

Elements of the Modernization, Dependency, and World System Theories and Alternative Approaches to Development.

Arlete M. S Alves*

Resumo: *Since after World War II, the field of development has evolved, among others, with theories based on the modernization, dependency and world system approaches, and after the eighties, a counter neoclassical revolution was being established. Recently, some authors note that there seems to be a convergence between some of the earlier theories, e.g., that the three dominant schools, modernization, dependency, and world systems, were very much alive in the Eighties and it seems that they are moving toward a convergence in the 1990s. The aim of this paper is to review important aspects of the modernization, dependency and world system approaches and discuss some of these aspects as important elements to be considered in a new light in new development alternatives in the field.*

Introduction

Development is a historical process, with societies developing through the centuries. As a discipline, however, the study of development began after World War II. Since then, the field has evolved with theories based on the modernization approach dominating the fifties and early sixties, dependency and world system theories in the late sixties and seventies, and after the eighties, a counter Neoclassical revolution was being established. New approaches like the "basic needs" strategy appeared in the midst of these and other theoretical perspectives in the field to counteract some of the problems with them. Recently, authors such as So (1990) notes that there seems to be a convergence between some of the earlier theories. To him, the three dominant schools, modernization, dependency, and world systems, were very much alive in the Eighties and it seems that they are moving toward a convergence in the 1990s.

The aim of this paper is to review important aspects of the modernization,

dependency and world system approaches and discuss some of these aspects as elements to be considered in new development alternatives in the field. Although part of these theories proved to be in some aspects inappropriate to the realities of many parts of the developing world, and Brazil in particular, important elements discussed by these perspectives may be considered in a new light by some alternative approaches in the field. As these elements were important in the theoretical analysis of development and in the alternatives approaches, their importance for new strategies in the field ought to be highlighted.

The paper is divided into three sections besides this introduction and the concluding remarks. The first section will highlight some key aspects of the three perspectives of development outlined, e.g., the modernization, dependency, and world system theories. The second will discuss alternative approaches to development of the last decades and some of the significant actors involved in those approaches. The third section will examine one of the key elements of the theories brought up previously, institutional change, important element to be considered in a process of development that is aimed at responding to the most pressing problems occurring in the realities of developing countries today, especially Brazil, and point out to strategies that could help in the implementation of such process.

1. Aspects of Modernization, Dependency and World System Theories

1.1 Aspects of the Modernization Approach

The modernization approach was the earliest set of systematized theories on development, appearing in the late Fifties and early Sixties. Some authors (Alvin, 1990), when explaining the emergency of paradigms in the social sciences, attribute the appearance of this approach as accompanying the emergence of the United States as a world power. Others (Evans and Stephens, 1988), while agreeing that interest in modernization stems in part from America's new position of international hegemony,

argue that it also grew out of a rediscovery of the central themes of classical nineteenth-century sociology. For the latter, with "America's emergence as a world power and the simultaneous discovery of the appeal of Communism to the 'underdeveloped people', questions of industrialization and the sociological changes accompanying it came to the fore of socioeconomic discourse again" (p.739). In the modernization approach, theories from sociology, economics, and political science tried to address these issues.

Evans and Stephens (1988) point to two influential theoretical works in the development of modernization theory. One was Talcott Parsons' reconstruction of the classic nineteenth century tradition. "Originally designed to model American society, Parsonsian structural-functionalism became the underpinning for one important stream of what came to be known as "modernization theory" (p. 741). The other was Weber's emphasis on rationalization as key in predicting institutional responses, and of calculability more generally. They write:

Increased 'rationality' is the definition of the movement toward modernity, or more crudely put, progress. For Parsons, Weber's work demonstrated above all the necessity of a certain pattern of values and norms if economic, social, and political progress were to be achieved. Normative patterns emphasizing 'particularism' had to be replaced by those emphasizing 'universalism' in order for development to occur. Achievement has to replace ascription in order to motivate social actors to generate progressive changes (p. 741).

Durkheim was also influential in the development of modernization theory. Evans and Stephens (1988) explain that Durkheim's vision of increasing functional differentiation as the master process in the development of industrial society is as central to modernization theory as the Weberian notion of rationality. "The idealistic side of Weber and Durkheim's concept of social differentiation provides a road map of the socio-cultural preconditions for development. The resultant prescription for the citizens of the undeveloped world and for those who would assist them was to find ways of inculcating the attitudes purported to prevail in advanced capitalist countries without being overwhelmed by the tensions created by such drastic value changes" (p. 742).

The Linear Stage and Structural Stages approaches are good examples of theories that consider assumptions of the modernization approach. Rostow's classic *Stages of Economic Growth* (1960) presents the stages in which the economies of underdeveloped countries should go through to develop. The stages are, as put by

Todaro (1994): (1) the Traditional Society, whose structure is developed within limited production function, traditional and low per-capita income; (2) the Preconditions for Take-Off, is a transitional stage, as it takes time to transform a traditional society so that it may exploit the fruits of modern science and fend off diminishing returns; (3) the Take-Off is the interval when old blocks and resistance to steady growth are finally overcome. The forces making for economic progress, which yield limited bursts and enclaves of modern activity, expand and come to dominate society.

The Take-Off stage leads to (4) the Drive to Maturity, a long interval of sustained if fluctuating progress, as the now regularly growing economy drives to extend modern technology over the whole front of its economic activity. The makeup of the economy changes unceasingly as techniques improve, new industries accelerate, and older industries level off. Finally, in Stage (5), the Age of Mass Consumption, is where, in time, the leading sector shifts towards durable consumer goods and services (Rostow, 1992). The structure of the work force changed in ways that increased the proportion of urban versus rural population, and also the population working in offices or in skilled factory jobs.

In the same vein, the Harrod-Domar Growth Model (Todaro, 1994) adds to Rostow's model by suggesting that mobilization of domestic and foreign savings to stimulate sufficient investment to accelerate economic growth was necessary. Both Rostow and the Harrod-Domar growth model were criticized as inappropriate for Third World realities because the implicit assumptions of Western economic theory was irrelevant to the conditions of the Third World along with the expectation that development would work as the Marshall Plan did in Europe.

The structural change approach, as exemplified by Structural Change and Patterns of Development are also within the modernization tradition. This theory hypothesizes that underdevelopment of the Third World is due to the under-utilization of resources arising from structural or institutional factors that have their origins in both domestic and international dualistic situations (Todaro, 1994). Development, then, requires more than just accelerated capital formation as exposed in the *stages of growth* and *false paradigms* models. This theory is a little less abstract than the stages of growth, but, although it attempts to incorporate institutional factors, its assumptions are still unrealistic; for example, the idea that industry will absorb all

labor released from agriculture. In fact, unemployment rates remain high in many industrialized cities of Third World, increasing labor participation in informal activities.

The theories of economic growth in the 1950s and 1960s which prescribed savings and investments, failed to generate sufficient employment. As an example, the "big push" strategy advocated domestic savings and foreign exchange to make large investments in strategic industries increasing output and capital accumulation. However, as Todaro (1994) points out, in spite of relatively impressive rates of industrial output, the rate of employment growth in many Less Developing Countries (LDCs) has lagged. This is due, Todaro notes, to increases in productivity, which allowed increases in output without a corresponding rise in labor absorption (p. 235). Recently, neoclassic theories advocate trade as the engine of growth. Again, trade may serve the international not the internal market, as seems appropriate for many LCD's today.

Along with the economic approaches, So (1992) points to the sociological and political approaches within the modernization tradition to examine Third World development. The first approach is exemplified by Levy's "relatively modern societies" and Smelser's "structural differentiation" (p. 22-25). Levy distinguishes relatively modern societies and relatively non-modern societies as two locations at the opposite ends of a continuum, with the United States, Japan and Great Britain at one end, India and China at the other.

Smelser (In So, 1992) applies the idea of structural differentiation to the study of the Third World. "Here modernization generally involves structural differentiation because a complicated structure that performed multiple functions divides into many specialized structures that perform just one function each. The new collection of specialized structures, as a whole, performs the same functions as the original structure, but the functions are more effective in the new context than they were in the old (p. 26). I would argue that the division of functions may be problematic. The specialized functions may work more efficiently, but this efficiency may not allow space to account for the complexity of a situation, leaving out some important elements.

The political approach is exemplified by Coleman's Differentiation-Equality-Capacity model. For Coleman, political modernization refers to the process of (1)

differentiation of political structure, (2) secularization of political culture (with the ethos of equality), and (3) enhancing the capacity of a society's political system. Like Smelser, differentiation is seen by Coleman as the process of progressive separation and specialization of roles and institutional sphere in the political system (Evans and Stephens, 1988). The understanding here is that most of the changes prescribed by these authors promote specialization of functions, structures, and institutions in ways that fragment them and this seems to go counter to the complexities of life caused by this same modernization process.

-

1.2 Aspects of Dependency and World System Theories

Other approaches to development appeared to explain factors not considered by the modernization school. Theories within the dependency perspective have sought to analyze the political economy of development and underdevelopment and the unequal relations between dominant and dependent countries (Baran 1957, Gunder Frank 1967, dos Santos, in Alvin So, 1992). Contrary to modernization theories that focused on internal factors as determining development, external relations of countries are important in determining the outcome of it, although one of the most important streams of this approach emphasize internal factors as also important to be considered in this regard.

Some authors (So, 1992) classify the dependency tradition as having three streams: (1) the neocolonial dependency model, which attributes Third World underdevelopment to a historically unequal relationship among rich and poor nations in a capitalist system; (2) The false paradigm model is less radical than the former, attributing underdevelopment to faulty advice by well-meaning, but often uninformed external experts, along with the resilient role of traditional unequal social structures that favor powerful interest groups and not the population as a whole; and (3) the dualist development thesis, presents the notion of dual societies, of rich and poor nations, and within poor nations, a minority of wealthy dominating a majority of poor people.

Another tendency within dependency theory, Cardoso and Falleto (1979) also focus on the interaction of internal with external actors, but some authors of the

dependency tradition criticize Cardoso for giving more attention to internal factors. Evans and Stephens (1988) describe this dependency perspective thusly: "Both authors built their arguments around historical case studies that integrated examination of local and international actors. At both levels, they emphasize interests rather than norms and values, economic and political structures rather than cultural patterns" (p.745). This viewpoint brings to the surface the political issue of deciding what kind of development a nation chooses for itself, depending on the power of its different groups, and external relations and possibilities.

Critics also charge dependency theory with displacing class relations from the Center of analysis of peripheral development. For critics, that fact misdirects political activity away from revolutionary action (Laclau, 1971). In this sense needed structural reforms including changes in the system of production that favor better income distribution do not occur.

Another development perspective, world system theories, is well represented by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974, 1979). For Evans and Stephens (1988) "Wallerstein provides a vision in which the logic of capital accumulation dictates not just relations among classes but also those among states and geographically defined zones of production. The position of individual states and societies within the world system may shift, but the structure of the system as a whole defines the pattern of development both globally and within individual societies"(p.745).

One of the important arguments defended by Wallerstein is the inseparability of social science disciplines, especially economics, politics, and sociology. The inseparability of these disciplines in the analysis of development as in the interrelationships among states is important in the globalized system of nations in the nineties. Wallerstein (1987) argues that:

The three presumed areas of collective human action—the economic, the political, and the social—are not autonomous arenas of social action. They do not have separate logic. More importantly, their intermeshing of constraints, options, decisions, norms, and rationalities is such that no useful research model can isolate factors' according to the categories of economic, political and social, and treat only one kind of variable, implicitly holding the other constant. We are arguing that there is a single 'set of rules' or a 'single set of constraints' within which the various structures operate (p. 313).

The consideration of multidisciplinary in the study of development is an attempt to incorporate an analysis of political economy into the realities one faces in developing countries. Issues like relations of production cannot be considered only in technical

terms, but the political strength and social position of actors will influence those relations. The distribution pattern of goods in an economy is usually not decided on the basis of the needs of a population, but the purchasing power of that population, which is defined by each person's position in the system of production and social relations. This study seeks to emphasize that the actions of different actors and sectors of the population influences its share in the system. Therefore, the emergence of social movements and other actors such as the as Non-government organizations (NGOs) may help in the building of new institutions that work toward strengthening the position of certain groups, thus increasing their power situation in relation to others that have dominating interests historically.

2. New Actors and Alternative Approaches in the Field of Development

Overall, the literature shows that the model of development adopted in many developing countries has not brought the improvements expected for people living in those areas. As well put by Reilly (1993), in both North and South, contemplation has given away to practical concerns. Politics and economics, state and market make way to civil society, voluntary associations, and communications networks. The scope and salience of the informal economy, the disappearance of traditional labor markets, environmental issues, linkages between development and migration, and the understudied but omnipresent issue of gender are examples of new concerns.

Moreover, there seems to be a consensus that economic activity and growth are central to development. But, besides meaning more than just economic growth, development also means the inclusion of all sectors and people with their social, political, and cultural realities in an economy, and not just selected people and sectors. In this regard, it is important to seek alternatives which include these different people and sectors in the economy and new ways to go about development work. For this, one of the aspects highlighted by the set of theories discussed in the first section and considered here as one important aspect of development is the changing of institutions. However, the institutional change is seen in this analysis in a new light, not as the changes proposed by the modernization approach, as for example increasing Weber's rationality, but including this rationality only in ways that serve the needs of the developing countries.

The institutional changes proposed considers as important the inclusion of

new actors, activities, and sectors in the economy. It considers, for example, the role of actors such as Non-government organizations and others from the Third Sector, as important in the field of development. The NGOs, for example, presents new approaches and dynamics in their work with the poor and marginalized groups in many parts of the Third World that are essential in a process that is aimed at ameliorating many of the socioeconomic problems confronted by those countries, which are among the basic development problems still to be solved. Their ways of dealing with the plight of the marginalized classes, using new methodologies and creating new mechanisms in their relation with states, for example, in the implementation of policies that serve those classes, are to be considered in the realities of developing countries such as Brazil today.

This perspective considers the position of authors such as Wolfe (1989), who discusses the role of the state, markets, and NGOs in development, when he refers to development generally and new realities: "From a social perspective, development is far removed from the pessimists who did not believe that development was possible and the optimists who believe that capitalism would transform every person into an instant consumer. Linking civil society and development calls for less ambitious plans, but for a recognition of the possible, working with what already exists, but seeking to expand and learn from experience rather than to overtheorize about what is and is not possible" (1991, p. 26). One example to consider is the work of NGOs with microenterprises given the latter production of basic goods for the population and employment creation and also their work on environment issues, central to any contemporary development strategies.

Part of the literature on the field has pointed to the NGOs as alternatives to mainstream development, because they tend to promote a kind of development that is more attuned to local conditions and people. NGOs are non-profit organizations, usually small, but vary in their work and action, have started with small projects on social change and expanded to shape policies. Authors studying them in Brazil (Souza 1992, Landin 1992) point to their growing numbers and the potential to expand their development role. However, their work will have major impact only if integrated with other institutions such as states and others in the private sectors which is open to do development work within the perspectives of the less privileged social classes.

The NGOs may become an enduring characteristic of peripheral economies. Souza (1991:8) points out that "while promoters of alternatives, resources and

projects, the NGOs are present in the complexities of the social life, creating micro-spaces and counter-powers, crucial for the development process in Brazil." Moreover, questions about mode of production, power, and distribution, and policies of support to each will show who will benefit from development, thus the importance of choices in this process, what reinforces the need for programs and policies that favor subordinated groups in the economy. In this way, society is seeking on alternatives to prescriptions such as those of Rostow's, that as societies achieved maturity, real income per head rose to a point where increasing numbers gained command over consumption that transcended basic food, shelter, and clothing, which have not materialized.

In this sense, the creation of new forms of relationship between State and Civil Society, but particularly between State and Non-government Organizations involved in activities of socioeconomic development is needed, with a institucionalist focus that seeks the materialization of these relationships in institutions capable of promoting more appropriate development models to the Brazilian reality. Many of the problems faced by this country from the beginning of its development process still persist, requiring a new posture of it in the search of alternatives. Alternatives that serve the needs of its populations and that promote necessary structural and institutional changes, even if for that is demanded the adoption of mechanisms of social organization of the production and distribution different from the ones of the present model. In fact, one of the problems that accompanied the development processes from its origin is the adoption of models, in the focus of the modernization, mainly, not adapted to its reality.

Given the state of inequality among individuals and countries, a limited resource base, and a globalized economic order, it is clear that a new social order needs to be built in the world economy. An order that allows more people to be removed from the poverty situation, because in varied ways, they will increasingly demand their share in the development. An appropriate alternatives ought to include in its structure changes in the production, distribution and consumption that are compatible with the demands of democratic societies, which would certainly be against the social and economic inequality levels still existing among and intra nations, and a new scenery where even the nature imposes limits to the current model.

Any appropriate development strategy to the Brazilian reality will need to deepen the study of the role of the State and of new actors as NGOs and organizations

of the Third Sector in the promotion of activities for communities at the local, national, and regional level, considering their social, economic, political and cultural realities and the emergency of activities such as the informal economy, and others, seeking to develop and to adopt a concept of socioeconomic development more adapted to that reality. A process conscious of its insertion in a global context, but that considers as useful and necessary activities that respond to a community's needs, considering its objectives, possibilities and potentialities in terms of its resources and of its external relationships, and the use of these resources in sustainable ways.

The NGOs develops activities for marginalized groups of the society, but they face limitations to support a larger number of them. Integration between NGOs and other institutions may be a form of improving the productivity and extension of those activities. Clearly, not even a high growth rate will absorb the growing number of unemployed people in Brazil and to reduce the socioeconomic problems, the State has to get involved with other actors in the society. The sectors concerned with development ought to consider that since many of the policies recommended by the modernization theories such as Rostow's predictions did not materialize, other mechanisms ought to be created to achieve the development goals.

Recently, there have been changes in the vision of the relationship among groups such as grassroots organizations, some members of the private and of the State sector, and the NGOs and an understanding that these actors are important partners in development. Although NGOs and states are still cautious in the subject, they now recognize the need for an integrated work that maximize resources and abilities, an improvement compared with the distrust of the two in the past (Alves, 1998). A partnership between NGOs or other organizations of the Third Sector might be a way of improving the performance and extension of development programs with views to the attendance of a growing number of people that need them. The creation and adaptation of the institutions involved in viable development alternatives make a significant difference for the necessary socioeconomic changes in Brazil, and certainly in several countries of the Third World.

3. Elements of Previously Development Theories and New Approaches to the Field

Among the key aspects of the three development perspectives just outlined,

one may call attention to: (a) the questions of industrialization and the sociological changes accompanying it; (b) Parsonsian structural-functionalism, (c) Weber's rationality; (d) The changing of normative patterns emphasizing 'particularism' by those emphasizing 'universalism'; (e) the replacement of ascription by achievement in order to motivate social actors to generate progressive changes; and (f) the need for structural or institutional changes. It is believed here that some of these 'receipts', as, for example, Durkheim's prescription to impose Western values on the "underdeveloped peoples," and Weber's rationality are at the roots of many of the problems when applying modernization theory to the different cultures, or "rationalities" of the peoples of developing world. How can one use the value of universalism in a world that is diverse by nature?

The modernization or 'development' of the third World countries would, according to those perspectives, find ways of inculcating the attitudes purported to prevail in advanced capitalist countries without being overwhelmed by the tensions created by such drastic value changes. And that process would generally involves structural differentiation because a complicated structure that performed multiple functions divides into many specialized structures that perform just one function each, increasing functional differentiation, progressive separation and specialization of roles and institutional sphere in the political system (Evans and Stephens, 1988). It is clear that most of the changes prescribed by the modernization approach promote specialization of functions, structures, and institutions in ways that fragment them. At the same time, this seems to go counter to the complexities of life caused by this same modernization process.

Another important point to note refers to the faith that as the Marshall Plan worked in Europe, a 'development' plan would also work on the third world countries. Critics say the Marshall Plan succeeded in Europe because the nations of that continent had the necessary structural, institutional, and attitudinal conditions to convert new capital effectively into higher levels of output. The Harrod-Domar (In Todaro, 1994) model also assumes the existence of the attitudes and institutions necessary for growth in underdeveloped nations: well-integrated commodity and money markets, highly developed transport facilities, well trained work force, motivation to succeed, efficient government bureaucracy, and managerial experience.

Among the elements highlighted by the theories of development discussed, the

need for institutional changes is chosen to be discussed here in more depth. Institutional changes is as central to development as structural and the other changes cited above, especially if a country seeks to adequate its institutions to respond to their socioeconomic realities. Change in the way institutions work must be a natural process in changing times.. The institutional changes talked about here concerns the way institutions go about to do development work. Whichever strategic plans there will be for a society, no institution alone can plan and/or solve the problems confronting developing nations today. The integration of private and public entrepreneurs of the various sizes, governments at the different levels, NGOs, grassroots organizations, and organizations of the Third Sector in the development process is the kind of institutional change discussed here.

These institutional, including organizational, changes ought to consider their social reality. Organizations have goals and functions to accomplish in their environment. When defining their goals, they base in the needs of some constituency and in their prospects that the product offered by them is of value to society. Some organizations though, have to act according to pressing needs and demands of their environment and do not have much latitude to choose the product they offer. This seems to be the case of many NGOs, which often have to start acting in their environment by serving pressing needs and do not even have favorable conditions to plan their activities in ways that could be more appropriate.

A positive corollary of this is that the NGOs may start and keep updating their work according to the needs of their environment and constituencies, what ought to be a characteristic of development work that aims to be effective and democratic. In a constant process of changes and adaptations these organizations might be better prepared to act in their environment than if they were established with rigid norms and rules to accomplish certain goals. Goals which ought to be defined with the participation of the public and various institutions if we are talking about a process of development that is being constructed by all people and sectors of a society. Changes and adaptations may not occur as smoothly as it would be the ideal, but NGOs are usually small and flexible organizations, features that may make it easier for them to change and adapt to new circumstances and demands than to organizations with more rigid structures.

In fact, this flexibility and adaptativeness should also be a characteristic of

states and other organizations working in development. Social reality is constantly in flux and a democratic state/organization would have to be flexible to adapt to new realities and changes. This is a kind of feature that government administrations could certainly learn with NGOs. The lack of flexibility may be at the roots of many problems states in developing countries face. The slowness and rigidities on their structure often prevent states from adapting on the speed needed to keep in pace with changing realities.

Many of the positive characteristics of the work of NGOs pointed out in the literature are their agility, flexibility, and ability to adapt and respond to the needs of their constituencies. Although it is not clear the state is ready to acquire those features, there are sectors within the state, at its different levels, which are and the state generally can certainly improve its practices when working with organizations, NGOs or others, that have them. The NGOs and these other organizations may also need to adapt to the way states work to some extent, so improvement in both sides occurs and the needed population will certainly be better served.

The integration among different organizations that look for development alternatives, and its articulation in strategic projects for the country or area, certainly favors the understanding that a development strategy should include the demands of the several sectors and individuals of the society, and that they can become partners in this enterprise. Institutional changes in the direction of more integration of different society actors are necessary here, so that alternative development projects are viable, as well as to sediment the articulation and commitment between the different projects and institutions. In this aspect, the State has the important function of agglutinating the organizations committed with a development project that has as goal the growth, but inside of a strategy of reduction of the inequalities, in the socioeconomic, political, and cultural spheres. In this way, we may finally advance in the construction of a really democratic social order, that has been going slowly and has even gone back in some aspects in the last years.

It may be necessary to concentrate in income generating activities and/or others of socioeconomic nature for these activities seek the attendance of the needs of income for considerable portion of the population in Brazil, and to the importance of the changes in the production and work relationships engendered by this type of activities. Changes that signal that new models that consider them need to be created,

since they do not fit well in the current models. In this perspective, it makes sense an effort for the re-design of existing or creating of new institutions that start to answer in a more adapted way to the needs of its economy and population.

It is also hoped that this economy looks for the attendance of the needs of its population and not just the conformation to laws and economic norms that a lot of times seek its maintenance in a global economic system that doesn't consider the needs of the different countries, but to its own interests in the international ambit. These changes can also be showing us the need for the critic to the methodological individualism of the neoclassical theory, justifying the creation or redraw of institutions and/or institutional mechanisms, more realistic to the Brazilian context, and capable of promoting the necessary socioeconomic changes in this reality.

Concluding Remarks

Different aspects of the theories discussed above could be included in a new light in a strategy of development that fits the reality of Third World countries such as Brazil today. Modernization of production and institutions may promote international competition and improvement of living standards for a population. Moreover, class as well as gender relations and issues of distribution and equality at both national and international levels need to be analyzed, taking into account local cultural realities, the environment, and as the dependency and world system theorists stress, each country's history and position in the world economy and the relations among countries in the new global order. In addition, in these relations, as in the development of the forces and relations of production, one ought to remember Wallerstein's argument of the inseparability of economic, political, and social factors internally as well in the external relations of countries.

In a perspective of analysis of institutional developments that promote necessary socioeconomic changes in countries such as Brazil, this study recommends the identification and exam of the work of NGOs and other organizations that support activities of employment generation and income in the country as well as other activities, programs and government policies at the different government levels, seeking: (a) to promote activities in the area of employment and income generation and others related to the socioeconomic development of communities at the local, national, and regional levels; (b) to deepen the discussions of the role of the State and

of the new organizations working in the field, seeking the development of new institutional arrangements capable of formulating and implementing a development agenda adequate to the reality of Third World societies; (c) to examine forms of creation of interaction mechanisms between government, development agencies, NGOs and other organizations of the Third Sector in the formulation and implementation of policies and programs, in the context of the new institutions, capable of institutionalizing the development activities examined as integral part of the effective economic system.

Such strategies ought to take into consideration the world economy and the postulates and recommendations of important international documents such as the Agenda 21, the document produced by the conference on the environment and development, given its importance in the formulation of development alternatives to the countries of the Third, and the First, World. The Agenda 21 is optimistic with relation to the resolution of the problems faced today by all nations in the world. Its evaluation is that in case these nations integrate the concerns of the environment and the socioeconomic development and devote more attention to that integration, it will be possible to satisfy the basic human needs, to elevate the quality of life for everybody, to obtain better managed ecosystems and to build a more prosperous and safe future for all. It is believed here that this document presents an opportunity for the construction of a new development process that works toward solving the still existing socioeconomic, environmental, and political problems in the field, when that process takes into consideration that document's principles and the possibilities, actions, and actors that ought to be considered in its design and implementation.

4. Bibliography:

- Alves, Arlete M. *Integração entre organizações Não-governamentais e Estado no process de geração de emprego e renda* In Anais do III Encontro Nacional de Economia Política 9-12 Junho de 1998, Volume I, 902-915, 1998.
- Cardoso, Fernando.H. & Enzo, Faletto. *Dependency and Development in Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Evans, Peter. *Embedded Autonomy: States & Industrial Transformation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Evans, Peter.B. and Stephens, J.D. *Development and the world economy.* In: Smelser, N.J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Sociology.* SAGE Publisher, pp. 739-773, 1988.
- Fernandes, Rubens César e Carneiro, Leandro .Piquet. *NGOs anos 90 - A Opinião dos Dirigentes Brasileiros .* Rio de Janeiro: ISER, 1992.
- Hirschman, Albert. *Auge y decadencia de la economia del desarrollo*, em Gersovitz, M. e outros. *Teoria y experiencia del desarrollo económico.* México. Fondo de Cultura Económica, pp448-469, 1985.
- Hunt, Diana. *Economic theories of development - an analysis of competing paradigmas*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.
- Laclau, E. *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory.* London: New Left, 1971.
- Landin, Leilah. *O Que é uma ONG? Text presented at the 3rd International Conference of Research on Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Indiana: Center on Philantropy, 1992.
- Reilly, Charles A. *Action, ideas, and policy.* In: Glade, W. and Reilly, C.A. (Eds.) *Inquiry at the Grassroots.* Inter-American Foundation, pp. 251-267, 1993.
- So, Alvin Y. *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories.* California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1990.
- Souza, Herbert. *As ONGs na década de 90.* Rio de Janeiro: IBASE, 5-10, 1991.
- Souza, Herbert. 1992. The NGOs in the 90s. In *Development, International Cooperation and NGOs: 1st Internat. Meeting of NGOs and the UN System*

Agencies. Rio de Janeiro.:IBASE.PNUD, 1992, 111-120.

Todaro, Michael. P. *Economic Development in the Third World*. New York: Longman, 1989.

Wallerstein, Imanuel. *The Modern World System 1: Capitalist Agriculture and the origins of the World Economy*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Wolfe, Alan. *Three paths to Development: market, state, and civil society. International*

Meeting of NGOs and the UN System Agencies. Rio de Janeiro, 1991.