supposed to be capable of formulating the problems to be dealt with and finding a way to solve them. This has been a dominant thinking in the various closed systems paradigm's traditions. The open systems paradigm presents a challenge to the traditional social research methods. According to this paradigm, modernity's conceptual tools have been, and continue to fail humanity (Brauer, 2000: 25). The open systems paradigm presents a world that is changing, as change is the fundamental principle of this paradigm. The open systems paradigm's ontology tells us that both the physical and the social realities are changing. As a philosophy based on taking on the world in its totality, the open systems paradigm avers that, development,
as it did and continue to, in the past and current traditions, cannot ignore the role of
other variables, such as the quality of life in its totality (Sen, 2000: 13). The open
systems paradigm not only takes on the processes of change, but also on the whole of
reality in its totality.

The open systems paradigm is an exhortation to scholars and practitioners of
development to forge a new concept of development. Today various perspectives and
traditions call for a paradigm shift so that humanity is placed at the centre of social
change and development. Emerging issues in these observations are that, power lies at
the heart of the problems of poverty and development. The open systems paradigm is
also concerned with the location of power. Without power, those who are poor remain
vulnerable to an ongoing process of impoverishment (Attfield, 1991: 36). Orthodox
approaches in development tend to reinforce passivity and monopoly at the same time.
There is considerable evidence that democracy as well as political and civil rights can
help generate economic security, by giving voice to the deprived and the vulnerable
(Sen, 2000: 63). Any form of authoritarianism, as it is in much evidence in the closed
systems traditions, is not conducive to development. Political freedom is itself part of
development as freedom is itself a basic constituent of good living (Sen, 1999: 63).
Added to this observation is the notion that development is about widening of people’s
choices and options (Schuftan, 1998: 12). The reduction of political deprivation can help
diminish economic vulnerability, as in the open systems context, human advancement is
only possible when the people and their minds are free from the shackles of dogma.

We have crossed the threshold into the new millennium, but we still find ourselves with
old problems as the closed systems ideologies continue to inform our day-to-day
business of development. These ideologies continue to offer us absolute certainty as if
they have all the answers. The totalitarianism of the surviving socialist states and also
that of the market forces still maintain the character of unassailability (Brauer, 2000: 3).
They remain closed to contradictory evidence, and they tend to avoid tests on the
authenticity and the validity of their claims, through rigid adherence to the principles
traceable to "tradition". This translates into ordinary people taking on the character of
objects (Wilson, 1983: 185). This inevitably will lead to alienation, as alienation exists where there is inadequate freedom to enable people to develop and use their potential to help themselves live the lives of dignity (Ahlburg, 1994: 128). The fundamental flaw of the closed systems' developmental paradigm is that of rigidity amidst relativising and flexible open systems (Griesgraber and Gunter, 1996: xii).

The open systems paradigm presents in the social reality, an historic transformation that is now in progress. A transformation that continues to demand that there be a broadening of a people's existential life-world. These transformative processes are not only about the restoration of a people's life, but also about the creation of meaningful lives (Wheatley, 1997: 48). This transformation, in the open systems context, is affecting the international economic order, global politics, and potentially, human values so fundamentally that it can truly be said change is occurring in the structure of the world order. The power of people's movements is driving social change, and it has largely been ignored in the field of development discourse (Fitzgerald, MacLellan and Munslow, 1995: 13).

The open systems paradigm helps us to question and evaluate the most basic institutions and values of society, as each of the approaches to development presupposes some conception of progress, good development or other basic goals. These presuppositions, in linearistic ways of the closed systems principles determine the way and the parameters within which development has to occur (O'Neill, 1986: 460). If development is guided by the closed systems ways of thinking, it inevitably leads to several forms and types of deprivation. Multiple forms of deprivation, as evidence of poverty throughout the world shows, lead to destruction of lives, human dignity and economic potential (Belsey, 1992: 37). Poverty is characteristic of a system and it is a product of systemic, exploitative power relations between and within countries, traceable to the unequal distribution of knowledge and power (Jansen, 1991: 18).
5.2. Traditionalism

Today, even in the so-called "more-advanced" societies in the world, there are sectors and regions that remain wedded to traditional modes of operation, and people wedded to traditional ways of thinking (Stiglitz, 2000: 2). In the less advanced countries, conventionally referred to in development nomenclature as developing countries, these modes of operation and thinking predominate. This is testimony to the fact that even in the new millennium, we still sit with the forces of tradition in most communities of the world (Herzog, 1999:26). The traditional family, as a socio-economic unit, continually reproduces traditionalistic ideas which are found to be antithetical to development (Melsome-Richards, 1990: 102). Interestingly enough, these are the kinds of systems that some governments and even some organs of civil society will argue for their sustenance. The sustainable development paradigm, other than the conservation of the physical enviroment as a resource base, also talks of the sustenance of the local social and economic systems. It is established that in such societies, economic processes and development (if at all), move at a glacial pace as decreed and encouraged in the closed systems ideologies of linearism and gradualism. Some communities in KwaZulu-Natal complain that some traditional leaders rule them with an iron fist, and that these leaders have been ruling in tribal areas for a long time without any improvement in the standards of living of the rural communities (Diadla, 2000:13)

Characteristic of the traditional societies is the acceptance of the world as it is, as events in it are pre-determined by the supernatural forces (Toffler, 1990:397). Strict adherence to traditions is encouraged and sometimes even reinforced by religions. Beyond encouragement of adherence, an effort is also taken, mostly by guardians of traditional institutions, to rationalise why things have to be left as they are, in accordance with the closed systems principle of immutability, which is a negation of development (Kent, 1995:297). People are encouraged to see traditional institutions as reasonable, and therefore, they should not challenge such institutions, as these institutions are part of their "heritage".
An open systems reflection on the traditional socio-economic systems reveals that traditional social environments are not seen as promoting development (Melsome-Richards, 1990:102). This is particularly more so, with reference to the place of the notion of change in traditional environments as the principle of change lies at the heart of the open systems paradigm and it is also one of the principal principles of development. A further open systems take on traditionalism reveals that traditionalism tends to strip people of their subjective humanity, their pride, in "development" and dresses them up with anachronistic objective humanity (Nchabeleng, 1994: 6). It is this subjective humanity that people are stripped of, that the open systems paradigm with its attendant philosophies is endeavouring to restore.

There today is a continent-wide movement in Africa led by organs of civil society to challenge the archaic traditional practices of female genital mutilation, a traditional ritual in which women are circumcised, some of whom, against their will. This is usually accompanied by explanations such as; culture and tradition demand it so. The problem with these kinds of practices in traditional rituals is that they reinforce the anti-developmental experiences of alienation. People in these systems are manipulated at will and sometimes kept as prisoners of a worldview. Traditional systems tend to limit the overall development of society and the individual, as in practices of domestic slavery, local despoticisms within communities, and socio-economic limitations that beset contemporary African kingdoms and chiefdoms. One such kingdom is that of Swaziland, where the continual enforcement of adherence to tradition is stifling several efforts at development. With the over-romanticisation of tradition, goes the uncritical embrace of scientifically wanting world views (Nchabeleng, 1994:6).

Traditional systems easily dovetail with the closed systems principle of reversibility. In traditional systems, there is a tendency of pointing at the past for inspiration, in order to find meaning in and for the present. The open systems principles of irreversibility and the contemporaneous processes of futurisation negate this. Today's development processes are inspired by the future and by what can be achieved in the future. The past has ceased to provide a valid guide to new realities brought on by the ceaselessly
changing world. Old rules no longer apply as people at the grassroots level are affirming
themselves against the systems that tend to make them less human (Zwick, 1998:4).

Another manifestation of closed systems thinking in traditionalism is the practice of the
centralisation of control in socio-economic and political institutions. The elderly men are
regarded as the centre of all authority and decision-making processes. Added to this,
traditional societies are closed societies as they have little or no commerce with the
outside world, reminiscent of the closed systems principles of self and inner-
directedness (Etuk, 1982: 22). When societies are inflexible and refuse to have
commerce with the outside world, and can no longer respond to any form of challenge,
they atrophy and die. The open systems paradigm on the other end avers that, today, in
social reality, systems are such that, consonant with the principles of mutability, outer-
directedness and other-directedness, people are demanding change in their lives.
Further than that, whether decreed by the system or not, people are reaching out to
each other across the globe. Some of the people engaged in such processes also
happen to come from the very same restrictive traditional systems that are averse to
change and social intercourse with other communities. As people catch on the drift of all
the forces of change that are sweeping across the globe, people are likely to embrace
the changes that are heralded by the prevailing socio-economic forces, more especially
if such changes are going to make a difference in their lives. As people begin to affiliate
to the emerging systems in the emergent socio-economic realities, traditional societies
will inevitably be weakened. Some traditional leaders in South Africa are complaining
about the way the democratisation process is weakening and diminishing their powers.
All human societies have had traditional institutions at one stage or another, but with the
advance of democracy, these old institutions are fading away (Dladla, 2000:14).

Corrupt headmen in Eastern Shandong in China are harassing development workers
and even disrupting development initiatives, as they are regarded as a threat and a
contributory factor to the weakening of their hegemony (Bezruchka, 2001:10). With the
growth of the democratisation processes, some traditional leaders think that they are
losing their handle on their constituencies and resources, over which they used to have control.

Open systems realities, as captured by the open systems philosophies, principles and processes are forcing society to, as a matter of fact, steer away from romanticising a past which also contains retrogressive aspects that tend to retard development efforts (Tindifa, 1998: 204). Local values, cultures and procedures are not fixed and immutable (Dichter, 1987: 17). There today is much talk about the African Renaissance in South Africa and several parts of the African continent. But then, communities require more than simply sustaining and reviving old institutions or tradition. The open systems realities as captured in the open systems philosophies, are demanding that at the end of it all, there must be a transformation of these institutions, so that empowered societies are delivered from the shackles of the dogmas of tradition.

5.3 Medievalism

Human history tells us that in the medieval era, the world’s strongest religions dominated almost all aspects of life. The world’s and human destinies were reflected upon in ecclesiastical and scriptural terms. Physical and social realities were conceived of as having been pre-ordained pre-destined by an omnipotent and omnipresent deity. A question might be asked, as to the relevance of all this to the studies in development. The answer will come in the form of a reminder that governments are by themselves development agencies. They have authority over the utilisation of resources that are often used to bring about and facilitate development. The development visions of some of these governments are informed by some historic traditions, some of which are traceable to the medieval period. Today we have Christian, Islamic, Judaic, Hindi and all other types of governments that owe their being to an ecclesiastical tradition of some sort. Their religious character has a bearing on the way development has to go (Toffler, 1990: 379).
Some organs of civil society that are found to be active in some parts of the world, in the world of development, also trace their origins and influence from some of the above-mentioned ecclesiastical institutions and cultures. The majority of some of the non-governmental organisations and the community-based organizations were formed in the churches, with a view to easing the plight of the blighted lives of the poor and challenging the injustices that continue to make development difficult to realise. In this context, scriptural and ecclesiastical considerations continue to influence and inform the course of development from a multiplicity of dimensions (Burbridge, 1997: 3).

The Islamic theory of the state for instance is almost exclusively a normative theory. The most central point in this normative theory is that all exercise of power ultimately has to be justified with reference to the will and precepts of Allah. This basic principle of divine sovereignty is interpreted and adapted in many different ways in the Islamic world (Martinussen, 1997: 190). In this line of thinking we come across closed systems ideologies of linearism and authoritarianism. Immediately people are expected to live under authoritarian rule, there is no way we can have development. Amartya Sen has always been emphatic on the point that development is freedom (Sen, 2000:63). In the Islamic systems, all rules and precepts for both religious and social life are given in the Koran and in the narratives of the actions and words of the prophet Mohammed. All that is left to contemporary rulers is to interpret the so-given rules and precepts. This interpretation is expected to be undertaken by an autocratic ruler with assistance and guidance from the religious scholars. This gives no room to the elected representatives of society in governance structures (Martinussen, 1997:191). Religious scholars will ensure that the modern laws and political decisions are in agreement with Islam. Even today, they are found to be exerting a lot of influence on political life in many countries with Muslim majorities.

In Afghanistan, the Taliban militarit, in observance of the Koranic scriptures, is visiting upon the ordinary people, highly totalitarian decrees. People in the ninety percent of the country that is under the control of the Taliban, live under a totalitarian and despotic regime. Women are by virtue of the scriptural decrees, not allowed to participate in
politics and also in social institutions like education. Today in Afghanistan no woman is allowed to enter a university system. Teaching in the universities too is expected to have a heavy bias toward Islamic theology (Mayson, 2000:29). The Taliban militia has drawn a blanket of dull and dreary conformity over Afghanistan (Chanda, 2001: 13). How possible is it to talk about development in this kind of an environment? The environment is found to be totally forbidding for development, as it is replete with all forms of the closed systems ideologies.

The Saddam Hussein's totalitarianism in Iraq functions in such a way those ancient Islamic codes are made into the law of the land. Political dissent is swiftly and brutally crushed. Criticism of the establishment is proscribed and as such any form of it results in punishment. In some cases punishment takes the form of amputations, as in the cases of the people who had their tongues cut out so that they no longer have a chance of criticising the government again (Anderson, 2000:78). The people of Iraq continue to live under such repressive conditions and the unending sanctions-induced poverty. The open systems paradigm on the other end argues that, political freedom is itself part of development. Development, if it is to be meaningful, should not ignore the dimension of freedom and the joy of life as some of the variables of the open systems paradigm. Under the totalitarian systems and regimes, the issue of the joy of life is out of the question (Kotze, 1998:12). The open systems paradigm's brief on the social terraces is to salvage people from these kinds of conditions. Through the processes of change, the open systems paradigm calls for engagement in the retotalisation of the lives of a people whose lives are detotalised and dismembered by the repressive systems.

The recent past apartheid governments in South Africa justified their existence and practices on religious grounds. The church establishment socialized the Afrikaner community into the values reminiscent of Calvinism, and in the process, building traditions of closed systems ways of thinking. This linearistic way continues to influence some sections of this community in their lamentation of the recent past. In any case, these are the people who were groomed into the "separate development" culture that influenced their outlook on the world (Mayson, 2000:29). With the hope of its
reinstatement, they are re-grouping on the tiny enclave of Orania in the Northern Cape Province and continuing with their closed systems tradition of separate development with its related narrowly defined identities. There are, after all, other members of the same community who, in the spirit of other-directedness, are transcending the worldview that once held them captive, and are linking up with other communities outside their own, in engaging the development challenges.

5.4. Modernity

The onset of modernity in human history heralded very important developments in terms of people beginning to understand the world they live in better. The scientific and intellectual revolutions that came with modernity helped to demythologise the claims to finality that usually go with the ancient and medieval traditions. The wave of the Newtonian science and metaphysics took to the centre stage in the cathedral of knowledge search and production. This development marked the unfolding of the modern world that was characterized by scientific, technological, economic, social, educational, and all other forms of progression (de Kock, 1995:8). This triggered a movement away from the age of faith into the age of reason.

The scientific discoveries of the first half of the seventeenth century undermined traditional explanations of the workings of the universe, as was spearheaded by Isaac Newton (Borowski, 1995:418). This kind of thinking also revolutionised human life and subsequently led to serious political consequences. This contribution helped liberate humankind from its reliance on superstition and ignorance, and encouraged people to reason, inquire and discover. When certain physical problems were solved through the use of reason, people began to have confidence and the belief that human reason could be successfully applied to any problem (Baradat, 1979: xii). Modernity is regarded as a process of change towards those types of social, economic, and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America. This is articulated in the Modernisation theory of development in the postulate that, the acceptance of the modern normative values is extremely significant as a foundation for launching new
kinds of economic initiatives. The spirit of this tradition caught on into the socio-
economic and political systems of liberalism, capitalism, modernisation, and the later
days' neo-liberalism (Gilpin, 2001: 104).

5.4.1. Neo-Liberalism

Throughout the liberal/neo-liberal philosophy's history, the concept of development is
identified and equated with economic growth that is supported by technological growth
that would help maximise profits. The liberal and the neo-liberal socio-economic and
political systems undoubtedly came with commendable achievements for the
improvements on the human situation (Crocker, 1991: 467). The revolutions that
heralded modernity brought with them democratic traditions that in several ways
contributed to development, in that, through these traditions, spaces were created for
people to affirm their being and needs for improvements in their lives. This gave
credence to the virtues of the principle of inner-directedness and its attendant ideology
of individualism in development. To the liberals this was the arrival of the "open
systems" ways of thinking and of doing things.

Democratic forms of governments were established in several countries of the North
and they continue to sustain democratic traditions. For the world of development, from a
neo-liberal point of view, such neo-liberal and democratic forms of dispensation are
playing a facilitative role in development, in that, they are allowing spaces for
development processes. In the modernisation theory of development, the neo-liberal
forms of political dispensation were recommended as pre-requisites for development in
the developing countries of the South (Schuftan, 1998: 36). For development processes
to be successful, the democratic institutions that accompany the modernisation process
will inevitably have to contribute in the weakening of the traditional political institutions
(Coetzee, 1996: 27). Traditional political institutions are seen as a stumbling block and an
impediment to development. Democratic dispensations are in the neo-liberal schools of
thought regarded as necessary conditions for development, more especially with the
"freedoms" that come with them (Webster, 1990: 49). Western neo-liberal democracies
did not only grow in strength within the developed countries. Their transboundary
development led to the emergence of transnational and international institutions that
came to influence development trends in the world. This is with reference to the
development financing Bretton Woods Institutions and their sister organisations.

The developing countries in the South and now of late the east European countries,
during their struggles for independence and at the close of these struggles, adopted the
Marxist-inspired socialist systems for the new post-colonial governments that they
subsequently set-up. With the sudden demise of the socialist regimes, they too, are also
beginning to embrace the neo-liberal systems for socio-economic and political
development in their respective countries. This development entails in more ways than
one the globalisation of the neo-liberal philosophy as it began to expand to the other
parts of the world. The one-time fire-spitting radicals of the extreme left are today
articulating the socio-economic imperatives of the neo-liberal tradition (Smith, 1996:83).

In the local, the national and the international political systems, the neo-liberal elites are
found to be powerful, particularly when it comes to the exercise of control on and or
over the resources. The neo-liberal capitalist elites, wherever they arrive, they make
inroads into the strategic territories and positions of power in relation to their interests.
The well off in this kind of system usually tend to first protect their interests and then
improve themselves, exactly in line with the spirit of the closed systems ideology of
individualism. They are less likely to press for improvements that would benefit the rest
of the members of society (Chetty, 1999:8).

Today's neo-liberalism is in several respects ideologically conservative and thus
implicitly ruling out the need for revolutionary change in the processes of “development”.
The conservatives' concept of change is “controlled change”, whilst the open systems
concept of change has to do with the processes of transformation. The neo-liberals will
in most instances give leadership in terms of charting the paths to modernity and
“development” to ensure that there is no digression from the “original and main forms of
liberal thinking” in the mould of the closed systems ideology of linearism
(Smith, 1996:84).
Inevitably, in the neo-liberal dispensations, the neo-liberal elites will exercise control over society through control of and the ownership of the means of production. This leads to the concentration of power in the hands of the elites and to some extent impotence and apathy on the part of the people from the lower rungs of the social ladder (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:430). With the capitalistic classes using the state machinery to their advantage, in the closed systems principle of inner-directedness way, there will always be centralisation of control. As a consequence of this centralisation, social groups on the fringes of "exclusion" remain with nothing but increasing marginalisation and immiseration. In this way capitalism gets to benefit those in the core and central areas of the system and those allied to them, whereas for those on the periphery, there will be misery and the absence of development (Galli, 1992:3).

Western countries are found to be supporting and collaborating with some of the world's oppressive regimes as in Chile, Nicaragua and Israel. The United States of America is clear on its position that it would not tolerate regimes that were uncooperative with its interests (Ekins, 1992:12). Authoritarian regimes in Africa are still locked and engaged in a tussle with the forces of change, trying to defend the interests of capital and corporate dominance (Anyang' Nyong'o, 2001:16).

In the hands of the powerful, development becomes a tool of marginalisation and disempowerment (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997: xi). In the neo-liberal capitalistic systems, there is no niche for the poor and the excluded. Development and democracy in such systems have come to mean impoverishment and disempowerment (Cooper, 1993:16). With the increase in overall opulence in such systems, there is equally a denial of the elementary freedoms to the vast numbers of people as they remain subjected to economic poverty, which robs people of their freedom to satisfy their needs (Sen, 2000:4). Society subsequently takes on the character of domination, subordination, greater poverty and to some extent ignorance (Nielsen, 1992:32). Hundreds of millions of people are unable to escape poverty and hunger as a result of such control-oriented and restrictive closed systems, particularly with the absence of
freedom in these systems that are informed by the principles of "control" (O’Neill, 1986:1).

The elites of the South have now joined forces with the elites of the North, to reap the benefits of all the free-market treaties (Gorostiaga, 1995:12). There is an increasing concentration of control over resources in the hands of fewer and fewer elites in the world, as more and more people are being pushed to the periphery (Nielsen, 1992:45). There is still the colonial mentality of the developed countries, in keeping with the closed systems ideology of linearism, as they keep on telling the rest of the world’s countries what to do in the name of development (Stiglitz, 2000:26). This in the open systems context is out of tune with where we ought to be in terms of “development”. According to Stiglitz (2000), this is not the way people should treat each other and not the way to get effective development. The open systems paradigm is about the equalisation of relationships and the flattening of hierarchies, that often times promoted the domination of other people in society by others.

With the capitalist countries of the North leading the neo-liberal crusade toward development, the agenda is still being driven by the developed countries and not by the rest of the world’s states on equal terms. Many African countries continue to chafe at the conditions the financial institutions impose on their governments in order to receive debt relief or development assistance (Harsch, 2001:10). There is no room for multiple perspectives to inform the content and character of the institutions that are leading the processes. The American led capitalism is drowning out the alternative messages that are being communicated through demonstrations at Davos (McAllister, 2001:32). The United States of America continues to reign as the world’s dominant economic, military and cultural force. The United States of America has become what commentators in development and other states have come to refer to as the “policeman” of international politics and economics. Across the world, the United States of America is found to be involved in either subtle or open politics, and as such nothing gets done unless the USA assumes a leading role (Mkhondo, 1999:9). The powerful metropolitan centres of the world, primarily the Western nations, have the monopoly on political, economic, and
in institutional resources in relation to their Third World counterparts, whom they also dominate. The powerful nations are currently consolidating their grip on the global economy, manifesting the hallmarks of closed systems thinking (Gilpin, 2001: 3).

The "Washington Consensus", the concept based on the neo-liberal beliefs of macroeconomic stability, through minimisation of the role of government, and the liberalisation of the markets, as the main pre-condition for growth, is also embraced by the leading capitalist states (Jakobeit, 1999: 4). Neo-liberalism is fundamentally in agreement with the imperatives of a total market for the facilitation of "development". This is the kind of thinking that is also guiding the World Bank. The hegemony of the neo-liberal elites is also manifesting itself in these institutions, as in many cases, the World Bank also has the power of definition and interpretation of what could be regarded as constituting "development". It is argued in this perspective that once the government steps out of the way, the markets by themselves would lead to efficient resource allocation.

This neo-classical economics approach ignores the ownership of the means of production and the power that this ownership confers. Rich nations are functioning as instruments for gigantic capitalist enterprises. They are dominating and exploiting the developing countries, using their resources and markets on unfair terms (Nielsen, 1992:26). This is in part one of the ways in which the free market forces would define what they regard as constituting the concept of freedom in development. From the afore-mentioned observations, we get to realise that under the neo-liberal institutions and systems, there are forms of injustice that are leading to social disintegration, and an increasing divide between the rich and the poor. The market imperatives and their decrees, instead of leading to development, they continue to ruin the lives of the ordinary people. This is with reference to what has been referred to as alienation, in the open systems’ descriptions of the lives of a people under the closed systems, wherein people are only seen as secondary to the profits that have to be made (O'Leary, 1995:270). The reduction of people to the status of objects is seen as a closed systems way of facilitating "development" through people and not for the people. The open
systems paradigm on the other end through the philosophies of phenomenology and existentialism, conceive of people as total subjects and whose subjectivity and humanity, in the name of development, have got to be both recognised and sustained.

Within the framework of the neo-liberal developmental paradigm, the global economy is being adjusted at the expense of the world’s poor people (Jordan, 1996:76). The powerful forces in the world’s social and economic systems keep on modelling systems in such a way that they will always emerge as beneficiaries as the closed systems’ principle of self-directedness would point out. It is only they themselves who count and not the other people. Mankind’s predicament is found to be rooted primarily in economic and social structures out of which only the better-off benefit. There is “development”, but the majority of the world’s people continue to suffer (Nchabeleng, 1994:16). The world continues to observe the arrival or onset of a global village with inequalities, instability and extraordinary fragility (Gorostiaga, 1995:9). This is not only in relation to the North-South dichotomy or only within the countries of the South.

The closed systems’ injustices and inequalities in the neo-liberal domain manifest themselves even at the very heartland of capitalism, the United States of America. The numbers of the casualties of the neo-liberal systems are also growing in America. There are a growing number of the homeless people, as the number of the affluent decreases. The USA is becoming a parallel universe of the fortunate ones who are reaping the rewards of the system and the growing numbers of those who are being edged to the margins. There are hundreds of thousands of little nomads in America, sleeping in the back of cars, on floors in welfare offices or in shelters. The affluent component of society does not want to hear about these refugees from the ruin of the American dream (Quindlen, 2001:80). This is yet another manifestation of the closed systems principle of self-directedness. The selfish people distancing themselves from the poor who are not in the condition they find themselves in out of their own volition. This parallel type of existence is out of keeping with the open systems’ social reality of the restitution and retotalisation efforts and processes of people making an effort to reach out to one another.
The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank on the other hand are not democratic organisations, as attested to by the several protestations by the excluded players, who are registering their displeasure at the way these institutions are being run. These institutions are also manifesting patterns of authoritarianism of some kind in the process of trying to give assistance to the development processes for the needy. Such authoritarian tendencies entail the absence of freedom for those who are endeavouring to reach the portals of power and control over the development institutions and resources. Genuine development occurs when people have power over the processes that are meant to salvage them from several forms of deprivation and disadvantage. Nations of the South have undergone changes that are premised on the need to reorganise conditions under which capitalism can maximise its profits (Dithake, 2001:16).

Until today, some people and states do not have equal access to the World Bank's money despite the open systems processes of democratisation and equalization that are demonstrated the world over for justice in development. There is a growing resistance to the dominant paradigms as the distance between the rich and the poor is being severely questioned (Jansen, 1991:30). The development landscape is being transformed, and presenting policymakers with new challenges at both the global and the local levels. There are now many powerful players and forces that are shaping the development landscape.

In the open systems context, development represents a transformation of society for the extension of life spans and the enrichment of the lives of individuals by widening their horizons and reducing their sense of isolation. The open systems processes of exteriorisation and interpersonalisation are aimed at the reduction of this sense of isolation and encouragement of people working together, as people are already developing transnational affiliations and are able to operate internationally (Bradlow and Grossman, 1996:32). For the facilitation of these processes of joining forces with others to tackle the development-related problems, there must be interaction in the local
spaces and at the same time, encouragement of greater autonomy in the emerging social movements.

Capitalism with its in-built unlimited competition drive generates its own particular brand of poverty, generically different from poverties experienced in any previous period (Carmen and Sobrado, 2000:2). Low-income countries are being marginalised increasingly from the global economy, under the guise of free trade and open markets (Ditlhake, 2001:16). If unchallenged, a capitalist-dominated growth and accumulation process will accentuate inequality and all other related forms of deprivation that would usually lead to the relegation of the lives of the marginalised people to the state of objectness. A market economy by itself cannot drive the kind of development programmes needed to overcome the massive inequalities in society (Nzimande, 2000:8). The super-rich are currently cocooned in their sumptuous living spaces, and they are in a closed systems way hermetically sealed off from others.

This is in keeping with the closed system principles of inner and self-directedness, as it is only the self (person and system) and not the others that matter. This can best be described by way of comparing this type of life with the metaphysical monads of Leibniz of the closed systems philosophy of monadology. The Leibnizian monads are the non-communicating physical entities that have "no windows or doors through which something can get in or go out". These monads cannot be directly influenced from the external world and they exist independently from each other without any relationships.

Each monad has its own internal purpose, perfectly self-determined and reflects the state of the system (Stumpf, 1988: 110). For the human condition, this is the definition of the functioning of the closed systems ideology of individualism. In these kinds of systems, people are living as islands of affluence located in the broader oceans of poverty and deprivation. The individualism and self-centeredness of leaders like Mobutu Se Seseko of former Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of Congo, left the country in ruins, after amassing the country's wealth for self interest at the expense of the many in misery (Robinson, 2001: 41). We continue to live with these systems in our day-to-day
existence. Carmen and Sobrado in the text "The Future for the Excluded" (2000), describe this scenario in a chapter called "Those who don’t eat and Those who don’t sleep". Those who live the lives of the "Included" are those who are well off and have all the resources they need to live the lives of dignity and affluence, whereas the "Excluded" are those who are marginalised by the system. The two groups are living in their own worlds and are they incapable of sharing in the world’s resources. The excluded rise up to affirm their own being in their quest for the lives of dignity, and the included become unsettled as they are not used to the cultures of having to share with others, and then begin to defend their own benefits. These parallel existences are also characterized by death, with the deprived dying because of the diseases of poverty and the included dying of the diseases of opulence.

The high rate of death in the United States of America is traceable to the diseases of over-eating, as in cardiac conditions, whereas their counterparts in the South die of ailments like tuberculosis, which is on most occasions aggravated by malnourishment. These are the ironies of the lives of a people living in the free market and democratic systems of the world (Bezruchka, 2001:85). This brings us to the point that the closed systems by themselves lead to what is normally referred to as autolysis, that is, a system digesting itself out of existence. The so-called “successful economies” are already accountable for the deaths of tens of millions of people around the globe through increase in deprivation (Schuftan, 1995:24). The Bretton Woods Institutions are currently forcing poor countries to cut social spending, while in the same process exacerbating the already blighted lives of the poor (Ratnesh, 2001: 35). These institutions continue to represent the interests of the rich and powerful nations, and creating a favourable environment for plundering the valuable resources of the poor countries (Dithake, 2001: 16). With the lack of transparency in these institutions that support the turbo-charged capitalism, the poor are left helpless and vulnerable to the whims of the market forces. Poverty in Brazil remains severe despite the "commendable" economic growth rates. The globalisation\(^2\) process has now

\(^2\) A process that goes further than either transnationalisation or internationalisation of capital. It is a much more profound reorganisation of trade and services within a globally encompassing system.
strengthened the domination of the richer countries over the poorer ones. The private sector is becoming the dominant actor in the economy with the poor being the losers. The closed systems principle of verticality is easily illustrated by this evolution, as the powerful forces consolidate their hold onto power, showing insensitivity to the forces of horizontality from below as manifest in the democratisation movements (Lacayo, 1999: 30).

The neo-liberal models are charting pre-ordained and linearistic pathways toward development. Any form of change or development is expected to be in keeping with the spirit of the neo-liberal traditions. Through linearism as an ideology of the closed systems, various socialisation mechanisms are utilised to guarantee continuity. The eyes of the affluent are usually turned away from the moral enormity of world poverty and hunger and from the tragedy of the suffering they engender (Belsey, 1996:46). At the intellectual level, there is a deliberate tendency to always keep the definition of poverty as narrow as possible. This narrow analysis of poverty mostly entails resistance to the broadening of the definition of poverty, and simply settling for the uncomplicated approaches of simply predicting trends and counting the poor (Sen, 2000:62). In this way, neo-liberalism ensures that people remain resolutely blinded to the destructive consequences of its present path. Contrary to the conceptual narrowing of definitions in closed systems thinking, the open systems paradigm is about more and more openness to multiple perspectives in intellectual and conceptual dialogues. The route to knowledge growth is seen as through letting thousands of schools of thought to contend for more clarity to prevail rather than remain married to absolute truth regimes.

Authoritarianism is evidently one of the main closed systems ideologies that significantly pervade the neo-liberal socio-economic and political fabric, given the ironies that are inherent within the neo-liberal systems. Traditionally democracy is regarded as a means of the distribution of power, but in several neo-liberal and "democratic" systems, it has become an instrument of securing power (Walden, 1999:64). A brief look on the shoulder into history reveals that even the most authoritarian systems like the Nazi regime, were results of the "democratic" processes. Hitler came to power through
democratic means, before he began to precipitate the worst forms of government systems in human history. Today, leading nations, through “democratic” means, are dictating terms for the direction of “development”. The resurgent so-called neo-liberal democracies in places like Uganda are translating into a rebirth of the discredited authoritarian regimes of the past (Anyang’ Nyong’o, 2001:17). This alludes to and gives credence to the claim that there is a hole in the heart of democracy.

The powerful nations of the North have demonstrated their penchant for authoritarianism in the 1980’s through the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They invested their trust for quasi-authoritarian governments, as they deemed them more capable of applying structural adjustment policies, because of their ability to withstand social pressures (Giulhot, 2000:35). This is evidence of minimal commitment by neo-liberal systems toward even distribution of social power between groups. This observation captures a combination of closed systems ideologies such as authoritarianism and centralism. In neo-liberal systems, power is centralised through either the overt or the covert methods, in the hands of the elites.

The neo-liberal systems are generally grounded in the values of modernity, which conceives of traditional values as a hindrance to development. But the modern industrial society itself is found to be still essentially a traditional society, more especially in its basic social relationships of production (Drucker, 1994:64). These traditional relationships have been preserved for several years. In the neo-liberal social relationships of production, people are not encouraged to question their own exploitation, and yet traditionalism itself is an ideology of the closed systems paradigm. This ideology does not much encourage that there be changes in society, and yet development is about change. Any form of change must be a guarded one, so that people do not start “thinking dangerously” about the system.

Neo-liberal systems remain exploitative for the vast majority of people in the world, with their pro-market policies that have resulted in all the ills that have come to characterise the system. Contemporaneous with the celebrated “growth” and “development” in the
capitalistic countries, there is an equally matched growth of the severity of poverty. Out of these closed systems, we are having a growing number of people who have been alienated by the system as they find themselves at the peripheries. The open systems paradigm is about the restoration of the lives of the people who, as casualties of such systems, have come to live the lives of alienation and deprivation. The open systems paradigm, with its philosophies, principles and ideologies, is about the salvation and restoration of humanity in the lives such of people.

5.4.2. Neo-Marxism

Further to the metaphysical, historical and socio-economic factors related to the Marxian traditions and philosophy, there are the additional contributions by the Marxian disciples in the post-Marx era. These are to the effect that, the free market capitalist system is not the sole alternative for humanity’s improved living conditions (Melsome-Richards, 1990:117). Marxism’s objective is regarded as being to provide solutions to concrete problems that beset society. According to today’s neo-Marxists, development can only take place under the leadership and guidance of the working class in particular and the poor people in general (Ncqakula, 1998:10). Development will be achieved through thoroughgoing revolutionary transformation programmes that would also lead toward the transformation of the power of the market forces. The struggles in Seattle, Prague, Genoa and many localities in the developing world by ordinary people are a reflection of a renewed human effort towards alternative systems that are better able to meet the aspirations of ordinary working and poor people (Nzimande, 2001:22).

Neo-Marxism continues to serve as a Marxian forecast of the role of social relations in social, economic and political functioning of systems (Melsome-Richards, 1990:117). Prior to the forecasts, the various Marxian schools reflect on the history and the current impact of the market forces on the powerless people. They all get to the conclusion that the market reflects decades of exploitation and oppression. Capitalist globalisation is regarded as leading to job losses and increasing poverty for people in developing countries (Nzimande, 2001:22). The one way of transcending the impediments toward
development is through taking the main means of production away from the capitalists and transferring them to public ownership (Kader, 1985:56). Added to this, there must be an advancement of the struggle for socialism in order to counter neo-liberal ideologies. By so doing, humanity will be able to deliver a society free of exploitation and a society that will be able to meet the social needs of the majority of the populations on a sustainable basis.

The Marxist philosophy and its attendant socio-economic and political theories will guide all of these processes. But just like the preceding grand-narratives of modernity, the Marxian accounts are equally replete with the closed systems principles and ideologies. In the Marxist-Leninist circles, there is a confession to the effect that society will for a considerable period of time be subjected to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletarian dictatorships we did have, that spanned decades, and with their resultant social degradation and humanity’s undoing. It is in the Marxist dictatorships that people were reduced to the state of objects, and always put to the service of the state, rather than the state serving them (Etzioni-Halevy, 1987:42).

The recent past examples are those of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and its satellite states in Eastern Europe and to its south in Asia. Socialist or Marxist states were so much of closed systems that information and knowledge gathering, and even its transmission, had to be supervised, controlled and determined by the state or the Communist Party elites. This was meant to guard against the “infectious” and “moribund” influences of the bourgeois forms of thinking. The political economy dynamics of knowledge production were the sole preserve of the ruling party (Toffler, 1990:415). True to the character of closed systems thinking, as in the principle of inner-directedness, Marxist or Socialist systems are found to be insulated, even in knowledge production and distribution terms, against the alternative messages from the other perspectives. In relation to the position of the other, the other is seen as a potential fellow traveller toward an internationalist socialist order. This means that the “other” is looked at in colonial terms, as the other must be “colonised” or “proletarianised” en route to a classless order.
Knowledge content in the universities and education systems was structured in such a way that it would, in a normative way, push and sustain the "party line". Knowledge was then used as an instrument for political "education" of the masses on the virtues of socialism. A rigid analysis and a deliberate turning of the blind eye to the excesses of the authoritarianism of the Socialist states, inevitably accompanied this tradition. The other perspectives and opinions were regarded as "reactionary" and therefore unnecessary (Chazan, Mortimer, Raubenhill and Rothchild, 1988:18), as those who are in command "know" what others should know. In the tradition of the closed systems ideologies of determinism and linearism, people are guided by a "revolutionary theory", so that there can be a revolutionary movement, moving along party lines. All activities are placed at the service of a master plan for society, by the party's decree. With knowledge having been made part of the state machine, this tradition meant a repression of artistic and intellectual freedom, so that alternative thinking is contained. Ironically, this practice is oblivious to the Marxian contention that "man makes his own history", meaning that, human beings are capable of choice and autonomy if given a chance (Eatwell and Anthony, 1993:119). Reflected upon from the open systems philosophies' point of view, people by their very nature are not passive tools of some irresistible dialectic. They are capable of transcending experiences of nullification and alienation and can bring about existential enlargement (improvement in the quality and being) in their own lives.

Another example of a closed systems socialist regime is that of China. Even today, China remains a closed mysterious political system run by a powerful elite, and it is revealing little about itself (Zakaria, 2001:29). But being that as it may, the Chinese internet revolution is causing a dilemma for the Communist Party, which is torn between trying to spearhead online developments and trying to slow them down as well. The Chinese government is trying to monitor all Internet transactions, in consort with the closed systems ideology of linearism, to ensure that there is no digression from the "mainstream thinking". In the past technology could be used as an instrument of control and oppression. Today, people with dissenting views and alternative messages also
have access to online conversations with the rest of the world. Technology is also found to be of service to the open systems paradigm, particularly when read in the context of the principles of outer and other-directedness. Through technology people are able to communicate with other people elsewhere in the world without difficulty. It is no longer easy for governments to control and contain information and knowledge systems (Gittings, 2000:18), more especially with the existence of independent sites.

Instead of having the transitional dictatorship of the proletariat in Vietnam, we are having entrenched communist elites, who as rulers are above the people, and their form of authority takes the vertical shape. As a result of their authoritarian rule, people have become subjects without a voice. It is only the party that has exclusive power and absolute authority over the resources and also over the lives of people. The communists generally believe in a stronger state in order to facilitate “development” and “distribution of resources” among the people. But this has taken the form of massive bureaucracies as we still do have in Cuba, Vietnam and China. Tight centralisation of authority entails the loss of freedom, and so long as people are deprived of freedom, all processes geared at development are futile (Sen, 2000:3). People in North Korea continue to live the life of adversity as in the glaring inequalities, repression, and human rights abuses. People are encouraged to keep quite about what they see and as such expected to cooperate in their own oppression. These are the rigidities and the hopelessness of life in some of the surviving socialist states (MacIntyre, 2001:30), demonstrative of a shadowy world of labour camps and a nation in shackles of arbitrary arrests. These images once again reveal combinations of closed systems ideologies like authoritarianism and linearism administered on the ordinary people. People cannot be “dragged screaming and kicking” to the improvements in their lives and well being. People can only savour benefits of development in an enabling environment of freedom.

Some people in Russia are still nostalgic about the socialistic system of the recent past years, as compared to the far worse off life under the market forces. The Russian Duma on the other hand is still communist dominated and functions in the mould of the “Soviet tradition”, as Russian repression and self-censorship are setting in once again under the
current president, Vladimir Putin. The Russian legislature has become a quieter place since Putin was elected, given his Soviet secret service background and subtle authoritarian methods (Quinn-Judge, 2001:21). When he searches for innovations to bolster development initiatives, he tends to look backwards, to a mix of past Soviet systems. The closed systems principles and ideologies observed in these kinds of practices are those of authoritarianism, linearism and reversibility. Putin’s dictatorial methods are inspired by his allegiance to the past Soviet systems. Russia today has become an idealised blend of paternal authoritarianism and diluted democracy, as people are getting used to criticising in moderation (Quinn-Judge, 2001:21).

Besides the presence of the Marxist socialists in some of the governments in the world, there are the communist and socialist parties outside of government that continue to campaign for socialist dispensations. The communist party is still alive in Russia, South Africa, several countries in Latin America, and almost all countries of the world. These parties are campaigning for the nationalisation of finance and industry. Despite evidence to the contrary, they still regard public ownership of the means of production as “progressive” (Toffler, 1990:418). They are aiming at advancing the struggle of socialism in order to counter the neo-liberal ideologies, as they continue to nurture the dream of a classless socialist society (Nzimande, 2000:57). The governing principle of the internal processes within these organisations takes the form of democratic centralism, where the party leadership makes all the decisions. This once again is another form of displaying the closed systems ideology of the centralisation of authority that entails the disempowerment of those at the peripheries of the hierarchy and the power circles.

Beyond the traditional pro-Soviet regimes and the extra-parliamentary organizations, there is also a groundswell movement for people-centred social justice. The emergence and growth of this movement is generating a momentum that amounts to the left’s best hope. It is a reinvention of the left that involves new formations in place of the traditional communist parties and left wing governments. It draws on a network of strategic affiliations among a wide range of new social forces and sub-cultural activities including
environmental groups, gay and lesbian activists, feminists, community based organisations, non-mainstream media and alternative education groups. This new activism includes historically oppressed racial groups, women, the self-employed and the informal sector. What usually brings them together is their stance against neo-liberal dogma of governments, big business and mainstream media, which preaches that there are no alternatives to the supremacy of the market forces (Daniels and MacFarlane, 2001:32).

With their impulse for self-preservation, these too, have closed systems ways of thinking as dictated by their sectarian interests. If not adhering to the donors’ interests, they are engaged in efforts to out-compete their competitors for funding. This is a manifestation of the closed systems principle of self-directedness.

All in all, there are people who are still pinning their hopes on the socialist futures, more especially after the global market failures at dealing with the growing poverty in both the developed and the developing countries (Kappel, 1998:21). The poor people of the former socialist countries feel that life was better off than what they have to endure under the capitalistic systems that are also entering crisis situations of their own.

5.5. **Sustainability**

The sustainability concerns in development, particularly on the impact of development on the environment are important. For humankind to have development, mankind needs the physical environment to provide the needs to satisfy basic human needs. It is true that humanity cannot survive without the physical environment, but the environment on its own can survive without humanity. The philosophy of sustainable development borrows freely from the science of environmental economics in several major respects (Pearce, Markandya and Barbier, no date: 1). The well-known definition of sustainable development that goes by the phrase; “meeting the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. In contemporary interpretations, it has come to mean whatever suits the particular
advocacy of the individual or group concerned. This subsequently makes this paradigm, vulnerable to closed systems interpretations to serve the interests of whoever would want to make a case for his or her perspective.

Massive industrialisation and technological development did increase the rate of development and the utilisation of the resources. Increased industrialisation is continuously alienating people from their environments (Swanepoel and de Beer, 1997:28). With the degradation of the environment, social and economic development can easily be undermined. With the constant erosion of the resource base, the economy is bound to suffer as it mainly depends on the environment. As a consequence of this, people's standards of life are going to be affected as they also do depend on the economy to improve the standards of their lives. Most companies in the corporate sector have established environmental management departments, in response to the complaints by the environmental activists' concerns about the impact of their activities on the environment. This they are doing without fail because in the same process, the interests of capital are also taken care of. They are still going to come back and make profit out of the same resources. At another level, sustainable development implies self-reliant and cost-effective development, facilitating access to health, shelter, clean water and food. The socio-political dimensions of this paradigm are of the view that sustainable development must also entail the sustenance of the local communities' social and cultural systems, and the local ecologies as well (Korten, 1991:29).

There has been contrasting discourses about sustainable development. The one perspective is that of the anthropocentric approach, which loads the dice heavily in favour of human beings. This perspective envisions sustainable development that would lead to the improvement in the quality of human life, through the eradication of poverty and justice in the distribution of the world's resources. Within this perspective a political and ideological battle exists between different conceptions of sustainable development, depending on which position is adopted. This is where the notion of sustainable development becomes vulnerable to closed systems interpretations (Hattingh, 2001:3). The other perspective is that of emphasis on the protection of the environment, in some
situations at the expense of people. This comes across as a partisan perspective, as it is incongruous with the open systems paradigm of taking on the full range of relationships, between people themselves and their environment.

The other dimension beyond the anthropocentric and the environmental, is that of participation. From the terraces of this dimension, sustainable development is regarded as having the capacity to articulate, nourish and propagate radical political ideas while appearing respectably "non-political". The concept of participation is no less vulnerable to closed systems interpretations, as in the final analysis it also depends on the position that is adopted (Hattingh, 2001:14).

But then, this theory does not come out clear on the nature and the character of the social, political and economic systems it envisages in order to bring about improvements in the quality of the lives of people (Pearce, Markandya and Barbier, no date: 4). If the arguments advanced in this theory mean the sustenance of the local traditional systems, then we will be going back to the problems of traditionality. As discussed in this chapter, the problem of traditional systems is that some of the world communities' traditional systems are found to be anti-developmental. The social components of sustainability are equally important. In so much as sustainability has got to be socially constructed, there is a need for clarity on the content of the envisaged social and political systems (Cerneea, 1993:11).

If there must be a sustenance of local systems and cultures, the likelihood exists that sustainable development can translate into the reproduction of old models, and the authoritarianisms that characterise some of these traditional models (Melsome-Richards, 1990:102). Grafted into the whole theory of sustainable development is the concept of participatory development. The much talked about participation in many instances did not lead to development. Some perspectives are of the view that this paradigm is the handmaiden of the controlling authorities (Malan, 1999:502). The few instances of "participation" do not reveal the participation of the target public communities at the conception and planning stages of particular initiatives and
programmes. The voice of the poor people in this theory is faint, as there are those who
are living in absolute poverty, and who cannot afford the luxuries of conservation and
sustainability polemics. To the absolutely poor, survival at whatever cost, is a matter of
life and death. Advanced debates on the sustainable development issues take on
technical forms and character for the specialists who stand to benefit from such
discussions, and you seldom hear the voice of the poor out of such debates.

5.6. Civil Society

The contemporary period in human history is characterised by movements geared at
the empowerment of those people who have historically been disempowered as a social
echelon. Throughout the world there are calls for change and transformation of the
institutions that have for years been regarded as anti-developmental. At the micro level
we have systems and traditional institutions, and at the macro level, we have national
governments and international institutions and agencies that are viewed as the cause of
frustration toward development (Gilpin, 2001:390). Several organs of civil society are
calling for either the transformation or the substitution of the Bretton Woods Institutions
and the oppressive governments in the world. The civil society sector is home to
organisations that come from various traditions and cultures. There are the non-
governmental organisations, community based organisations, the media, the unions and
many more. In more ways than one, these organisations and agencies influence
processes in development planning and implementation. They do make invaluable
contributions to the debates around development polemics and dynamics. They
challenge the corporate sector and the governments, on behalf of the poor people
around the world (Brauer, 2000:3). Just like the forces of capital and the markets do,
organs of civil society are also entering into transnational alliances. This is with a view
to mobilise people towards a global people’s movements of the poor and the
marginalised for transformational change (Korten, 1991:34).

They campaign for changes in institutional power structures to accommodate the new
forces that have historically been consigned to the margins. These processes serve as
a testimony to the fact that the power of the ordinary people must not be under-
estimated (Bozzolli, 1995:128). This is a confirmation of the open systems notion that
when people are being pushed, they do push back. Civil society movements are
presenting challenges for the reform of the global economy so as to maximise the goal
of equitable, sustainable and participatory development (Jordan, 1996:76).

Instead of being different from the systems and institutions that they are challenging,
they too, manifest vestiges of closed systems thinking. They are often the loudest when
it comes to calls for transformation, whereas they themselves are resisting their own
transformation. The larger non-governmental organisations are still dominating the
weaker and smaller ones, and they are paranoid about their own independence
(Jordan, 1996:76). Some of these organs of civil society continue to draw their influence
from the meta-narratives of modernity. The Society for International Development (SID),
is a neo-liberal association of the liberal and right wing non-governmental organisations
and they usually are found to be defending capitalistic causes all over the world and
also campaigning against left wing governments (Brauer, 1999:25). They are
challenging certain forms of closed systems thinking and they want to have them
replaced by alternative forms of closed systems thinking. They are found to be
gravitating to the right of the spectrum along the neo-liberal paths (Guilhot, 2000:35).

On the other end of the spectrum, we have the organisations that are allied to the left
wing forces. In South Africa for instance most non-governmental organisations were
ideologically allied to the liberation movements with strong Marxist influences. Some of
these are still in disguised form, retaining these identities. They keep on demanding
transformation of certain sectors and institutions and yet they remain untouchables
when it comes to their own transformation (Guilhot, 2000:35).

Throughout the world in the civil society sector, we meet with this dichotomy of either
the left leaning or the right leaning organs of civil society. Whether on the left or on the
right, their identities and fabrics are still steeped in the closed systems foundations. Civil
society organisations tend to be traditional and parochial in their outlook and are
dominated all too often by entrenched, reactionary and self-seeking elites, who resist transformation in the sector. With the drying up of funding in other parts of the world for most of the civil society sector, these organisations are now expected to be self-supporting and self-sustaining (Esman, 1991:9). These organisations are becoming more and more obsessed with their own vested self-interests (Berhens, 2000:31), and they try to become entrepreneurial, as they are found to be moving further away from the poor people they are supposed to be assisting. The spirit of competition within the civil society sector is growing, as organisations are battling for self-preservation, along the lines of self-directedness in the closed systems paradigm. The open systems paradigm on the other end both presents and postulates processes of outer and other-directedness, with people making critical connections across the nations and cultures.

5.7. Conclusion

Most of the traditions discussed in this chapter emerge from the conceptually critical intellectual traditions and thought systems. These traditions are informed by some of the tried and tested knowledge regimes that are supposed to positively illuminate our thinking in our conversations and discourses in development. But with all our knowledge, all our power, our laws, constitutions and universal declarations of human rights, we still remain a deadly species, preying on other species through exploitation and destroying life. Humanity must definitely find a way out of these quick sands of unfairness in development to the firmer grounds of reasonableness and responsibility. The open systems paradigm, in keeping with the “sciences of the times”, is sketching an alternative account of people and the moral relations that should exist between them in the unequal world of today. The open systems paradigm further points out that if people are not invited to the centre, and excluded on issues that affect their lives, they begin to ferment instability from wherever they are. Through the open systems paradigm, we are encouraged to recognise the centrality of all social actors and their institutions in development. In the open systems paradigm's context, development thinking must always be aimed at the transformation of society, as the open systems philosophies emphasise the authenticity of human existence as primary and supreme.
CHAPTER 6

THE OPEN SYSTEMS PARADIGM AND DEVELOPMENT THEORY

The discussions that were highlighted throughout this study are a confirmation of the claim that a paradigm is fundamentally a constellation of theories, methods and procedures that share central values and themes. This constellation, which develops in response to historical conditions, provides a conceptual framework for seeing and making sense of the social world we create and live in (Maguire, 1987:10). This chapter re-visits the open systems paradigm and its implications for development thought and practice. In conformity with research convention, a paradigm is regarded as also consisting of all the theoretical and methodological assumptions and operations which prevail in a period of "normal science", during which scientists usually do not disagree about their conclusions. All new information and "additional knowledges" are subjected to testing and verification within the specifications of and rules of the prevailing paradigm (Himmelstrand, 1994:1). But then, paradigms and perspectives are not esoteric, as with the passage of time, they also do outgrow their usefulness and reality value. Paradigms and their attendant theories are as a result forced to reconceptualise, review and re-examine their relevance, due to the inevitability of paradigmatic mutations. This is the reality and challenge that is closing in on development theory.

Taking on various theoretical and thought traditions on the development landscape, we meet with absolute claims about the process of "development". Beyond these claims on the "gains" made in "development", we still remain with the people who are powerless, more especially with the growth of poverty throughout the world. Societies in the world are still plagued by the rigidity of the many traditional institutions, uneven power relations between the developed and the developing nations and the continuing denial of people, their political liberties and civil rights by authoritarian systems (Sen, 2000:62). The global level human rights are still weakly institutionalised, leaving the poor and the powerless people as vulnerable as ever, as capitalism continues to pauperise the lower
classes (Himmelstrand, 1994:29). Several communities throughout the world still find themselves in the deprivation trap, driven by the global unemployment and global poverty, as there is still no equal access to the resources that enable people to experience what they can refer to as development. People are still being prevented from sharing in the "increasing wealth" as a result of "growth" (O’Neill, 1986: 460). We are still having begging "panhandlers" even in the developed countries, right in the streets of New York, not far away from the Wall Street (Anderson, 2000: 78). They are begging for money, as they are trying to escape poverty, that is attributable to structural imbalances in the world’s economies (Okuni, 1998: 21).

Theory formulation in the social sciences is directed at social reality. At the descriptive level, theories make contributions on the causes of the many problems experienced in social reality. In modern neo-liberal thinking, tradition and the stronger states in the socialistic sense of the word are regarded as problems for development. The neo-Marxist schools point at the neo-liberal systems as impediments toward development. From the descriptive configurations, normative postulates are worked out as prescriptions to influence the realisation of the desired behaviours that would be facilitative of development. The open systems paradigm is presenting a social reality in which people have decided to affirm their own being. In reaction to the dehumanising nature of their experiences at the hands of the powerful, the powerless are affirming their being. The developmentally disadvantaged are engaging in the processes of the restoration and retotalisation of their lives. They are engaging in the endeavours to overcome the haunting experiences of alienation. This, in the open systems philosophy of existentialism is referred to as a response to a call to life (Gill and Sherman, 1973:13). In response to this call to life, people are finding creative new ways of executing and living development, as they engage in the pursuit of freedom from want, ignorance and bias (Scholtz, 1998:25).

Various organs of civil society are pressurising governments into more just and legitimate forms of rule. The poor people are being mobilised into solidarity groups, in order for them to wrestle back and regain control over their lives and local economies
People are engaged in these processes of striving toward authentic existence, with the potential of bringing about literal disintegration of the most powerful and oppressive institutions. This development and processes of affirmation are seen as a movement toward the creation of new institutions that are responsive to humanity's developmental challenges. These processes are seen as constituting the movement of people organising for a better world based on solidarity, social justice and ecological sustainability rather the world that is decreed by the powerful forces, particularly the transnationalising forces of capital (Brauer, 2000:27).

This is the movement of people engaged in a search for meaningful lives and also working toward achieving development, as they are assisting the effort of ensuring that democracy is recovering some ground it has lost (Sen, 2000:63). In these struggles for socio-economic justice and the re-conquest of the centre stage, popular movements are also linking arms across borders and continents to make input into the democratisation of the embryonic global socio-economic state. These are the processes that manifest the open systems principles of outer and other-directedness, as people are reaching out to others to realise the common goal of authentic development (Brauer, 2000:27).

The open systems paradigm is presenting a social reality in which people are inspired by the impulse for developing structures for dialogue and participation, drawing on the experiences of the poor and marginalised and to freeing of a people's imagination, in relation to their developmental needs (Brauer, 2000:27). These processes are more in line with the underlying idea of the open systems paradigm, that, the open systems paradigm is itself a call to true selfhood. This state of being can be achieved through the release of the potential of the people to achieve prosperity, and the continuation of the struggles for a place in the pantheon of the global economy as a force (Michnik, 1999:28)
All of the afore-mentioned experiences and processes are by themselves presenting a challenge for development theory. Some form of development theory must as a matter of fact guide development practice. Theories provide models of group behaviour through generalisations that are formed and tested. They rest on the evidence of factual instances, and they can be disproved by pointing to other instances which do not conform to them (Raphael, 1987:2). Theories provide us with conceptual maps that designate the routes to follow for the achievement of desired behaviours and goals. The grand or meta-narratives of modernity do to a large extent inform the form, content, and character of much of the current development theories. This is with specific reference to positivism's quantitative methods and critical theory's participatory approaches (Mouton, 1996:23). Theory generally helps data to cohere and enable research to go beyond an aimless and unsystematic piling up of accounts. It is impossible to be a true development agency without a theory that directs action to the underlying causes of underdevelopment, because theory does help to correct the course of development (Fitzgerald, MacLellan and Munslow, 1995:13).

Given the recent past and current failures of the development approaches that are in use, we are faced with the challenge of inventing alternative models. It is one thing to argue persuasively that current development approaches have led to the neglect of the poor, and it is another to provide a substitute model. It will be counterproductive to attempt to replace the current development models with another, if power and equity issues continue to be neglected (Schuftan, 1998:22). The open systems paradigm philosophies and their attendant principles and processes, engage the issue of the location of power. Drawing from the various postulates of the open systems paradigm, it is self-explanatory that it is futile to impose models on social reality. Instead it is social reality that is supposed to give development theory content, character and form. The open systems paradigm is itself not a theory, but it affects the context within which theory must work (Maxwell, 1998:23). It is therefore appropriate that the metaphysical
milieu captured by the open systems paradigm be revisited before reflecting on the implications of this paradigm for theory development in development theory.

At the heart of all the philosophies that provide metaphysical pillars for the open systems paradigm, is the principle of change. The open systems paradigm tells us that both the physical and the social realities are continuously changing. This paradigm affirms that people participate in a world where change is all there is. It is further observed in this paradigm that we sit in the midst of continuous creation, in a universe whose creativity and adaptability are beyond comprehension, as we adapt and change all the time (Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers, 1998:6).

In the open systems paradigm, every living being, every microbe, every person develops and changes because every living being has freedom to create and preserve itself. The freedom to create one’s self is regarded as the foundational freedom of all life. Something is regarded as if it is capable of producing itself, as the open systems paradigm is itself an invitation to life (Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers, 1998:7). Every living being is regarded as an author of its own existence, and continues to create itself throughout its entire life span. Freedom, as it has been observed throughout this study, pervades the entire fabric of the open systems paradigm. Freedom is not only a political ideal, but it also appears in biology as an inalienable condition of life. Future development theory has to take these factors into account, as these are the realities we are already living through. The challenge of development theory is that of having to link up with the vital “science of our times”, with its images of a constantly changing and infinite world (Wheatley, 1997:141).

6.2. The Open Systems Social Reality and Development Theory

Development theory has historically been based on the experiences in social reality and its postulates geared at influencing the same social reality. For future development theory to be anything to go by, it has got to both dovetail and be informed by the social reality that is captured by the open systems paradigm. The open systems paradigm
takes on the whole of reality in its completeness and the whole full range of relationships between things in creation. In the social realm, human beings are also viewed in their totality and as changing subjects, who keep on changing from time to time. Phenomenology, as one of the open systems paradigm philosophies, explains that human beings inhabit a world that is always subjective and is shaped by the people's interaction with it. Human beings therefore cannot be developed passively, as they develop actively by themselves as groups or nations (Sen, 2000:63). The other open systems philosophy, the philosophy of existentialism, further explains that all human beings are capable of looking critically at their own world. Through dialogue with others, they gradually become conscious of social conditions and problems and deal with them.

Future development theoretical projections have to integrate these aspects of human reality that have been omitted in the many development theories that are there. In observance of the principle of totality, development theory should no longer be measured in economic and infrastructural terms only, as it obtains in several current traditions. It should be a development theory that is measured in terms of its impact leading to greater fullness of being. It should be a theory that is geared at producing a "being-for-itself" at the personal, social, economic and political levels simultaneously (Burkey, 1993:30). The "being-for-itself" characteristics are those of freedom, self-determination, continual transcendence of all experiences of alienation and the perennial self-creation and re-creation initiatives. These must be manifest at the personal level, at the social level, where there will be a collectivity of subjects, and at the economic and political levels as well. Implicit in these formulations and configurations are the socio-economic imperatives that must be at the base of a theory.

The open systems paradigm is also for empowered people, as it is based on the philosophies of empowerment. Future development theory will need to be aimed at politicised and empowered populations of the world, as the level of political consciousness among the people is rising. This is with reference to incidents in Seattle, Davos and Genoa, where people are demonstrating that they can no longer sit back and leave everything to corporate and state dominance in determining the direction and
content of development. The open systems paradigm's take on social reality reveals that people are getting out of passivity. Society is coming into grips with the inevitability of globalisation and is contesting that the rules of globalisation do not necessarily have to be written or scripted by the powerful and richest nations of the world alone (Gorostiaga, 1995:12). There today is a rising tide of demands for political and human rights, as people continue to demand more democracy in the institutions that influence development (Wolfensohn, 1999:111). Democratisation of the social, economic and political institutions and structures has become a pre-requisite for development. No matter how terrible the oppression, people are finding ways of affirming their being, as a way of pushing back. People in Iran, irrespective of the authoritarian nature of the establishment, are demanding more reforms of the medieval Islamic systems. Even the best-equipped armies that governments can put together no longer frighten people. The students in China at the Tiananmen Square took on the Chinese establishment, demanding reforms and the restoration of their dignity as human beings.

Margaret Wheatley and Marion Kellner-Rogers (1998) said that people will always bring themselves into the picture and add their unique signatures to the situation. People keep on engaging in the processes of what is referred to in the open systems paradigm nomenclature as the affirmation of being. The world wide rejections and challenge of authoritarianism are affirmations of the open systems notion that life without freedom is no life at all (Amin, 1990:113). People are demanding the type of development that will both bring and increase their freedom, and this concept of freedom runs throughout the open systems paradigm’s philosophies, principles and processes.

The power of the people’s movements is now driving social change, as there is a notable growth of the organs of civil society even in within traditional communities (Thesing, 1997:19). People have developed a democratic consciousness, as they get to recognise the factors and forces that contributed toward the situations that they find themselves in. The new type of politics that is emerging is that of addressing the needs of the poor, and not only the mainstream political process. This “liberation movement family” is not only concentrated within countries’ national boundaries. As people are
reaching out to each other, priority is also given to “others”, wherever they are, in accordance with what the open systems paradigm presents as the principle of other-directedness. Politics has come to relate to thousands of concerns and interests, with the accompanying processes of the transnationalisation of civil society (Herzog, 1999:24).

People are today going around systems to make critical connections with other people elsewhere in the world as they go about promoting a civilisation of global consensus. Through the transnationalising civil society, people are interacting with other players to neutralise the harmful sides of the market economy (Kappel, 1998:21). Through the processes of affirmation, the world is witnessing the dawning of the visions of another type of development. The type of development that is driven by the impulses of interdependence and solidarity among nations and people. People have established several forms of dialogue across various boundaries and are creating openings towards new areas of collective existence. This is a challenge for development theory, as the future theory will have to be that for an already transformed landscape of development (Wolfensohn, 1999:111).

The democratisation movements in the realm of social reality are endeavouring to lever the world back into a just balance through structural transformation, so that the economy is placed at the service of the people and not the people at the service of the economy and capital (Almaric, 1998:2). People are demanding that economic growth should be inextricably linked to social justice, so that there is a fair distribution of the fruits of economic expansion. It is expressed in these movements that for the world to produce healthy nations, there must be a reduction of today’s record gaps between the rich and the poor and changes in how populations share in the economy.

It is expected of the development theory of the future that it charts pathways that would lead to personal integrity and well being (Martinussen, 1997:45). It will have to be designed and formed in such a way that it provides humans with the opportunity to live full human lives as projected by the open systems philosophy of existentialism. The
other challenges of future development theory are those of having to guide humanity to the definitions of development as alluding to the claim that; being “human” as meaning “to be more” rather than “to have more”. It must demonstrate a sensitivity to the imperatives of human existential enlargement throughout the development processes (Kotze, 1998:12).

6.3. Meta-Theoretical Considerations of the Open Systems Paradigm

Research work in the social sciences can be categorised into three phases. The first phase takes on the descriptive character, in which, phenomena in social reality is described as it presents itself to reality. In our studies in development, we tend to reflect on the causes and factors leading to poverty and all the relevant and related data in the knowledge search for the understanding of development. The second phase takes on a normative character as various theories prescribe ways and actions that could lead to development. At both the descriptive and the prescriptive levels, numerous concepts are used to advance arguments. In the third phase these concepts are subjected to rigorous scrutiny for more clarification on the concepts used (Mouton, 1996:20).

In so much as this study puts more premiums on the open systems paradigm for future development theory building processes, it does not necessarily mean that this paradigm is conceptually impeccable and unassailable throughout. As stated in chapter five of this study, that there is a hole in the heart of democracy, the same obtains for this open systems paradigm. There also are some holes¹ in this paradigm that will need to be plugged as conversations within and around this paradigm take to the plateaus of academic and intellectual refinement.

When taking a look on the other side of the open systems concepts, we get to establish that some of the concepts warrant further clarification. One of such concepts is that of “freedom”. The open systems paradigm conceives of the notion of freedom as one of the gateways toward what in the open systems nomenclature is referred to as authentic

¹ Refer to discussions on pages 137-139.
development. The concept of freedom has in many instances been subjected to a number of interpretations, in some situations for the perpetuation of the closed systems goals. The neo-liberal concept of freedom in most instances refers to the notion of individual freedom. People can campaign for the freedoms not to associate with "others", but to be on their own. To add to this, the concept of freedom in this context could even imply the freedom to exploit "others". The racial exclusionists, in justification of their causes for freedom for "separate development" also use the concept of freedom. The neo-Marxists have their own understanding of what the concept of freedom entails. At the outset they see the importance of freedom in the quest to liberate the working classes and the poor people from the exploitation and oppression by the capitalist classes. After the acquisition of these freedoms, it would seem society’s "freedom" would have to be negotiated through the proletarian dictatorships. There are multiple perspectives on the meaning of the notion freedom; in so much as there are multiple understandings of the concept of development (Raphael, 1987:10).

Once the concept of freedom continues to be viewed in the closed systems contexts, it will still translate into being anti-developmental. Freedom, therefore must both be responsibly sought and used if it is to be of importance in the driving of development (Gibson, Ivancevich and Donnelly, 1994:375). There have been so many instances of the abuse of freedom, so much that it has come to mean the compromise of the freedoms of others. There is a need to clarify what this notion of freedom is and the extent to which it can be exercised (Carmen and Sobrado, 2000:3).

The other open systems notion which despite the nobility of its origins, and tends to be abused is that of affirmative action. After their election victory in 1948, the Nationalists in South Africa practiced linguistic affirmative action within racist affirmative action. They embarked on a conscious and declared policy of promoting Afrikaners in general and their supporters in particular in every area of South African life, creating a structured advantage and disadvantage dichotomy (Hugo, 1992:204). Apartheid was a system devised to give an Afrikaner flavour to what colonialist imperialism had already begun. It
was at all times aimed at benefitting whites at the expense or to the detriment of black people (Molema, 2001: 14).

Today, the same nationalists are battling hard to come to grips with the realities of another form of affirmative action. This is understandable because injustices and inequalities produced by past race discrimination do not go away simply because the laws which enforced the discrimination are repealed. These inequalities tend to replicate themselves from generation to generation. Children are as such born into a world where their life chances are grossly unequal. However skilled or hardworking or upright they might be, their destinies are determined not primarily by any virtue or merit they might have, but by the accident of the race to which their parents happened to belong. Depending on which side a person finds himself, poverty gets handed down as a bitter bequest from parents (Hugo, 1992: 205). The majority of the people in South Africa, more especially blacks, still lead a hand-to-mouth existence and a small, well-off white elite is able to hold its own, even in the global economic milieu (Molema, 2001: 14).

Black youth in South Africa inherited poverty and deprivation from their parents, after years of living under a discriminatory system of Afrikaner affirmative action, for separate development. The legacy of these inequalities is still in evidence. As white school children are being bussed to school, they ride past walking black school children who have long distances to cover (Hugo, 1992: 209). Today, the Afrikaner youth are being made to pay the price for the sins that they did not commit, as they fall casualty to the application of the new South Africa’s brand of affirmative action. Given the application of affirmative action in South Africa, white youth are made to bear the brunt of the new order, as they get marginalised in the process of making up for the past of which they were not part.

Affirmative action is good as a means of correcting the moral wrongs of the past in order to facilitate and implement development on level playing fields devoid of discrimination. The underlying idea of affirmative action is to overcome massive inequalities and also as a midwife of equity. In South Africa and several parts of the
continent, the usage and understanding have come to mean jobs for friends and those who are connected to the "inner circles". Affirmative action has also come to mean the employment of people who will come to pillage the development resources. The vulnerability to abuse of affirmative action presents the likelihood of opening the way to "redistribution" through nepotism, corruption, protection and of jobs for friends. The process is already taking root in South Africa, as evidenced by the subtle "struggle" credentials required in securing a job in government circles (Qwelane, 1999:9). This notion too warrants further academic engagements, as the open systems paradigm is also about keeping the channels of conversation on issues open.

The political dimensions of the open systems paradigm also refer to the imperatives of the democratisation of the development processes. There is a growing demand for the decentralisation of authority and power. The notion of decentralisation as implied in the open systems principles of outer and other-directedness, is regarded as by itself a principle of development (Venson, 1997:277). The processes of decentralisation are geared at making governments and development organisations more representative. It is meant to decentralise power more effectively to people in local areas, to strengthen the rule of law, combat corruption and facilitate the empowerment of the poor people (Harsch, 2001:12). It is often argued that the decentralisation of power and decision-making is necessary for the creation of an enabling environment for development.

Decentralisation of power should be done with the view to supporting community efforts rather than defining the content of the communities' development needs. The Ugandan civil society in its conscientisation crusade is not insular but is also looking outside for more connections with others (Anyang' Nyong'o 2001:17). Decentralisation is meant to create as much space as possible for interplay between a wide range of stakeholders. The experience of Zimbabwe has been such that, the ruling party infiltrated the local community structures to ensure that even at the local level, people are continuing to toe the ruling party's line. This kind of a process of decentralisation for re-centralisation is in essence the same as going back to the closed systems principle of continuity and the ideology of linearism. The ruling party ensures that there is continuity and that its
representatives in the form of local elites retain the control on behalf of the executive central committee (Mushauri, 1997:271). This tendency also happens in the organs of civil society, as they also have a tendency of imposing their own definitions of what development is and what it ought to be. After doing this, they tend to proceed to demand transparency in and from other players. A clear definition of what this concept is, is also necessary as we try to find our way out of the conceptual cobwebs of development to clearer understandings.

The open systems paradigm also presents processes of inter-personalisation. In the context of these processes, there is a growing awareness that in a world of greater interdependence, every single relation counts (Wongibe, 2001:21). Francophone countries of Africa are in agreement on the diversification of external relations as the best way forward. In the context of the open systems paradigm’s principle of outer-directedness, they are venturing to seek new partners outside the continent. From the North, the USA has made inroads into parts of French speaking Africa through the take-over of some privatised state-owned companies, particularly in telecommunications and in the energy sectors. South Africa is also increasing its investments in several parts of the continent, as in Tanzania and Kenya. Development enriches the lives of individuals by widening their horizons and reducing their sense of isolation (Stiglitz, 1998:2). As people and their organisations increase their linkages across boundaries, more opportunities become possible.

6.4. Conclusion

Further to the afore-mentioned challenges of future development theory, the open systems paradigm is rekindling hope and the dream of better models for development. Implied in the open systems paradigm is the suggestion that future development theory needs to postulate models that are fully responsive to the whole environment in its totality and the whole full range of relationships. Through the open systems paradigm, we can be able to step into a new era of development thinking, with innovative ideas and thoughts for development. The open systems paradigm’s implications for future
conversations in development are that, it can assist in bringing renewal and hope in the form of socio-economic justice and authentically responsible freedom. The open systems paradigm is supportive of the creative partnerships of equality and the underlining of the interdependence of people in the forever-changing world.
CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Findings

The challenges that confront the world of development are still around and will most probably still be for the coming few years. The argument presented in this study traces most of the problems experienced in development to the several fronts of closed systems thinking. As stated in the first objective of this study that this study will be identifying elements of closed systems thinking in development theory and practice, we observe that, throughout the world, there are people who through no fault of their own, are still kept as "hostages" of a special type by closed systems traditions. Once people are kept in the throes of a particular kind of a system against their will, development becomes difficult to realise. Further to the foregoing discussions and observations in this study, it is noted that, closed systems tendencies still dominate the domains of development thought and practice.

Tradition as a closed system in both the so-called developed and the developing countries, is viewed as limiting and not promoting the overall development of society. As stated in the chapter on the critique of the trends in development, even in the so-called "more-advanced" societies in the world, there are sectors of society that remain wedded to traditional modes of operation, and people wedded to traditional ways of thinking (Stiglitz,2000:2). Adherence to tradition is rife in the countries of the South, and it manifests itself in practices of domestic slavery, local despotisms within communities, and the socio-economic limitations that beset contemporary kingdoms and chiefdoms. People in such systems are manipulated at will and sometimes kept as prisoners of a worldview, and as such, stifling many a social, economic and political development effort and initiative.
Further to the effects of traditional systems on development, some societies in the world continue to enforce medieval decrees on people. This study referred to life under the authoritarianism of the Taliban militia in Afghanistan, as the Sharia systems are traceable to the medieval times. The Northern states of Nigeria are also found to be enforcing Sharia legislation (Durotoye, 2000:24). The open systems paradigm and its philosophies like existentialism, postulates the social reality of existentially enlarged people. Under tight ecclesiastical decrees, irrespective of the religion in place, the dominant in such societies draw a blanket of dull and dreary conformity over society (Chanda, 2001:13). We are having a number of ecclesiastical totalitarianisms in several parts of the world. Beyond parts of Nigeria and Afghanistan, we have Iraq, Libya and several more in the East and the Middle East. These systems in large part bear the hallmarks of the closed systems paradigm.

On the plains of modernity, developed countries keep on preaching the doctrines of openness, and yet they engage in restrictive practices as they safeguard and protect their own interests (Stiglitz, 1998:23). Instead of modernity’s systems delivering people from deprivation, there is an intensification of human repression resulting from increasing denial by governments of the most fundamental human rights and the inability of the increasing numbers of people to develop even a small part of their human potential (Ekins, 1992:1). In Tanzania, with the centralisation of power and resources, the state has systematically deprived the rest of society of economic sustenance (Anyang’ Nyong’o, 2001:16). The powerful nations are currently consolidating their grip on the global economy, a process manifesting hallmarks of closed systems thinking. There is an increasing concentration of control over resources in the hands of fewer and fewer elites in the world as more and more people are pushed to the periphery. There is still the colonial mentality of the developed countries, in keeping with the closed systems ideology of linearism, as they keep on telling the rest of the world what to do in the name of development (Stiglitz, 2000:26). The neo-liberal models are charting pre-ordained and linearistic pathways to development. The United States of America is becoming more and more of a closed systems country, as manifest in the decline of its goodwill. Its inconsistency on its position regarding the Kyoto Protocol is one case in
point. The USA is regarded as biggest emitter of the greenhouse gases, which is posing a serious threat to the world climate, but it is not cooperative when it comes to discussions on how best to deal with the problem (Bals, 2001:4). Environmental commentators regard this kind of attitude as holding the world climate hostage. With calls for more liberalisation of the markets in South Africa, we have the consolidation of the entrenchment of the economic power in the hands of the elites at the expense of the poor people (Molema, 2001:14).

There is a confluence of closed systems philosophies, principles and ideologies in the neo-liberal school of thought. Whatever form of change that is being proposed, it must be in keeping with the interests of capital. This is suggestive of a retreat from openness in the developed nations' world (Stiglitz, 1998:23). Further to the observations made in this study, neo-liberal tendencies illustrate a measure of being comfortable with certain forms of authoritarianism, as with their tolerance of certain authoritarian governments.

The failures of capitalism and neo-liberal systems have become the unwitting organisers for a socialist future (Nzimande, 2001: 23), as people are losing faith in the forces of the markets. This has triggered a resurgence of the Marxian philosophy and its attendant socialist traditions. At almost all the demonstrations against corporate dominance, the communist flag is once again flying high, as it was observed in Seattle, Davos and Prague. As indicated throughout this study, the Marxian systems are also replete with elements of closed systems paradigm.

Marxist-Leninists are clear on the position that some of the closed systems ideologies cannot be avoided, before society can arrive at the communist utopia. The closed systems ideology of linearism for instance manifests itself in the thinking that the disciples of this philosophy ought to toe the party line, and always observe the specifications of the "revolutionary theory". As it was stated in this study, any form of deviation from the "original idea" is regarded as reactionary. The surviving socialist states rely heavily on the application of the closed systems ideologies; like democratic centralism, linearism, authoritarianism, determinism and gradualism.
The problem with the application of these afore-mentioned ideologies is in their leading to alienated individuals and society. Today, people are battling to survive out of this system, as in people trying to escape out of Cuba, China and North Vietnam.

The sustainability perspective in development at face value appears to be liberatory, but upon profound reflection, it emerges that it is vulnerable to closed systems interpretations and justifications, in the service of the interests of whoever wants to make a case for whatever perspective. The same position is found to be applicable even to the participatory development school of thought.

In relation to the second objective of this study, which is about engaging in the open systems reflections on the current trends in development theory, and as illustrated throughout this study, we get to realise that, even though we have crossed the threshold into the new millennium, we still find ourselves with old problems as the closed systems paradigm continues to inform our day-to-day business of development. The closed systems' paradigm continues to offer us absolute certainty as if it has all the answers. The totalitarianism of the surviving socialist states and also that of the market forces still maintain the character of unassailability (Brauer, 2000:3). As stated in chapter five of this study, they tend to remain closed to contradictory evidence, and they also tend to avoid tests on the authenticity and the validity of their claims, through rigid adherence to the principles traceable to tradition.

As stated in the previous chapters in this study, open systems reflections reveal that, the open systems paradigm, in keeping with the trends of the moment, is sketching an alternative account of people and the moral relations that should exist between them. Despite the sustenance of closed systems ways of thinking in several institutions of development, the open systems paradigm presents a social reality in which people have decided to affirm their own being. The developmentally disadvantaged are engaging in the processes of the restoration and retotalisation of their lives. People are finding
creative new ways of both executing and living development, as they engage in the pursuit of freedom from ignorance, want and bias (Scholtz, 1998; 25).

The power of the people's movements is now driving social change, as evidenced in the growth of the civil society sector, as people continue to develop a democratic consciousness. Whether governments and other institutions like it or not, people are today going around systems to make critical connections with other people elsewhere in the world, promoting a civilisation of global consensus (Kappel, 1998:21). These processes are found to be symptomatic of a movement of people organising for a better world based on social justice and ecological sustainability (Brauer, 2000:27).

A take on the third objective of this study, which set out to explain the open systems paradigm as a framework for future development theory, reveals that, the open systems paradigm on the other hand is shining through as a beacon of hope for new and alternative forms of development thinking. Through the lenses of the open systems paradigm, we are able to see people on the move, as they engage systems and traditions that have made them less human, through affirmation of their own being (Zwick, 1998:4). People are now navigating for new ways of approaching development problems and challenges. The philosophies, principles and processes of the open systems paradigm are offering anchorage for future development thinking and practice, and hope for meaningful life. Metabletics, the open systems philosophy of change in its totality tells us that mankind is ever renewing in the ever changing times. The processes of change in many parts of the world have begun to undermine many traditional institutions, leading to the discomfort of the custodians of traditionalism (Chu, 2001:56). The world is today observing traditional systems tottering into retirement (Mayson, 2000:29). Civil society movements are making significant inroads into states like Iran, as people are increasingly demanding serious changes and more openness in the country's medieval social and political institutions (Macleod and Moaveni, 2000:7). There today are movements toward a new order and these are suggestive of the need for "another" development (Ekins, 1992:99). These movements are making a statement to the effect that, systems of government that are autocratic and unresponsive to the
needs of the people, must be replaced by those that are democratic and sensitive to the political rights of the people as well as their basic needs (Anyang’ Nyong’o, 2001:16). Democracy is gradually recovering some of the ground it had lost in Asia, Latin America and Africa. The transnational players in the economy and in society, science and culture, technology and ecology have started to assert their interests and spread their messages at a global level (Herzog, 1999:23).

As was illustrated in the demonstrations at Genoa, the anti-globalisation movement with its components of various shades, has grown in strength since the ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization in Seattle in December in 1999 (Graff, 2001:20). People are demonstrating their commitment to challenging governments and corporate dominance with courage and determination (Harvey, 2000:23).

The revolution in information technologies is reaching deep into the developing world to link far-flung cities, towns and hamlets to the global village of the twenty first century (Sancton, 2000:39). The international economic order is evolving into a highly integrated and electronically networked system. As stated in the discussion on the open systems paradigm, we participate in a world where change is all there is. We sit in the midst of continuous creation, in a universe whose creativity and adaptability are beyond comprehension (Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers, 1998:6).

7.2. Recommendations

Further to the fore-going exposition of the open systems paradigm and its implications for development thought and practice; the following recommendations are made, that:

The open systems paradigm needs to be at the base of much of development thought so that society can truly develop. This will entail democratisation of development knowledge and development itself, and inevitably a change in the ways of thinking about development.
With the adoption of the open systems paradigm in development research, there must be a change of the established canon of research, so that audience could also be given to the marginalised voices.

In the spirit of the open systems paradigm, there is a need for a development theory that is committed to the transformation of worldviews about development, research traditions, attitudes toward others and the environment, development institutions, socio-economic and political relations.

In the spirit of the open systems paradigm, new development approaches will need to put the political, institutional, human, social, infrastructure, ecological and cultural aspects on an equal footing with the macro-economic angle.

There must be a balancing of the political environment so that even the common people in society would have a way of expressing their political opinions that breeds effective economic decisions for the well being of all in society. Every human voice would like to be heard the loudest.

There must be an expansion of the floor of social rights as according to the open systems paradigm, development entails the empowerment of the individuals, so that they have more control over the forces that affect their lives, so that they can have healthier and richer lives. Development enriches the lives of individuals by widening their horizons and reducing their sense of isolation.

The open systems paradigm’s reality is upon us, and thus we need to model our future approaches in both development theory and practice on the pillars that it provides. As our traditional ways of thinking about development loose their reality value, we need to either adapt or transform our thinking into consonance with the realities of the “new sciences” of the open systems paradigm.
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