

Towards the Idea of Democratic Developmentalism

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

TOWARDS THE IDEA OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM: ANALYSIS
OF LIBERALISM, COMMUNITARIANISM, DEVELOPMENTALISM AND
DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM.

By:

Hadgu Ataklti

Advisor:

Dr. Bekele Gutema

JUNE, 2016

ADDIS ABABA

Hadgu Ataklti

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

TOWARDS THE IDEA OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM: ANALYSIS
OF LIBERALISM, COMMUNITARIANISM, DEVELOPMENTALISM AND
DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM.

By:

Hadgu Ataklti

Advisor:

Dr. Bekele Gutema

THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN
PHILOSOPHY

JUNE, 2016

ADDIS ABABA

Hadgu Ataklti

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

TOWARDS THE IDEA OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM: ANALYSIS
OF LIBERALISM, COMMUNITARIANISM, DEVELOPMENTALISM AND
DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENTALISM.

By:

Hadgu Ataklti

Advisor:

Dr. Bekele Gutema

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

_____	_____	_____
ADVISOR	DATE	SIGNATURE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	DATE	SIGNATURE
_____	_____	_____
EXAMINER	DATE	SIGNATURE

Concept Paper

Title: Towards the Idea of Democratic Developmentalism: Analysis of Liberalism, Communitarianism, Developmentalism and Democratic Developmentalism.

Thesis Statement: Democratic developmentalism based on a given identity, context, culture is a better alternative than foreign Western based liberal system.

Abstract: I have been discussing the liberal system of thought and practice. In particular, I question whether it is equally applicable and viable for different forms of societies. The main reason is that its socio, political, and economic versions have many conceptual limitations, controversies and practical inadequacies. Its widely claimed structural imperative to some sides is part of its problem. Having that in mind, it is also an abstract, imposed, non-contextual ...system for different forms of societies and contexts. Not only that, that system downplays some traditional and newly emerging concepts and discourses. This paper is not a paper that rejects liberal system all in all in favor of another thought. But, it is to show that, either of liberal, communitarian, developmentalism system of thought and practices can't independently claim itself as a universal social and political philosophy and system of development and democracy for all humanity. They might be only viable in their respective contexts. Based on the stated limitations and inadequacies of liberal system; I am adamant to go for a conception of democratic developmentalism. I think that, it could be a good alternative to different social forms and contexts. Especially for least capable states, it may help to solve some of their problems related to democracy and development. Thus, following the critic on the origin, nature, characterization, rationalization of liberal system, to claim for an alternative of genuine conception of democratic developmentalism is my central point.

Acknowledgement

I am very grateful to my advisor Dr. Bekele Gutema, for his helpful discussions of earlier drafts of this thesis, and for his comments and constructive criticisms which were an inspiration.

I would also like to show my gratitude to the professors of department of philosophy for sharing their wisdom with me during the course of my study.

I would like to specifically thank Dr. Pelle Dorota, for his constructive ideas and for giving me very important materials on the area of my thesis. I am also very grateful to Dr. Setargew Kenaw for being so considerate to share me some ideas.

At the end, my heartfelt thanks go in plural to my family and my friends.

General Introduction

This is a paper on political philosophy. We get different conceptions or thoughts of social and political philosophies among forms of societies. It is an intent to discuss some principles and conceptions liberalism, communitarianism and developmentalism. I think, all forms of societies have their own understanding, principles and values towards society, individual, government and the relation among them. These different conceptions are the bases of my discussion on this paper. For instance, liberalism has its own conception, principles and values. The same is true with communitarianism and developmentalism. What are liberals', communitarians' and statist's' conceptions, principles and values? Why do we accept them? Why do we hold these values and principles? Why do we adhere to them, when we could instead simply act on instinct, whim, envy, and passion?

Since the 1980's, there is a heated debate between liberals and communitarians based on the conception, principles and values they have in their thoughts. And recently the conception of developmentalism also emerged as a late alternative. Still, lately, there is a notion of democratic developmentalism. This thesis will be an analysis of these conceptions, thoughts and their ideas. Mainly, it is a critical look at the liberal system of social and political philosophy. Through an examination of some of its major conceptions, ideas, principles and values, it is an attempt to understand and criticize the way how liberal social and political philosophy is usually perceived, construed and practiced. I will also look at other conceptions and thoughts of social and political philosophies, such as communitarianism and developmentalism. Furthermore, I will attempt on how to articulate alternative conceptions of social and political conceptions. The alternatives might be in the way how to advance other's authentic concerns.

In a current global status quo, there are several contexts. Contexts and conditions are not permanent or they are not rigid to change. Especially politics is dynamic, spontaneous and fluid. Accepted claims and conceptions of one system of thought could be overturned by another alternative tomorrow. Because all global contexts are incapable of equally conceiving or entertaining a particular system/thought/principle i.e. Western based liberal/neoliberal thought of individualism. Yet different contexts do not deny other alternative thoughts or conceptions to conceive. I think that a social and political thought, philosophy or conception must be based on a context. It must be open to self-criticism and self-correction. Its wild guesses and hypothesis must be rationally

and normatively founded. It must be tested against practical viability in every context, where it claimed to be applied. Otherwise, its foundation is practically under question.

Liberal/neoliberal system of thought and practice have become one of the dominant economic, social and political philosophies of our contemporary era. It is a widely believed fact that we, at least the majority of humanity, live in an 'age of neo-liberalism'. Towards the last quarter of 20th and the early decade of 21st centuries some states experienced alternative ways of looking at the arena of a socio-political sphere. Providentially, many social and political philosophies have their own philosophical foundations and values, i.e. liberalism based on the philosophy and value of individualism and liberty respectively. Even more, others claim that social and political philosophies require context and culture. That is why different social and political philosophies have given expression to various forms of political institutions and ways of human life.

Foundational principles, context and culture that required for a particular social and political philosophy or conception become part of contemporary debates on the area. Thus, I will analyze some conceptions based on their foundations, principles and values.

This thesis is a type of hypothetical research. In the course of the whole work of my thesis, I will use some materials, like books, articles, and websites to have more credible sources.

Chapter I

The Ideas of Liberalism, Communitarianism and Developmentalism

1.1 Introduction

Nowadays, there are plenty of social and political systems. To know and to have the best possible system might require some wise attempt. For academic purpose it may also require a philosophical approach to deal among many systems. And in this paper, I am not only to remind what and how some systems are, but also to analyze some of their natures and principles.

Liberalism, communitarianism, and developmentalism are conceptions that belong to some sets of economic, social and political insights. Liberalism is a social and political philosophy based on the principles of minimal state, liberty, equality etc. It got prevalent authority, dominance, and influence in our contemporary debates and practices. Nowadays, we do have many liberal states, societies, and people. It is one target of this paper. I will continue my discussion through some analysis on that liberal thought.

I ask myself that, what liberal thoughts, states and agents bring into humanity? We can see the conception and meaning of the liberal thought. We can also see the conditions of advanced and civilized liberal states or society. Having the ideas and practices of liberalism, one could fairly argue that, these thoughts and conditions have their own meaning to humanity. It gives humanity its own shape. It became a system of thought and practice for many states and societies. Therefore, that social and political philosophy and its structure, system, principles and values, which stand behind many of our contemporary societies and states are at the heart of this paper.

Lately, the challenges of communitarianism and developmentalism¹ on liberalism are part of it. Like other social and political philosophies, communitarianism and developmentalism have their own systems of thoughts and practices. I will also discuss if there is; difference or similarity among them and some common drives and goals for these conceptions. I will also see these issue alongside how they developed and argued from different scholars.

¹ **Note:** *Developmental state (DS) as social and political conception sometimes called as developmentalism (D) and for this paper I may prefer to use the latter to help me for some technical purpose. Meanwhile, in the case of democratic developmental state (DDS), I may say democratic developmentalism (DD) for the same purpose. Many narratives are also used the same way. While statist and democratic statist goes to the individuals who believe in both insights respectively.*

To see a liberal system of thought and practice alongside some other contemporary social and political conceptions is very important. I feel that we ought to address some economic, social and political limitations and problems of our contemporary time through such analysis on the frameworks of different social and political conceptions. Thus, one could also attempt a comparative outlook, following an analytical discussion on them. Now I will go to the discussion of the liberal system of thought and practice, but some background before that.

1.2. Historical Background

History never denies that, during 17th c, Europe was torn apart by series of violence and wars, mainly by religious wars. After several decades of extreme violence, people decide to put differences to one side and come together to form ‘rational’, secular, liberal and tolerant societies and states. They went through periods of terrible and consequent wars and violence till they secure that new order for their states/societies. They then exported this model of ‘rational’, secular, liberal and tolerant model of organization to the rest of the world. That was slowly accepted by many, while some were forced to accept it for different reasons. This is the history of how the modern rational, secular, tolerant and liberal order of the western world was invented and evolved.

There are vast narratives on the liberal system. There are its own core commitments, principles, values and basics, which make it a system. Despite its limitations and challenges, liberal states and societies reaffirm and readjust that liberal system into neoliberalism. Almost every aspect of liberal thought, principle and values become the important pillars and attributes of the neoliberal system of thoughts and practices.

In general, any social and political system has its own power to shape the status-quo of a society, state and overall development. The same is true of liberalism/neoliberalism. And this has been seen for many decades. To seek a qualitative and quantitative improvement in the economy, the well-being of the people and welfare of a state as a unit are highly determined by a social and political philosophy they used. That is why some social and political philosophies appear to fail to do so and face charges. There are indications, that liberal system show signs of failure, loss in dominance and got some critiques lately.

Some scholars and writers charge liberal social and political philosophy and its Basics. From an authoritarian statist view, neoliberalism charged dozens of problems. Statists like Meles accuse it as “socially wasteful and rent seeking”, most dependency theorist accuse it as structural imperative, exploitive and conceptually wrong. From communitarian view liberal system of thought and

practice is charged with many misconceptions of the self, community and the relation between them. Lately emerging democratic developmentalism also charges it as system responsible for underdevelopment, economic injustice, inability to advance out of poverty traps and other vicious circles. Even some republicans charge it as a source of deviant behaviors.

So that communitarianism and developmentalism appear as late challenges and alternatives to the liberal system of thought and conception. Even in Africa, a pragmatic shift and a rediscovery of the importance of the state in the development process and the need for a more capable state has been taking issue since the late 1990s, (Mkandawire, 2001 and Fritz and Menocal, 2007). These all challenges are intents to look at alternatives to the liberal system. To proceed let me say some points about political philosophy.

1.3 What is Political Philosophy?

Most of the time, people confused political theory or political ideology with political philosophy. Here a conceptual clarification is very important on these issues. Because to discuss political philosophy, one needs to differentiate all the above three concepts. The concepts could be interconnected and refer to the same area. But, they are different concepts. According to *T. Sargent*:

...political ideology, political theory, and political philosophy are frequently used to refer to different ways of thinking about political ideas. The first term... relates...to the beliefs of a group...The other two terms are often used interchangeably with nothing lost; [but] ... Political theory refers to generalizations about politics and society that are based on data, much as any generalization in any science. Political philosophy ...is explicitly evaluative or normative. (Sargent 2009:3-4)

Thus, political philosophy is a normative attempt towards a government, a social life, a ruling set of values and socio-political institutions. It is also a normative look towards relation between societies/individuals with their government. That provides standards to analyze and judge existing government, society, conceptions, institutions and relationships. The 'ought to be' nature of a political philosophy shows that how much political philosophy is founded on the basis of ethics, unlike political theory, political science and political ideology. Because the last three are mainly descriptive, while the first is essentially a normative one.

Political philosophy is, therefore, a philosophical approach to politics, may be it seeks to give an answer to the questions around the nature, limit, source and requirements of political authority, power, institutions and relations. In addition to that, it examines normative issues of justice, equality, and fairness among other basic concepts. As well it deals with the philosophies, principles,

and values that are at the base of political organization of humans. Thus, its area is politics, its approach is normative and its context is a human society.

Thus, I can say that political philosophy is a critical examination and evaluative analysis of political ideas, concepts, thoughts, institutions and relation among political and social agents in a rational and normative way. Thinking through political philosophy is a search for normatively adequate and well-founded social and political philosophy. That could give a better dimension for political organization and wellbeing of a society.

A philosophical approach to politics is not a recent human insight. That approach of philosophy towards politics has a long history since Plato's justice in his Republic up to the recent work of John Rawls and his contemporaries. There is no such a single normative principle to politics, rather many approaches and conceptions of political philosophies. Thus, there are different normative understanding of liberty, justice, freedom, individual, community or society, government, political authority, political legitimacy and political institution which are basic concepts and terms in social and political philosophy. One can see the, thoughts of Plato and Aristotle on the polis, the conception of the sovereign state of Machiavelli and Hobbes, conception of the constitutional government of Locke, conception of democracy in Rousseau and Tocqueville and conception of neoliberal thought of J. Rawls, late conceptions of communitarianism and developmentalism of some Asians. These are many important attempts by scholars around the area. But I take them roughly among many others.

Through time and contexts, there are different social and political philosophies at the heart of attempt to organize human society politically. To list liberalism, communitarianism, developmentalism and democratic developmentalism are among the most recent models and the logics behind those models are: the logic of commitment to liberty, freedom, market governed political economy and minimal state is the paradigm of liberalism; the logic of massive concern to community and state-directed common good of a community are the backbone of communitarian thought; while the logic of state governed political economy goes to developmental state as a principle; lastly, the logic of state governed political economy and focal point to components of democracy and human rights, at the same time, are widely attributed to the conception of democratic developmental state.

Having this in mind, I would like to go for the next topics which are very important. However, I will go into a quick analysis and evaluative discussion of particular social and political

philosophies. My attempt is not to make a case on each and every normative understanding of each conception of social and political philosophy. Rather, it is to have a general and critical look on some selected social and political understandings. Now it is to begin with liberalism.

1.3.1 What is Liberalism?

It is an unclear issue where and when specifically the thought of the liberal system of thought and its principles, values, practices, and experiences give way to being. Some scholars say it is about 16th c, some say 17th c, while others say 18th c, still some say 19th c. In a similar case, some claim the works of Smith invisible hand or Hobbes's ideas of liberty or Luther's ideas of reformation or while other scholars claim for other contributions to the liberal system. But these all claims are quite down absurd. For the first case, a century is a long time and that claim lacks precision and in the second case, an individual could not launch the totality thought of liberalism at a specific time. Liberalism is a broad term sheltering many different forms and versions within it. Thus, its outshine must be shaped and developed through a long gradual process. It must have also many contributors, both in group and individual, like the above ones.

Different scholars suggest different ideas regarding the base of liberalism. It has been widely said that neoclassical economic perspectives, the Austrian critique of Keynesianism, monetarism are among many others. More concretely, this has been said for liberalism and other thoughts of modernity in general:

...historical remarks make evident, essential to liberalism is the moral criticisms of dictatorship, arbitrary power, intolerance, repression, persecution, lawlessness, and the suppression of individuals by entrenched orthodoxies. (Kekes 1997:3)

In a different manner, even other could say that capitalism, liberalism, and neoliberalism are essentially the same thoughts only they reformed and rearranged systems almost in the same line of thought. My idea is that liberalism has not only those suggested political and social urges but also economic and cultural bases to raise as such. However, I did not believe that it emerged as a matter of fact. It is a matter of gradual process since the enlightenment and reformation movements through now. Thus, I feel, like many scholars, that there is no such a linear account in the rise of liberalism.

But, here, it seems demanded case to say about the definition of the term. What is liberalism? The term is frequently used in a political discussion. Meanwhile, confusingly, it can also refer to a social, economic, cultural and other human aspects. What principle really determines a socio-

political thoughts/practices be liberal? A definition for liberalism should base on necessary/sufficient conditions that meet all versions and forms of liberalism. But there is no such like set and that case make liberalism an obscure term to define. The definition of liberalism has remained me a problematic concept and there is little agreement as to what really it is. But in the absence of a single plausible definition there are many descriptions that apply to many versions and forms of liberalism.

The etymological meaning of the term “liberal” is to mean “free” or “not a slave” as it derived from the Latin word “liber” and this can say something sensible to the late political sense of the term in the Western world. Early, in 17th and 18th c English and French renaissance and enlightenment thinkers alongside movement for self-governance in America were entertained movements and thoughts widely debated as the mother womb of liberalism? In 19th c with the urge individuals to be free from constraint or prejudice the political sense of the term developed. There are widely believed notions of some liberal thinking and ideas in ancient classics too. But here, I will discuss the modern and contemporary concept and idea of liberalism, which come alongside movements of enlightenment and reformation. According to *T. Sargent*:

*...the root word in liberalism is liberty. Some ... find liberalism in ancient Greece and Rome, but liberalism is most commonly traced to the English revolutions of the [17th c]. Politically, liberalism originated in the revolution of the 1640s... Today most liberals argue that liberalism is primarily concerned with liberty, and they trace their roots to ... Mill (1806–1873) and his ... book *On Liberty* (1859), which stressed freedom of thought and speech. (Sargent 2009:140-1)*

J. Locke's, “Two treatises on government” of 1689 considers intellectual and economic liberty and idea of natural rights. Mill's thought of liberty and the contribution of Scottish enlightenment thinkers, through the works of D. Hume and A. Smith, to liberalism are also important, mainly the later argue for the “invisible hand” in his influential work of “The wealth of The Nation”, 1776. Meanwhile in France; B. de Montesquieu advocate a law that confine government, even a monarch, alongside the idea of “laissez-faire”; J. Rousseau's and Voltaire's argument for natural freedom and “constitutional monarchy” respectively are also evident thoughts about liberalism in France. The American surge for self-governance, during the second half of 18th c, was influenced and has the intellectual bases from the ideas of T. Jefferson, T. Paine. And J. Adams, who argue for “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” as well as for democratic government and individual liberty. And later, liberal ideas gradually expanded its influence much more almost to the whole Western world as essential social and political philosophy and as means to secure liberty and equality.

But, what many seem to agree on is the descriptions of liberalism. This time, most scholars have contented themselves in describing what liberalism is. There could be many different descriptions of liberalism and are similar to each other. I think that the different descriptions of liberalism are due to the different versions it has; economic, political cultural and social, and forms; classical, new they are not the only versions and forms but to list some of them.

Liberalism as a social and political philosophy is a broad system. It has several forms and versions. When I come with the notion of versions of liberal thoughts we can see the following among others. Economic liberalism is, roughly, a quest for the minimal interference of government to the economy. Cultural liberalism is liberal thought or view that stresses the freedom of individuals from cultural dogmas. Social Liberalism roughly stands to seek governments to play an active role to guarantee real freedom for citizens, thereby to ensure that citizens are healthy, educated and free from poverty. There are also different liberals and forms of liberalism.

Despite various forms and descriptions of liberalism, there is no agreed single definition. However here are some definitions I refer from both Business and Merriam-Webster Dictionaries online and they stated like this respectively: It is “preservation of individual liberty and maximization of freedom of choice”. It is “emphasizing individual freedom from restraint and usually based on free competition, the self-regulating market, and the gold standard’. The first associated with its political version while the second is more economic one. Encyclopedia Britannica also stated; it is ‘protecting and enhancing the freedom of the individual to be the central [issue] of politics’ despite the different definitions of liberalism, in one way or the other, they consider individual liberty, freedom, and minimal government to be their most important social and political goals among many others. Thus, liberals’ commitment towards liberty, freedom, minimal state, market economy and the like principles are common to them.

The principles and values of liberalism are interdependent and reinforced to each other. First, the notion of plurality come from the demand to value the reasonable conception of the good life of each according to each. This plurality notion demand a minimal state that obliged to formulate and maintain laws that allow the ruled to live their wishes. That is a neutral stand of the state towards a conception of the good life of individuals and it create the condition to plurality, liberty, and equal right. Good life based on the plurality of reasonable conception of the good life of individuals, in turn, allow them freedom and equality, still that, in turn, promote just distribution to pursue their

conception of good life. Individuals, act for themselves autonomously. Thus, the basic liberal values that liberals commit themselves too are plurality, freedom, right, equality, distributive justice, minimal state and the aim of liberalism is to form, maintain and foster these values. Social organization and state based on the line of liberalism is aimed and justified to value these principles. The formation, justifications, and high commitment towards these principles of liberalism are much interwoven. And some almost all liberals agree on most basic principles:

Liberals have typically maintained that humans are naturally in “a State of perfect Freedom to order their actions...as they think fit...without asking leave, or depending on the Will of any other Man” (Locke, 1960 [1689]: 287). Mill too argued that “the burden of proof is supposed to be with those who are against liberty; who contend for any restriction or prohibition.... The a priori assumption is in favor of freedom... (1963, vol. 21: 262). Recent liberal thinkers such as J. Feinberg ...S. Benn... and J. Rawls...agree. (Gaus, Gerald, Courtland, Shane D. and Schmidtz, David, , 2015)

Thus, liberalism could be described as a cluster of social, political and economic thoughts based on the commitment towards the above-discussed principles. Social, political and economic aspects are targets of the commitment for these principles. Liberals have much in common but sometimes they disagree. Some rise argument for and against both new and classical liberalism, some argue for and against both negative and positive rights, still some argue for and against government intervention among liberals.

Of course, liberals disagree among themselves ... The disagreements among liberals today are primarily focused on how to balance governmental activity and personal freedom and what role the government should have in the economy. Present disagreements are not about fundamentals but ...degree (Sargent 2009: 143)

In the case of right, some stand for negative rights, while some stand for positive rights, and still some others for middle ground on both rights. In relation to it, some stand for state intervention while some condemn it. On liberty I can state this:

For Berlin and those who follow him, then, the heart of liberty is the absence of coercion by others; consequently, the liberal state's commitment to protecting liberty is, essentially, the job of ensuring that citizens do not coerce each other without compelling justification. ...Rousseau... seemed to advocate a positive conception of liberty ... one was free when one acted according to one's true will (the general will), [his] conception was best developed by the British neo-Hegelians ...such as H. Green and B. Bosanquet. (Gaus, Gerald, Courtland, Shane D. and Schmidtz, David, , 2015)

But, liberals alike commit themselves to liberty, despite the conception of liberty varies from Berlin and his followers' negative conception of liberty up to Rousseau and his followers' conception of positive liberty, as stated in the quotation. One of the ultimate human value under liberal thought is an autonomous self who can enjoy his liberty. Many scholars widely challenged that this liberals' theory of value has the limitation on the ground. It accused that, sustainably

unattainable for any society-embedded individual and communitarian challenged it in a substantial way. I will see this in the next chapter, now I will go to other principles of liberals.

On state intervention, practically, new/modern liberalism, as it stands against old liberalism and still avoiding any collectivist approach, got many followers. Like J. Dewey and J. M. Keynes among others argue how government should intervene. Later following the great depression, others like F. Hayek and M. Friedman, launch the counter argument for them and their idea of new liberalism, as they contend that too much government intervention and regulation are unnecessary.

For classical [or old] liberals ... liberty and private property are intimately related. ... [They] have insisted that an economic system based on private property is uniquely consistent with individual liberty, allowing each to live her life ... as she sees fit. Indeed, [They] and libertarians have often asserted that in some way liberty and property are really the same things ...” while “... ‘New’ [or] ‘revisionist’ liberalism challenges the intimate connection between personal liberty and a private property based market order. (Ibid)

I always felt, the inconsistency of property rights and liberty. That property rights, those considered to being consistent with liberty for old liberals, bring inequality of wealth and then capability, power, which can have negative effects on liberty. This case could be a counter fact for liberty as a core value of liberalism. That is why this condition give a chance for liberals to revise old liberalism and give to the rise of new one. Thus, the debate over state intervention among them remains unsolved.

There is also a debate on the comprehensiveness of liberalism as it also invites non-liberals. On that question, in on side, some stated that it is only a political theory and while others argue that it has broader theories of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, value, society. So some argue that it is comprehensive while others reject as it is not. Furthermore, the applicability of liberalism is also a widely debated issue among both liberals and non-liberals alike. Would liberal system justify for all political communities is the question that mesmerizes many thinkers? This divided scholars into Universalist position like T. Page and M. Nussbaum and anti-universalistic position like J. Rawls, J. S. Mill. For instance here is Mill’s view On Liberty “Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion” (1963, vol. 18: 224)). In that case, I would argue that it is not applicable everywhere, rather it is highly contextual and time dependent. According to a site:

...liberalism is not a universal human ideal but one restricted to the context, prosperous, industrialized and democratic states; that individuals are formed in essential ways by the context into which they were born and in which they have been raised. (Kekes, 1997:15)

It is impossible to separate liberalism from the philosophical foundations and justifications that it rests on. Every social and political philosophy has its own conception of human nature, society,

liberty, right, duty, political power, political authority, political and social relation and the like issues. The same is true for liberalism. However, different segment of humanity has its own conception of these. Meanwhile, liberalism is a random insight of some segment of humanity. Therefore, some might be backward and irrational to reject it, while some could be rational and advanced to reject it, at least, based on the social and political setups and endogenous understandings they may have. Fairly some may argue to reject it as it appears to be a threat to public order in their context and human society in general. So, liberalism must have its own context to fit. Thus, the universality claim of liberalism could be challenged from a rational ground. Based on many possible social contexts, forms and setups, different social and political philosophies may require different context. Based on that, every social and political philosophy can have its own merit and demerit. Not only that, one could be the possible fittest for some context while it could be a misfit insight to others.

In general debates around the new and old versions of liberalism, nature and meaning of liberty and freedom, its comprehensiveness and its applicability are widely debated issues. Roughly, the first two are debates among liberals while the second two are open for non-liberals too. Despite that, there are core beliefs, basic values and political program of liberals and I call them, in general, basics of liberalism or liberals. In fact, since there is no such a huge substantial difference between them the basics of liberalism are still basics of neoliberals. If I have said this much about liberalism I will go to the next topic which is neoliberalism.

1.3.2 What is Neoliberalism?

Even though there are no clearly stated criteria, liberals and non-liberals alike widely claimed that there are different kinds and forms of liberalism namely classical, social/egalitarian, conservative, neoliberal, American, cultural, economic among others. Sometimes neoliberalism is claimed as a form of liberalism. A commitment and strong justification for values of individual liberty, equality, economic freedom, minimal and democratic government and the rule of law among many principles and values are common to both, liberalism and neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is the intensification of the influence and dominance of capital; it is the elevation of capitalism, as a mode of production, into an ethic, a set of political imperatives, and a cultural logic. It is ... a project to strengthen, restore, or...constitute anew the power of economic elites. ... [It] is ...not a new turn in the history of capitalism. It is more simply, and more perniciously, its intensification, and its resurgence after decades of opposition from the Keynesian welfare state and from experiments with social democratic and welfare state politics. (Harvey, 2005:256)

"Neo" means something a revival of an old sort or a revitalization of an old kind. So what was the old kind? What was the old system? It was liberalism and neoliberalism is revival/revitalization of liberalism. It is a renewal and reaffirmation of liberalism in a new fashion. It is all about a redefinition of old liberalism. Thus, in principle and practice, neoliberalism is a re-articulation of liberalism into actual policies.

Neoliberals like liberals do not call liberty is value, however, they place and preach it as a value above all good. An autonomous life based on the philosophy of individualism is at the base of their thought. Thus, their value is on liberty and individualism. They are also methodologically monists. The conception of the self is at their metaphysical foundation of their thought. They also favor free trade and deregulation, minimal state, privatization, lowering of income and corporate tax.

In the case of whereabouts does neoliberal thoughts and practices come to happen, it is not a matter of fact likewise what I argued for liberalism, rather it evolved as a matter of process through different steps. Similar to my conception, this claim has been claimed widely; "The roots of neoliberalism are long and varied, and its emergence cannot be dated precisely." (A. Saad-Filho and D. Johnston, 2005:2) Precision on spatiotemporal of neoliberalism is somehow difficult.

Meanwhile, if we question to know what, when and where the seeds and cores of neoliberal thought developed? We can have many works of scholars that can widely attribute to it. A. Smith is one of the widely debated scholars who contribute for the seeds of liberalism and neoliberalism alike, at least in its economic version of the thought, through his conception of an invisible hand. He credited like this;

The foundations of neoliberalism go back to Smith's Wealth of Nations., the fundamental assumptions underpinning neoliberalism remain those proposed by Smith" It is not the only seeds of neoliberal that saw him, having the similarity both in mind the same is true for liberalism. (Sargent, 2009: 59)

Since it is a rearrangement and reaffirmation of liberal thoughts, it could be a bizarre issue to determine the time and place whereabouts neoliberalism has advanced. It is not worthy to deal with its spatiotemporal cases. But for the matter of its orientation, I can discuss some points. It is widely believed that neoliberalism was coined in 1938-and came into use in the 1960s. It is also widely attributed to the western world mainly Anglo-American culture and commitment. "Neoliberalism, emerged, first within the countries of the center – beginning with the [UK] and the [US] and then gradually exported to the periphery." A. Saad-Filho and D. Johnston, 2005:2. Having the intimate relation with the forces of the center or most capable states, neoliberalism is a new project of global elites. Despite, it rarely mentioned by the mainstream press of our world,

it becomes the dominant means of the global elite's projects on economic, social and political orders. It reshaping our society and economy. It seems manipulated and orchestrated by agents behind it. As of T. Sargent:

Neoliberalism represents a reassertion of the fundamental beliefs of the liberal political economy that was the dominant political ideology of the nineteenth century, above all in Britain and the United States. The arguments of political economy were based on intuition and assertion rather than on rigorous analysis. (Ibid, 2009: 67)

Neoliberalism does not occur in a vacuum. It has social, cultural, political, economic and strategic motivations and bases. Approaches to regulate the deregulated glob, approach towards social life based on self-autonomy and strategies for management of abstract circulation and expansion of the values and principles of liberal thoughts are highly guarded and based on interests of some society. In its worst form, neoliberalism is associated with arrogant centrist, hegemonic² and imperial projects. "Neoliberalism is inseparable from imperialism and globalization." A. Saad-Filho and D. Johnston, 2005:2. Despite many claims from different critical narratives on neoliberal thoughts and projects, the project and the end of neoliberal thought remain unclear and I can only critically analyze its base and nature. But to add a little bit, this have been said on how similar attributes it has with a centrist attempt.

...the so-called process of globalization ...is merely the international face of neoliberalism: a worldwide strategy of accumulation and social discipline that doubles up as an imperialist project, spearheaded by the alliance between the US ruling class and locally dominant capitalist coalitions. (Ibid: 2)

One can say that neoliberalism is not a value-free social and political system. That social and political system could not be independent of the inherent project and context of neoliberals. If we can see the following words taken from a critical reader on neoliberalism's motivations and bases, it will be very clear.

The revival of neoliberalism was also aided by economic and cultural factors. ...Economic...the success of New Deal Keynesianism may have contributed to its own undoing [intellectual division among the Keynesian].... Cultural...America [which is one of the states at the center of the system] has always celebrated radical individualism. (Ibid: 30)

The basics of liberal thoughts are unchanged in a neoliberal thought too. From this one can argue that there is no substantial difference between the two. From the very beginning, neoliberalism is not a social and political system like a season that has a natural pattern meant to follow in the

² **Note:** By hegemony, I mean global hegemony that refer to the influence, dominance and growing power of westerners and their system of thoughts and practices over the global south. The hegemon is a capable agent (state or group of states) behind that condition and process.

history of humanity. It has no naturally ordained pattern to follow to be part of human history. It is rather a random invention of human talent and experiences out of the plenty possible alternatives of looking at the general spectrum of social and political philosophy.

In any given period of history, a culture is to be judged by its dominant philosophy, by the prevalent trend of its intellectual life as expressed in morality, politics, economics, culture, art etc. Neoliberal/liberal intellectuals, at least since they are dominant, are the voice of a culture, structure, system and, therefore, they are leaders, integrators and bodyguards of their system and its structure.

1.3.3 What is communitarianism?

Communitarianism is a social and political philosophy. It is a form of collectivism. In contemporary debates, it is challenging to the liberal system of thought. Communitarians are individuals and/or groups who stand and commit themselves to the ideas, values and principle of communitarianism.

We can get elements of communitarianism in many historical, political and religious works—e.g. in the New Testament Acts 4:32: “Now the whole group of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one claimed private ownership of any possessions, but everything they owned was held in common”. In Islamic concept of Shura or “consultation” and in Confucianism similar pattern of thought are evident. These are among others apart from intellectual and philosophical works of political philosophers. See the following;

Communitarian thinking is not an American import. Its roots sprout from ancient Greece and the Old and New Testaments. ... While each society must evolve its own communitarian answers, the challenges are similar. Man and woman do not live by bread alone; it is unwise to believe that all we need is economic rehabilitation. We require our daily acts to be placed into a context of transcendent meaning and their moral import made clear. (Niki Raapana, 2005)³

Communitarianism seems to have arisen in various thoughts by many scholars. Some say that it arose in Aristotelian thought, T. Aquinas thought, traditional African way of life, alongside “Asian Value”. While some say it emerged in 1980's with communitarian thinkers, or generally during 19th C and the like. I would appreciate all the communitarian views in all the thoughts and traditions of humanity, but now I will go to the modern and contemporary communitarian view.

It is widely argued that a person behind the modern and contemporary sense of the term communitarian is G. Barmby, as he coined it in 1841, and the term refers to utopian socialist and

³ <http://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/communitarian/niki.htm>

communal lifestyles. Later in the 1980's the term gained its recent social-political currency. It is by the works of some political philosophers who argued for the importance of community and common good against liberal's thoughts of individualism, autonomy and individual rights.

Communitarianism does not mean only in favor of community at the expense of individuals. There are communitarians who go for more emphasis on community over individuals where others are modest and go for the balance in which "[They] wish to place community and individual on a collision course, saying there is some kind of balance that is needed between the rights of individuals and the rights of the community" Freeman: Ideas on Liberty, Tibor R. Machan, 1991. This position seems in a search of middle ground around some Marxian whole cell collectivist nature and a particularistic relativism of liberalist and capitalist line of thought.

Communitarianism stands as a social and political philosophy that emphasize on the collective or community to enhance the degree of wellbeing and welfare of both society and individual. For them, that is also better for the notion of justice, right and freedom. It is a collectivist approach and methodologically holist towards society and politics. Communitarianism was originally considered a critique of liberalism but also, it is a philosophy with its own unique ideas that are supposed to be good towards individuals and community.

The core principle of communitarianism is a community. Communitarians argue that, to some extent, all individuals are created by and embedded in specific communities. Our beliefs, moral systems, and senses of a self come from the community or communities of which we have been and are a part. (Sargent, 2009:145)

The communitarian emphasis on the importance of community and how individuals are embedded and molded through that for the good functioning of political life. They claim this understanding of human identity/nature and well-being of humanity is indispensable.

1.3.4 What is Developmentalism?

Developmentalism is another social and political conception that emerged lately.

Though the provenance of the term 'developmental state' goes back to C. Johnson's study of ...the Ministry of International Trade and Industry in Japan, Johnson 1982" Developmental states, effective states and poverty reduction are common in our contemporary time. (Leftwich, 2008:11)

J. Chalmers is a person who widely credited for his first invention of the term, "developmental state". In his conception, the regulatory orientation and the development nature of a state are the central points of it. Intervention, as well as extensive regulation and planning, are basic in its theoretical and practical sense. Here are some definitions of developmentalism that forwarded by scholars: "Developmental state can be conceived as an interventionist state" P. Caldentey, 2009.

“A state that is capable of deploying the requisite institutional architecture and mobilizing society towards the realization of its developmentalist project” Edighegi, 2010: 4. It is where “a government is involved in the macro and micro-economic planning to effect economic growth” (Onis, 1991). It is while there is “state-led economic development” (Boyd/Ngo 2005: 1; Rapley 1996: 118-119; Woo-Cumings 1999: 63.

Meanwhile developmentalism has a number of forms we can see Deyo, 1987; Haggard, 1990; Johnson, 1982; and Wade, 1990, among others. Its characteristics also vary and we can see Thompson, 1996; Woo Cumings, 1999 among others. Historically, in cases of “China, Botswana, Mauritius, and Australia”, Rodrik, 2002: 11 could be also good evidences. These have some general attributes in common but they are not identical nor closely similar.

Those definitions, nature and forms of developmentalism has some similarity with famous Keynesian thinking. Both have some common ideas. The later has gotten a high credit and success before it was counter-attacked by neoliberals in 1980’s and 90’s, and that critic resulted into an adjustments and shifts on its pros and cons. The relevance of developmentalism thought and practice is insightful, despite some charges towards its lack of adherence of democracy and human rights. That charge mainly comes from liberals. The undemocratic nature of developmentalism might be its limitation. But if that case been charged by liberals to developmentalism they may have their own response. Later, I will discuss this as both sides will contend on this issue.

Developmentalists/statists are individuals or groups who commit or entertain the idea and conception of developmentalism. They feel that developmentalism refer for a state that sets economic development as its top priority of government policy and is able to design effective strategies to promote such a structure and goal. Arguably they thought that vicious circles, corruption and poverty traps that highly dominated in less capable states can be removed by state-led action. A state-led social, political and economic affairs is at the heart of their conception. That is also a source of optimism for development. Even some statist believe that development is a political process first, then economic and social process. Because they believe that, creation of a political set-up that is conducive to accelerated development is a first step.

Consequently, ‘developmental’ in the conception of ‘developmental state’ requires the state to intervene and guides the direction and pace of economic development. Under that conception the state directly intervening in the development process, instead of relying on the free influence of market forces to allocate economic resources.

In a general way, developmentalism as a conception is an attempt to combine theories, capacities, visions, norms and ideologies to solve and transform social, political and economic problems in a different and alternative way to liberal thought.

1.4 The Emergence and Development of Communitarianism

In the next chapter I will discuss the liberal-communitarian debate, now I must raise some points that can give me a good grasp on the emergence and development of contemporary communitarianism. Because one may ask that, what is unique and different about contemporary communitarians' conception and emphasis of community? Because, even though in various ways, the notion and conception of a community was attributed almost with every social and political conception. This is why I required adding some discussion about it. Modern philosophies and ideologies like socialism, conservatism, liberalism, nationalism, communitarianism, and republicanism may have their respective conceptions of liberty, equality, and community. But the contemporary communitarian view became an ardent position to debate with liberal thoughts. Roughly speaking the communitarian's emphasis on the importance of community got a contemporary credit. One could not deny the human interdependence and collectivist nature in a web of relations. So that they also claim, the self is also dependent and part of the collective. Meanwhile, there are different versions of communitarianism; Philosophical, academic, ideological, and responsive communitarianism. In their case of a community, all communitarianism, in general, could go for three forms of valued communal life; the community of memory, the community of commonplace, and psychology community. However, it is important to discuss the different versions of communitarianism before discussion on the heated debate between liberalism and communitarianism.⁴

Ideological communitarianism: Some communitarians accuse leftist who shifts power from local communities and democratic institutions in favor of centralized bureaucratic structures by the name of fair and equal distribution of benefits and for not supporting welfare rights that sustain the economy and community. Thus, their position heading to have a powerless and alienated form

⁴For the versions and forms of communitarian thoughts I use these websites. There is no direct sentence or phrase, I closely paraphrased from the following links, credit goes to them, <http://www.britannica.com/topic/communitarianism> <https://debate.uvm.edu/handbookfile/pubpriv/046.html> [http://www.luc.edu/faculty/twren/phil389&elps423/lib com article.htm](http://www.luc.edu/faculty/twren/phil389&elps423/lib%20com%20article.htm). and <http://web.missouri.edu/~johnsonrn/comm.html>

of political dealing. When they contend to the political right, they give little emphasis to social responsibilities and to the values of communal life, and to getting reciprocal communal benefits as a result of the interaction, relation, and ties. That erode communal, societal, and familial ties and moral fabrics.

Responsive communitarianism: Like Etzioni, Galston, R. Bellah, B. Barber may attend for a modest communitarianism. This position of communitarianism may be considered as a synthesis of both liberalism and academic-communitarianism, as it concerns to get a middle ground between them. They would argue that overemphasize autonomy and rights of an individual at the expense of the common good and promoting the common good in a paternal way and at the expense of substantial and basic human rights are two extremes and need a mean somewhere between them. They thought that neither individual human dignity nor the social dimension of human existence should be ignored or violated at that mean point.

Philosophical Communitarianism: this position widely deals with metaphysical, epistemological and ethical issues or concerns. The metaphysical conception of the community, the methodological and epistemological relation that it has with values and beliefs exist in public space are the center of the concern of this position.

Academic communitarianism: Elsewhere, there are Academic communitarians that demonstrated since the works and thoughts of Aristotle and through G. F. W. Hegel as they argue for some conceptions of the social good must be formulated on the social level, meanwhile community should not be a neutral agent in a normative realm of the social web of their interaction.

Generally, a value of community is not sufficiently recognized in modern liberal thoughts, especially on liberals' theories of justice. As a reaction, general advocacy for civil society, especially community is a project of communitarians. Because the significances of cooperation, kindness, reciprocity, trust, integration, solidarity etc. in civil society are highly valued by communitarians. Communitarians shared the same interests and perspectives, when, in fact, it would be closer to the truth to say that what they shared was a loose set of methodological commitments, the most important of which was a collectivist approach to their conception. Their emphasis on civil society, mainly community, is their central point. Despite there are different versions and forms of communitarianism, I do not think that all communitarian are hostile to liberalism, rather their conception is a different emphasis and interest towards civil society i.e. community than an individualistic belief of liberalism.

The new communitarians... believe that community already exists, in the form of common social practices, cultural traditions, and shared social understandings. The community does not need to be built de novo, but rather needs to be respected and protected. (Kymlicka, 2002:209)

The communitarians' social and political perspective have entered to a central debate in contemporary social and political philosophy. It was during the 1980's with the work of M. Sandal; Liberalism and the Limits of Justice (1982) that develop ardent critiques of Rawlsian liberalism. Other political thinkers like A. MacIntyre, M. Walzer, C. Taylor and W. Kymlicka also have contributed to the development of communitarianism. With the rise of communitarianism, liberal individualism got a rigorous challenge. It was not an easy case for the stand of liberals and neoliberals. That critic gives the way to the so-called 'liberal-communitarian debate'.

The new communitarians are united by the belief that political philosophy must pay more attention to the shared practices and understandings within each society. They also agree that this requires modification of traditional liberal principles of justice and rights. They differ, however, on how these principles should be modified. (Ibid, 2002:209)

Before enlightenment and reformation movements the social-political conditions were widely dominated by the nature of authoritarianism, tyrannical governments, arrogant communities, rigid dogmas of religion. Classical liberalism could be considered as a reactive conception to these kinds of cultures of centuries. While neoliberalism is a refined extension of classical liberalism. Mainly, contemporary communitarianism is also a reaction to an excessive and undue emphasis of individuals in a liberal system. Meanwhile, liberals may charge the communitarian's position like it is similar to East Asian authoritarian communitarianism that lacks democratic aspirations. Or it is Marxist rhetoric with little reform that vague what constitute a common good for a society. Or its social, economic and political designs of the common good can sometimes be oppressive. They may react like this as some ideas are summarized by W. Kymlicka about that issue.

After the [WWII] ...the community seemed to drop out of the picture. For example, in Theory of Justice, Rawls says that his work is intended to provide an interpretation of the concepts of liberty and equality. It is not that Rawls explicitly rejected the value of community; he simply paid little attention to it. Perhaps he thought that community was no longer a subject of ideological dispute, or that recent history had revealed that the idea of the community was too liable to manipulation by fascist, racist, or totalitarian regimes. (Ibid, 2002:208)

Throughout the liberal system of thoughts and practices, conception of community in the social and political organization of society got little emphasis, if not totally ignored in contrast to the undue emphasis that individuals got. That is why communitarians trying to defend and argue the necessity of attending community in their thought. In their argument, the political organization of society needs to have an emphasis on the factor of a community. According to W. Kymlicka:

In the last twenty years, a community has resurfaced. An entire school of thought has arisen in political philosophy, known as 'communitarianism', whose central claim is precisely the

necessity of attending to community alongside, if not prior to, liberty and equality. Communitarians believe that the value of community is not sufficiently recognized in liberal theories of justice, or in the public culture of liberal societies. (Ibid, 2002:208).

Some liberals and neoliberal hit back at the communitarian thought as if it is Marxist rhetoric with little reform. In the case of traditional communitarianism, there might be a close similarity, but contemporary communitarianism is a very different version and much far from Marxist thought.

Communitarians respond like this:

This emphasis on a community can be found in Marxism as well ... [in] ...communist ideal. However, the kind of communitarianism which has recently come to prominence with the writings of M. Sandel, M. Walzer, A. MacIntyre, Daniel A. Bell, and C. Taylor is quite different from traditional Marxism. Marxists see a community as seething that can only be achieved by a revolutionary change in society, by the overthrow of capitalism and the building of a socialist society. (Ibid, 2002:209).

At the same time, in East Asian society and political thought, they used communitarianism as social thinking within authoritarian societies like China, Singapore, and Malaysia, they give emphasis to the common good and much less weight to self-autonomy and rights. In such societies individuals considered as they are not free agents, rather they got meaning in their contribution to the whole society. America based political theorist Russell A. Fox and Singapore-based diplomat Bilahari Kausikan promote that kind of communitarianism. In another case, 1980's "responsive" communitarianism of Etzioni and Galston are also in favor of another version. Their main thesis is that either principle of common good or self-autonomy should not a choice over the other. Through the first two decades of 21st c, responsive communitarians felt that the Scandinavian states had achieved the best balance of individual freedom and rights and common good, despite some individual rights were being shortened for different communal, perhaps welfare, reasons.

The Communitarian Network is coalition of individuals and organizations who have come together to reinforce the moral, social, cultural and political projects and thoughts with a project to build on a communitarian philosophy that aims to the foundations of civil society such as families, schools and neighborhoods -- and stand-in a commitment to the welfare of the community. Liberal/neoliberal system do have powerful organizations i.e. Briton Wood Institutions (BWI) and resources that back it to be a dominant enough, while in the case of communitarianism it is a very difficult case, irrespective of its viability. Thus, Communitarian Network is a very important organization to make sure that the values principles and ideas are available on a philosophical table and got its true weight by the global audience. Communitarians have strong agenda on social justice and the common good." communitarianism is a public philosophy developed by some robust social and political theorist and philosophers. They are challenging western radical

liberalism and particular individualistic approach towards social and political philosophy, to mold into a new collectivist or holist approach and common good of a community.

1.5 Common Ideas and Drives of Some Social and Political Philosophies

In the modern and contemporary era, development becomes a struggle for survival in an openly competitive Darwinian world, while development of society/state always relies on the socio-political philosophy they adopted. Normatively speaking, the true drive to have a socio-political system/philosophy must be a demand to improve both a society's well-being and a state's welfare. That is why some philosophy of social and political suffer a charge from another social and political philosophy, as their attempt fail to bring the meaningful demand and outcome.

Although many valid comparisons can be made among some socio-political systems, the most apt comparison could make on the values of these systems. Liberalism value individualism, freedom and liberty settings. Liberals endeavor, in the world of a variety of global settings but they fantasize as identical to their own. They submerge some core beliefs, basic values, and political programs together as if these all are necessarily for all forms of society. While these actually make lives worse. Convincingly some African and Asian lineage might never try and never need to be represented and treated by the supposedly liberal's reality and thoughts, unlike what the majority of Western lineage might conceive. In contrast, communitarians value community and shared value in a web of life of a community. And this could be welcomed one to Africa as well Asia. Literally speaking Africans and Asians are lovers of freedom and liberty like Westerners do. Perhaps, the case is on prioritization of what they love. Even if freedom is something important, it might not be the most essentially driving need of people in that context. Even transcendent context is required to enjoy it. Still, developmentalism's low concern to democracy in practice and its surge towards development recorded as phenomenal and for that matter it is also worth dealing. But, what are the common drive among these three conceptions?

Following a critical look on how liberal system and based on the some exposed limitations of it, one could be touched by communitarianism and developmentalism as alternatives. Developmentalism mainly deals on the role of the state in the process of structural transformation of the health of the economy, state welfare and people's well-being. It has much in common with communitarianism; in regard to the state-led, common good conceptions and collectivist approach they may favor alike. It has also much in common with an old Keynesian model that advocating government intervention. An intent for state-run social, political and economic affairs are sources

of optimism of development to both of them. Here the function of civil society that communitarian might think come as a function of the state/government in developmentalism. This critical look lets me consider their intimacy and common ideas.

Communitarianism and developmentalism alike object the neutrality politics of state in the liberal system. Communitarians go for a state intervention for the 'politics of the common good' (Sandel 1984 and Taylor 1985). Developmentalism urges for state-led plans and projects of developments, investments and reduction of poverty. Apart from that, both developmentalism and communitarianism seem to agree on their notion of supporting positive rights which are rights/guarantees to certain things. They are both in support of state/government subsidized services and rights. On the way both give little concern for negative rights. These are some of their different views than the liberal thinking.

The approaches, principles and values of each conception are very different and many in number. And there is no clearly and explicitly stated common goals and projects among liberalism/neoliberalism, communitarianism and developmentalism. However, one could state the practical demand of any socio-political philosophy, which is common to them. I extract the following common drives for having a social and political philosophy.

First, without a stable political system, nothing is possible within a given society/state. Stable and secure political condition is the source and base of many other securities. Self-interest, freedom, liberty, life security, property of an individual are only possible with the presence of stable political system. I am arguing that secured political system is a base for other securities. Thus, social and political conception might contribute to questions of securities and that is why we go for them.

Second, our socio-political affairs need to have a normative guide. For that, any social and political philosophy is based on moral thought. It should have a political morality. And it should be a normative attempt to create a good condition and decreasing bad condition for lives. Based on that, any social and political philosophy has positive and negative measures to promote good condition and prevent bad condition respectively. Thus, the need to have a normative guide is common.

Third, political philosophy prescribes how we ought to approach a socio-political affairs of human society. Liberal/neoliberal, communitarian, and developmentalism social and political philosophies/conceptions do the same. The liberals' prescribed basics of liberalism are supposed means to create a good condition for lives. Communitarians, in the same fashion but different approach, argue to have their own principles, values, and core conceptions for the same purpose.

Still, developmentalism goes for their own alternative way but it is for the same purpose. Fortunately those all principles, values and conceptions are not a gold standard for all societies and are open and subject to revision as well to overthrow following their possible unviability. But in common they do urge to have standard values and principles for socio-political affairs.

What does humanity expect from any social and political philosophy? By those all means any social and political philosophy is an attempt to bring wellbeing, welfare, happiness, favorable condition for human life. As I discussed above, the means and conceptions are different from one system of thought to another. But the above points are some of the general common drives to have them.

Chapter II

The Challenges of Communitarianism and Developmentalism on liberalism

2.1 Introduction

Around the last half a century, mainly in Asia and Africa, I think that we're looking at a kind of theoretical war of systems of social and political philosophies. A theoretical war is an intent to have a justified social, political and economic philosophy that enable to solve their important political, economic and social problems they have and to try development through it. The leading liberal system bombarded the potentially newly emerging native social and political concepts/systems and other traditional socio-political conceptions. Proponents of that system stated that "There Is No Alternative (TINA)" to neoliberalism, while Asians and Africans stand for: "There Are Thousands of Alternatives (TATA)" other than it.

Contemporary debates within modern political systems are almost exclusively between conservative liberals, liberal liberals, and radical liberals. There is a little place in such political systems for the criticism of the system itself... for putting liberalism in question. (Kekes, 1997: 1)

Epistemologically and practically liberals always made it that hard enough to get a space for other possible alternatives of social and political philosophies. They force others to seek alternatives and remedies for problems only within that system of thought. The system does not allow others to look outside. The dominant contemporary debates among liberal, conservative and radical liberals are remarkable evidence of the way they systematically avoiding and deny space for other alternatives out of the system. Their dominance and 'ill-advise' to have that system for the global south is also evident.

2.2 Merits and Demerits of Liberalism and Neoliberalism

What is liberalism and what are its values and principles? Since the period of the renaissance through the time of reformation till now, liberal thoughts and practices gradually transformed from a negative reaction to its predecessor social, political and economic order of its preceding system to be a positive alternative system and enjoyed an extensive authority. Liberalism transcends different culture and borders; draw individuals, groups and states as adherents from different corners and backgrounds of societies. But what is the force that draws to its center and what helps liberalism to transform as such force? What is the merit of that liberal thought? As a social and political system, it has its own conception of values, man and good life that formulated and justified by that system. That liberal conception of man, the good and values are the means or force, among

others, that drawn to the system. In order to proceed let me say something about the merit and demerits of the liberal system of thoughts and practices.

If one genuinely sticks to a rational thinking to realize some merits and demerits of liberalism system, that person needs to have a twin-eye to see the two sides of liberalism. First: there is the philosophical or epistemological foundations of the system that give a base and outlet to the second. The second is a step forward to the first and it is a practical implication and consequences of it. T.

Sargent stated;

We must distinguish at the outset between neoliberalism as a system of thought and actually existing neoliberalism. ...the first can be traced back to the ideas developed in the writings of F. Hayek during the [WWII] and their popularization ... by M. Friedman (1962), the latter is a more practical vision centered on a program of macroeconomic stabilization, liberalization of trade and privatization ... (Sargent, 2009: 69)

Based on the above conception, one can plausibly claim that liberal thought, system, structure and ideas have, roughly, theoretical and practical versions. Therefore, it seems necessary that evaluating merits and demerits of a liberal system need an eye towards both versions.

As a merit, liberalism attempts to avoid evil conditions and to promote good condition. This is unobjectionable and welcome stand. Even if liberalism is allegedly designed to create good conditions for lives of humanity in general, but, no thinking mind could fail to recognize the worst inequality-enhancing nature and structure of practice of that liberal system.

In its general conception, liberals' stand is pro-freedom, pro-right, pro-pluralism, pro-distributive justice and the like. These all are theoretically plausible and it seems nice to have that stand. These all are great for humans who are lovers of freedom by nature. Thus, it could be taken as a merit of liberal thought. In practice, the efficiency that economic freedom offers is also one basic merit.

However, if one ask that, how liberalism system works? It will go like this; "Hey lets open the borders and let everyone compete with everyone that would make everything work better". That stand seems intuitively very plausible and welcome to everyone. But there is a time when that works badly and lead to the bad condition. For instance, I can ask whether pro-freedom is intrinsically valuable. It allow many corporates and individuals to accumulate wealth, profit and to have extended life. Meanwhile, critics raise that, monopolies or concentration of wealth, based on a pro-freedom notion, become remarkable problems. Not only that, economically, the competitive and profit-seeking nature of that thought has also inherent problems since that way excludes those who are less capable of affording their lives and others' basics of lives. Thus, some supposed values and merits become problematic in practice.

What is then that liberal stance? Is it good or bad? Is it wrong or right? Is it worth pursuing or not? If one follow the way of thinking that some sort is intuitively plausible then it is always good and worth pursuing, the conclusion about the liberal system is clear. That, it is good and worth pursuing. But, what if I think like this; all intuitively plausible sorts are not always good and worth pursuing? That position will be safely defeated. What if the intuitively plausible sorts of the liberal system do not defend the interests and demands of the majority and lead into worst conditions, i.e. economic injustice and capability gap. It is pro-freedom but yet not really as much it promised. Many things intervene us the structure, the system and the inequality under the liberal system. The self is supposed to be free and responsible but there is prevalent 'under-determinism' of an economy. The freedom of individuals lead into maximization of self-interest and from some Asian communitarians view it accused that leads into anarchism.

The theoretical reason for the basics and the conceptions of liberalism first seems intuitively plausible, but the practical aspect based on those basics bring more contradiction and problems on the ground. That means the intuitively plausible sorts lead into a practically implausible sort. The theoretical economic freedom and practical maximization of self-interest lead into overuse of nature and environment, accumulation of wealth, economic inequality and the like vices while others strive for basics of life. If one look back to Hobbesian prisoners' dilemma of the state of nature, everyone seeks to maximize self-interest to rescue their lives, as a result of it, everyone is worse off. In a liberal system of thought and practice, at least in its economic notion, everyone seek to maximize self-interest and enter into competition and scenario of lives' basics. At that condition, being so selfish get situations ugly very quickly. That condition seems in the state of political society might worsen conditions. The competition to maximize self-interest/for lives' basics remain worse than ever before. That condition could be much worst in an advanced form of the liberal system. I can claim these all as the demerit of liberalism.

Thus, the attempt of the liberal system to avoid bad conditions and to promote good condition is unobjectionable while not up to its promise. The theoretical promises it claimed to have never realized. It seems, its demerit weighted for the majority. It is obvious that the system, structure, policies and basics of liberals have created and extended economic inequalities between global south and north and among states in both global regions. That means the system, structure, policies and basics of liberalism reinforces and enhance inequality in its practical sense. I feel that liberalism at its long run if it continue unchecked, could worsen these conditions.

It is not enough to introduce and have a system of social and political philosophy. It is a more important issue to organize inclusive wellbeing of individuals and society as well welfare of state accordingly. If it fails at the more important one, thus, it is not well founded social and political philosophy. For that case alternative way of looking at the social political problems is demanded in such cases. It seems almost, practically impossible for some states to breakout liberal system and tries out other alternatives, despite it seems it is overreaching its power on the ground.

2.3 Communitarian's Challenge on Liberal thoughts and Practices

Despite the fact that there are many other reactive social political philosophies towards liberalism, here I will discuss the idea and challenge of communitarianism. First, it was supposed as a critique of liberalism. But it has its own conceptions. The origin, history, unique principles, values and ideas of communitarianism has discussed in the last chapter. Now it is about its challenge.

Intellectually, following the decline of socialism as a viable social and political philosophy, communitarianism is now one of the most active, genuine and grounded philosophical alternatives to liberalism. Communitarianism is a form of collectivism and it is also dubbed as pretty the same with "democratic socialism."

Communitarianism is a social philosophy that maintains that society [state] should articulate what is good—that such articulations are both needed and legitimate. Communitarianism is often contrasted with classical liberalism, a philosophical position that holds each individual should formulate the good on his or her own. Communitarians examine the ways shared conceptions of the good (values) are formed, transmitted, justified, and enforced. (Etzioni 2003:224-228)

There are different versions and approaches to the single affirmation of communitarianism, which they consider as important in the social realm. Even in experience some favor for strong social bonds and moral culture like in the case of Japan, while some seek effective state/government to maintain social realm like what regimes in Singapore and Malaysia done.

All communitarians uphold the importance of the social realm, and in particular of community, though they differ in the extent to which their conceptions are attentive to liberty and individual rights. Early communitarians, such as Tönnies and Nisbet, stressed the importance of closely knit social fabric and authority. Asian communitarians [go for] the values of social order...to maintain social harmony, individual rights and political liberties... (Ibid: 224-8)

But, where do liberals and communitarians come into a clash? The clashes are based on the above conceptions. Let me bring some battlefields of both sides here in my paper.

⁵Modern and contemporary liberal-communitarian debates, mainly Rawlsian thought on one hand and communitarian, on the other hand, is a heated debate in our contemporary. I think, it got its base from J. Locke and the like conceptions that stress equality, rights and liberty of the self, and self-autonomy and universalizability of moral principles of I. Kant as that stand against Middle age communitarian thought. Thus, I felt that, the Lockean-Kant thought implicitly stand against Aristotelian communitarianism and give the way for that contemporary liberal-communitarianism debate. Liberals accuse communitarianism roughly; with a program of compulsory service for a community, as revised Marxism-Leninism programs, as leftist stand among many others. The communitarians' arguments on "emptiness", "social thesis" and "embedded self" are as a critic and response to the liberals and that is a rational foundation of their thoughts.

Liberalism neglects or gives less emphasis to the value of community and they go for "atomized" or asocial view of the self. For instance, Rawlsian, like others' too, liberalism rests on relativistic individualism conception of the self and one can say it 'Atomism'. The core problem of this idea of liberals began with its understanding of the self and his relationship to the community. C. Taylor objected to the liberal atomistic view of the self and he stated; 'men are not self-sufficient outside of society' (Taylor 1985, 2000). To add a point, Sandel, liberals underplay, and undermine, the importance of the community. His position criticizes liberalism for "advocating an unencumbered self... [Its] understanding of the relationship between individual and their communities overriding importance they attach to rights" C. Fabre, 2011: 40. In a similar fashion, A. MacIntyre defended the Aristotelian idea of the intimate, reciprocating of a local community bound by shared ends, where people simply assume and fulfill socially given roles (MacIntyre 1984). Rawls seemed to present liberalism, particularly at least in his earlier work, he claims that his theory of justice as universally true. Other liberals like B. Barry in his book, *Justice as Impartiality would go for* hard universalism as he argues that liberalism can and should present itself as a universally valid ideal. Communitarians, like A. MacIntyre and C. Taylor, contend that the standards of justice vary from context to context and must be found in forms of life and traditions and societies, Liberals' conception of justice also charged from other communitarians. For Walzer, liberalist's "principles of justice are not universal in scope" Ibid: 40. Furthermore, others say justice is historical to society and is a remedial means to society. It is demanded in the absence of other virtues, like cooperation.

⁵ I used some paraphrased ideas from a site and it identified by this link and credit goes to it. <http://web.missouri.edu/~johnsonrn/comm.html>

In addition to the above. C. Taylor and M. Walzer objected other Rawlsian' assumption towards the minimal state. That conception goes to argue that the principal task of government is to secure and distribute fairly the liberties and economic resources individuals need to lead freely chosen lives. And the communitarian stand for politics of common good and function of attending to the community for individuals to sustain and promote the society as a unit. When liberals like R. Nozick and J. Rawls argue for the minimal state and neutral stand on other affairs, W. Kymlicka, ardently stands for neutrality should be rejected for the common good favor.

On the issues of place, nature and conception of the self, communitarians reject atomized conception of the self is a will of intent to favor methodological universalism instead of particularism of liberalism. And it can be summarized like this.

Communitarians have a number of different arguments against the liberal account of the self and its ends... [It] can be summarized this way: the liberal view of the self (1) is empty; (2) violates our self-perceptions; and (3) ignores our embedded-ness in communal practices. (Kymlicka, 2002:222)

If I would have the right to join that predicament what can I say about it? Let me deal with some core ideas based on the debate between the two.

Cultural, social, economic conditions and factors may force individuals to prioritize for conflicting rights and different societies may rank rights differently. That can lead to different conclusions about a particular right. Citizens of more advanced liberal states/societies may be more willing to sacrifice a third generation rights in cases of conflicting with first generation rights, While some African/Asian societies with a communal tendency or Confucian heritage, respectively, may emphasis on cultural, social and economic factors and necessities for the justification of rights that one needs to pursue and these factors can provide moral and communal foundations for that justified right. Thus, a distinctive understanding of rights, political practices and social and political institutions than the western-style of liberal democracies is justified and well founded in many other societies. Considering those rights may not have universal connotation and status. The plurality of liberal thought needs to compromise the like intent and attempt towards freedom. The notion of 'Asian values' of East Asian states/society, emerged from the East Asian region, may be rooted in indigenous cultures and traditions like Confucianism, as it challenges to Western liberal democracy and serves them as a systematic alternative. The Asian go for family and social harmony, while the intervention for the promotion of liberal values, human rights and democracy may be attributed to the supposedly universal Western based liberal thought. This shows that their conception of right and plurality is problematic and in danger to promote smoothly. Family, society,

community with communitarian values and interests take the precedence over that of the individuals' will, interest and envy that claimed by the westerners.

I strongly felt that family is not a social institution only for reproduction of life. Like kinship, community and city, it is also an institutionalized social sphere for furthering the good life. Reproduction and meaning of life are possible, in turn, based on those social institutions. Literary individualization and disintegration could be a strict opposite of social institutionalization. Thus, any social and political philosophy that seek to bring meaningful values and conditions to human beings need to be founded alongside the nature and necessity of social institutions.

I can argue that there is no, even a single, isolated individual that pursue his self-interest in any given society. Any social, political, cultural and economic foundations based on 'atomized' conception of the self is flawed one. Because society is a web of individuals and individuals are no less than wild beasts or inhuman creatures out of the community that gives them full meaning of human life. That is why I favor communitarians' challenge on liberals.

2.4 Developmentalism's Challenge to liberal thoughts and Practice

The present communitarianism-liberalism debate offers me a fertile ground for examining the touches of collectivism and individualism in the clash. But, new alternatives, as well as historical political theories which still provoke and attract debate, should not be ignored. Different social and political paradigms, philosophies, ideologies, conceptions and principles have developed over the past years and introduced into a social and political arena.

Some politicians began actively to challenge the predominantly western based liberal systems and its basics that slowly eroded the importance of endogenous culture, conceptions and views of different forms of communities. Developmentalism is a recent attempts to a development and it is viewed by many as a criticism of the liberal system. Some states have tried two roads to development-liberalism/neoliberalism and developmentalism. The first leave them far away from the edge of development. They found it the misleading road of development. While the second give them some positives. Practically, the sigh of relief in the East Asian countries, despite its poor record of democracy is evident. The need for development is, in part, a commitment for necessary precondition like integrated growth, poverty reduction and inclusive welfare in which all requires effective government, social organization and contextual strategies. Meanwhile, promotion of sustainable and effective developmental, both qualitatively and quantitatively, is a very important

goal to pursue. That is why states test paradigms' viability on litmus paper-of-practice to their context and project, thereby to race towards development.

The critical point, development is a transformative process ... It is inescapably about change – economic growth, social transformation and political transition. And, in practice, it is commonly a radical and turbulent transformation which is concerned with often far-reaching change in the structure and use of wealth and power, must transform it. ... When people change the way they use, produce and distribute resources, they also change their (social and political) relations – relations of power - with each other; and when people change their political and social (power) relations with each other, they usually change the way they use, produce and distribute resources. Closely paraphrased from: (Leftwich, 2008:9)

That is the way both qualitatively and quantitatively changes could be resulted. But that development is always dependent and related on a social and political organization of that particular society. Through this point let me come back to the real challenge of developmentalism on liberal thoughts.

The high profile success of state-led development in 'Asian Tigers', and the problems of a market-led economy in Africa and Latin America, despite other fact of the same system in Europe and North America, has revived interests on 'developmentalism', which belong to the Asian Tigers. These are two positive and negative derive to the revival of developmentalism. That shows the real challenge of developmentalism in practice to liberal thought and practice. Following that, some states are inherently autocratic, where some are 'democratic on their developmental approach to achieve inclusive development. Being the fact, effective state and development are related.

The defining and core function of the modern state has been to promote, organize, protect and sustain this economic and social transformation and the evidence is overwhelming that effective modern states and economic growth have gone hand in hand. (Ibid, 2008:9)

Here above, the relation and interdependence of effective government and development are clearly stated. The government is the forerunner on the guide and plan for the development on the approach of developmentalism. State, to organize, protect, promote and sustain that track of development is really different to the neutrality politics of liberal system.

The effective transformation and development based on a well-founded organization of a society is part of the responsibilities and duties of state/government. It must be in all social, political and economic aspects too. But there could be many different ways to do these things. Still, same scholars claim there are different models. A. Leftwich observes that there are four models. First, Anglo-American-liberal-model that required the state to ensure four prime conditions namely promotion of private, market-driven growth, property rights, a fair and efficient judicial system, an open and understood set of rules for economic activity and facilitating market entry and

functioning. Second, based on the first, it is a social-democratic model in which the democratic processes were fundamental in ensuring that fiscal and institutional arrangements have been developed to contain the worst excesses of capitalism, by redistributing opportunity and income and reducing over time the inevitable inequalities associated with the earliest forms of capitalist development. The third model is the Soviet model, of forced-march top-down industrialization involving pervasive state ownership, control and management of the economy. The fourth was that of the 'developmental state'. Nowadays, out of these models, the first and the fourth are much in debate.

What did it mean liberal democracy for developing states and what is the relation of liberal thoughts and development? Democracy-development debate is one of the cracking point on the relevance of liberal thought towards development. Why do liberals reject state-lead economy and paternalism affairs of a state? Let me put the following words that allow to seeing some responses:

Why then do liberals oppose state paternalism? Because, they argue, no life goes better by being led from the outside according to values the person does not endorse. My life only goes better if I am leading it from the inside, according to my beliefs about value. (Kymlicka, 2002:216)

Others in a counter response to the liberals might go like this:

Nonetheless, if economic growth is to be achieved, if poverty is to be reduced, if inequality is to be contained if not reversed, and if social provision to be assured, any emerging state in the developing world will need to be effective in terms of one of these models. [Mind the four models he quoted above as he favor for developmentalism] (Leftwich, 2008:9)

M. Friedman and his followers may ardently advocate economic liberalism and minimal state on the economy and other affairs. Economic liberalism is, basically, the belief that states ought to abstain from intervening in the economy, and instead, leave as much as possible up to individuals participating in free and self-regulating markets. In that case, the government is a mere protector of the supposedly just using, acquisition, transaction and accumulation of wealth. That is to dictate a state to remain a protector of the entrepreneurs to accumulate the resource, property, power and favor to the elites side and that make possible to control as many possible things by accumulation. Then this lead into a condition that the will of these elites will be a will of the system. That is why, this system of liberal economy charged as portage, wasteful and rent-seeking by some statist.

A paradigmatic shift and a rediscovery of the role of a state in a development process and the need for a more capable state has been taking issue in Africa since the late 1990s, see Mkandawire, 2001:292; Fritz and Menocal, 2007. That thinking has a positive record since a famous Keynesian thinking, despite it suffer counter attack by Neoliberals in 1980's and 90's. Even though there is the contextual difference the optimism of developmentalist is also confirmed in East Asian states.

How a state should to remain abstain to the social, political and economic currents and affairs. A socio-political system must help for development, reduction of servitude and poverty. Inequality-enhancing nature and structure of a liberal system must be checked. Thus, the market-led and minimal state conception of liberal thought need to be challenged from statist view. That is partly why some statist harping for developmentalism.

2.5 Understanding the International System and Structure

The current liberal oriented dominant international system is an economic, political and social order and regime. It is subject to critic, revision and to be replaced following its test of viability. The system is not only a structure but also it has economic, social and moral philosophies that understand individuals, society and reality in terms of its own principle and values. Under that system, individuals, societies, regions, cities, nations and their resources are open into a market sphere. As this system lasts to serve as a system market plays a focal point. K. Marx stated:

Capital is the organizing principle of modern society.... [It] is a process that puts into motion all of the other dimensions of modern economic, political, social, and cultural life. It creates the wage system, influences values, goals, and the ethics of individuals, transforms our relation to nature, to ourselves, and to our community ... seeks to mold.... (Debord, 1967)

The only thing that I want to extract from this view is that how a new liberal based economic the organization of society mean a change in organization of almost every aspect of human life. The culture; the ethical and moral and conception they have; about themselves, about human nature, about other nature and environment, their relation; man to man and man to their environment and conditions, their belief; faith, religion and the values they have and other many aspects. In the same way like a Marxian assertion in the above, everything changed with the coming of the liberal system of thought and practice. But to add more in advance, the economic organization of our contemporary time fails under the mercy of politics and it became inherently politics in command. Political elites are behind the dominance of economic elites. In our contemporary time, liberal system comes to be the dominant global social, political and economic thought. Most capable states determine to back the system and its structure which their lifeline was organized and orchestrated on the line of that system.⁶

⁶ Note: By capability, I mean that a potent that enables states to do and influence some subtle and concrete sort. It is an actual capability to realize one's will.

The dominance, influence, universality claim and the structure of the current dominant international system is very challenging to many states. To have a justified social and political philosophy mean it is one step to solving their important political, economic and social problems. But, I argue that any social and political philosophy need be constructed respectively to social forms, their context and their project. There might be demands to construct a new social and political philosophies or conception. However, that dominant system might also be challenging and denying a space to have a social and political philosophy for others.

Under that dominant international liberal system; political, economic and social aspects of humanity are widely in dynamism. The international system and its dynamism proceeds as if morality and legitimacy is some sort of prudence of the hegemon or most capable state. While each state remain to be a 'night dog' in their respective area, as autonomous one. Those most capable states are main actors, police and drivers of the international system. In an anarchic world system, states' will, laws and interest never last long unless that backed by most capable state/states. Our world is being transformed into a more complex post-international world. By post-internationalism, I mean that an international system characterized by the interaction of diverse states are at the mercy of the hegemon. Sovereignty is much weak and they are becoming mere subjects to the system and to the hegemon. The hegemon is not morally and legally entitled to obey a state's law. States' will and interest may face influences to be realized. This is obvious from how the space in the international sphere tightens for the less capable states.

Sometimes I call this international status quo or regime or global system or simply a system. As it stands the current dominant international liberal system remain to serve and imposed as if it is a legitimate and globally viable system. The current international status quo is then dominantly drive by the system's social, political and economic thoughts and practice. Following a critical approach, we required justifying all its intellectual and practical virtues and vices. But, the influence, expansion, and dominance of the system towards different societies' social, political and economic aspects backed by powerful institutions and agents who seek to do so, as part of the system.

The international financial institutions and their stand, as part of the web, are comparable to an imperial power, especially of the colonial powers. Bretton woods Institutions (BWI) are the de facto colonizers of a sovereignty of states, mainly on a national economy. A national economy getting into a victim of global economy more than ever before, while most of the global economy is under-determinism of BWI. In caricature form: a new and powerful empire has come into

existence, the Empire of BWI-ian, at an unspecified location. The system and its philosophy is a faithless paradigm backed by faithless elites that urge economically for the consolidation of BWI-ian Empire.

The political and conceptual origin and development terms and concepts like “industrialization”, “modernization”, “economic development”, “westernizations”, “globalization” originated, highly promoted and largely shaped by American intellectuals. current terms and ideas in the global politics and economics such as west and east blocks, the global north and the global south, first world and third world states, developed and developing states have the same origin, attributes with the above concepts. These all are interrelated and reinforced to each other, and at the same time highly integrated into almost every society of the world and practically many societies used to be attributed by these concepts.

The evolution of English language to be a de facto global official language, the evolution of dollar currency as global legal currency and other global trends alongside the dominance and influence of the hegemon are parts of the system. All these have origin and relation to the Anglo-American based liberal system. That dynamisms much related to the dominant world governing system and its philosophy originated, structured and shaped by the hegemon. That way of global dynamism give a new dimension in all aspects of society. The system and its principles work in favor of the Empire of BWI-ian and the hegemon. The dynamism as shaped by the system and the system is also in favor of the hegemon and the empire. That kills many healthy aspects of different forms of society. See this one:

The proponents of the 'free market' encourage poor countries to super-exploit; one could say 'rape', their own natural environments ... marginalize their native rural populations. [It is] noted... that what is generally referred to as the 'neo-liberal' development model has further aggravated the condition of poor. No one really seriously denies that this model, which has now been practiced in many countries for decades, has led to the concentration of power and wealth in increasingly fewer and fewer transnational 'hands' or institutions. (Kelbesa, 2005:19)

Here, one need to keep an eye towards that dominant philosophy and its principles. No one has a God eye's point of view towards all forms of society. The same is true of the liberal individual, a liberal scholars and a liberal politicians. The attempt to universalize liberals system to all forms of societies and all human affairs is a form of rationalization. It is only to be counted as an alternative not as the end of human endeavor towards social and political affairs. Like some liberals who cowardly describe their system as imminent, innate and an end to humanity, there are many pseudo-assertions towards it. That is literary wrong conception. In many forms and aspects of

societies and in many corners of our world that system shows some negative signs. It fails to bring as much positive outcome to other areas like it has done in the center. Continuing that system there could be repeating the same mistake and continue de-contextualization over there. At this point, we need to have a position of perspectivism.

Some most capable states impose, consolidate and maintain that system as a comprehensive worldview or philosophy. It is to rule and influence geographically subordinate states by implied means of power under that system. The expansion of that system is by the means of appeal to force –appeal to political, economic, military, harms- rather than by direct and practical military force to control. It is a global hegemony in which an indirect and subtle form of establishing global government takes place by the hegemon.

There is no, globally, super-agent in authority, but in capability, power and means. The system of the hegemon is like a hierarchal political authority in a politically unified state. It includes the pattern of thought, philosophy, ideology including its political programs and practical outcomes. Global hegemony used to have a theoretical weapon and practical measures to keep geopolitically subordinate states under one's mercy and thereby to maintain control throughout the world, just through persuasion/coercion; political intervention, violence, military coercion, diplomacy and ideological measures. Thus the theoretical and practical ways and approaches into all aspects; political, economic, social, cultural ... of the hegemon are backed by a liberal philosophy. The monopoly of one social, political and economic idea leads to the inevitable formation of a single global system. The current dominant Western-based liberal form of the social, political and economic system of thoughts and practices and organization of people on that line is heading towards that formation of unequal statuses. Simple observation could tell you that, its inequality-enhancing and economic injustice of the system. The system leave the average society alien from the comfort zone of that system, while few become wealthy and economic elites. The elites have everything; including the system, structure and the means of a market to participate and enjoy every market. The poor majority have only a market and to do nothing with it. The process of internationalization and globalization are a gradual and subtle process and part of that system too.

2.5.1 Globalization

What is globalization? Here are selected definitions of it from Financial Times and Merriam-Webster dictionaries respectively. It is 'the tendency of businesses, technologies, or

philosophies to spread throughout the world, or the process of making this happen”. It is ‘the state of being globalized; ... an increasingly integrated global economy marked especially by free trade, free flow of capital....’ These and other definitions of it referred to a *globalism* by a total interconnection of sorts by opening national boundaries. The process of interconnectedness and interdependence of peoples, corporates and states. The process has economic, political, cultural financial, trade, and communication integrations. It is for fast flows of peoples and their tangible and intangible properties like goods, finance, ideas, concepts, services, across international borders. There is an agent behind the tendency, attempt and measures of the process to facilitate or promote such process and flows, at both international and national level.

Globalization is a term that used to describe the process of internationalization. For me globalization is a process in which everything is exposed to the international sphere. The process is a process of internationalization. It is part of actualizing the hegemon’s project and will. It is a complex weapon of global hegemony and it deludes and de-contextualize the subordinate states. As a term, it is fabricated meaning safely to convince that globalization and its effect as inevitable social, political... a phenomenon that appears in the course of interaction of world society. To connote meanings of inevitable and natural to the term globalization is a mistaken conception. That is a wrong meaning and attribution, while it is artificial.

That process run through the international principles, laws, and regulations. Roughly, there are two ways of doing the internationalization; one the epistemological/philosophical claims, in which the pseudo pictures, false promises and motivations are laid by the philosophical conceptions. The political, social, cultural... programs and practices that attempt to make sure those claims on the ground are step forward from the first. Both ways and measures backed by system and principles. Nowadays we can see the case of liberal thoughts and conceptions belongs to the first step and the process of internationalization belong to the second. Thus, liberal system and globalization are two different and interconnected concepts. They work hand in hand are mutually reinforced.

The international community is globally open by globalization. The influence and capabilities of states are different. The philosophy and principles of the most capable states are liberalism and its principles and values. In the globally unipolar, open and anarchic system and conditions, the claimed authority of the hegemon, their conception and principles are most probable to win the international institutions as a means to legitimize measures and ambitions of the hegemon are the will of the same agent and inseparable from one another. They are all parts of a working machine

of the whole internationalization. Those who are less capable are more influenced to share and trade liberalism, otherwise, it is very difficult to them. That takes condition and realities of our world into an exploitive trans-internationalization scene.

Globalization, or the internationalization of the world economy, is an old process.... The internationalization of capitalism has always been marked by exploitation and direct violence. This is central to imperialism. (Saad-Fiho A. and Jhonston D. 2005:10)

States and trans-national agents compete among themselves for capability, the structure of the international system is open and anarchic but it leaves least capable states with little choice and space. Under that system sovereignty of a state is always in a continual threat. Virtually, in that system, the say of the least capable states is far from influencing formal decision-making process and transnational agents. The process and practices of trans-national agents tend to be unofficially influenced and dominated by the interests of most capable states and multinational corporations. Or they deal everything in favor of them. X need to be open by the system and Y used its capability status to exploit X as the system and its structure set and allow that.

Under that unipolar system, there is no moral foundation and philosophical justification of contemporary civilization, development, and globalization. In a case of any economic crisis, somewhere else in the world, like a recent rattle of western economy and very recent oil price fall, it would hit the entire world economy around. That is a hit towards capabilities of states and member of them. They set the system, the structure and it works like that. The system never is good or right at its foundation nor at its well-functioning period nor at its time of crises.

The cause of some international crisis and problems are wrongly recognized as if they are natural and inevitable under the process of globalization and falsely justified as the effect of globalization, not as a problem of the system. But the case is, globalization is an artificial process and these are only vices of that system. They are the outcome of the artificial consolidation and maintenance of the global hegemonic system. That system and globalization as a process are most helpful, beneficial and successful means for the hegemon's will, geopolitical projects, and to maintain the system itself.

Historical ambitions of USA, Britain, France, China, Russia, who stand against the Axis Power during the WWII, to establish UNSC, under the UN a police of the system is one step forward to be a hegemon. Despite recent disagreement among them and dominance of the first two in some global issues/decisions, their entire will be global sovereign powers/authorities lead into a form of a global unipolar system. Their ambition and measure were part of a hegemonic will. Despite the

hegemon and most capable states claimed to have super power there is no guaranteed authority to that status. In the absence of a global sovereign authority, anarchism is a condition of our world states. Some structural realist like Waltz might say that the international system is anarchic with no authoritative world government. In such global condition, more capable states, other transnational actors and forces face no barrier to entering national boundaries and rape whatever they capable by that process. There are international institutions seek to formalize norms, rules, principles and decision-making process for the international interactions. Still the institution, system, structure and pattern are at the mercy of unipolar system and that system has no authority. The unipolar system is dictated by the hegemon. Thereby the system gets a means to enforce what it will as a legitimate sort. There are false promises of securities; economic, political, social and many others from the hegemon's system. But, I feel, it is a form of rationalization

The UNSC is an alliance of states as a means to give securities for our world under the UN. But it allows some states to form a universal indivisible security. The hegemon is a core of that universal indivisible security to drive the world. That security comprises more than military and political security to them i.e. economic security, social and others. The most capable states are dealing with the core and it is part of driving machine of the globalizing world. Most world states may be influenced by it. That is what I call a unipolar system. Unipolar means one global center; one center of authority, of power, of force, one center of decision-making, among many other, in the international level and in a long run that ends up with one master, sovereign and hegemon.

In our contemporary, new center of tension, of conflict, of human tragedy, of other socio-political and economic problems in many corners of our world become frequent. These are real physical problems and crises. Since once the hegemon emerged as a center of almost everything; authority, of power, of decision making, in a unipolar and globalizing world, it always influences and intervenes in most the like matters and affairs. The international system, structure, pattern and institutions are much adjusted by the hegemon. The capability, dominance and influence of the hegemon is massive. That intervention of the hegemon by the name of democracy is not real. These have nothing common with democracy. Democracy, as they claim, is run some affair as of the power of, an opinion of, will of, an interest of the majority alongside other principles. What intervention has of democracy? What that unipolar and centrist nature could share about democracy? Where is the democracy they have? Go to some African and Africa and see how their conception of communal and consensus democracy works. Go to Oromo people in Ethiopia and

see how democracy works in its classic way. Those all do not have any ends other than promoting democratic conditions and processes unlike liberal western based democracy. Their system, structure and intervention practically marginalize and undermine the like cultural riches.

These are the practical problems and theoretical limitations of the system and globalization. But, that is how the internationalization works. Consider the effect of the system and process of internationalization on the national sovereignty, economy, politics and socio-cultural conditions. Economically, ideologically, socially, politically the world required to have different polar, system, structure. Thus, we need to march into a kind of socio-political perspectivism.

2.5.2 The Challenge and Influence of Most Capable States to Form and Maintain the International Status-quo

The hegemon has the required capability and philosophy to influence and dominate others, thereby to maintain their system, structure, pattern, ideology, and culture as universally viable and legitimate. It is a will and subsequent practices to rationalize as a universally valid thought and practice. The same fashion is true of the current social, political, and economic, ideological affairs by the hegemon. It is so because of its capability. The hegemon has members in a hierarchal step wherever the strategies/conditions of the hegemon require. The members are at that position as of the will and purpose of the hegemon. It is a remarkable fact that the US Special Forces are now present in more than hundred “sovereign” states and U.S’s operation of more than hundred military installations in more than hundred nations. This in itself tells some concrete information about a status of some “sovereign” states and their position in contrast to the US. The hegemon claim for common democracy, peace, security and other states, inadvertently, regard it as a genuine to that claim. But, the driving forces behind US policy is to maintain and serve the system, structure and its order thereby to consolidate its hegemony. It is a consolidation of a global hegemony. Every thought and practice backed by their geopolitical goal.

I reasonably argue that system has epistemological foundation behind the dominance and structure and pattern that suite the hegemon. It has its own protective shell from demise and has a culture of fighting against emerging alternative structures, systems, and concepts. The response of defenders of that system for states, groups, intellectuals who endorse illiberal, principles, values, and ideas is fatal. It is an illiberal act for the liberal system- who commit themselves to liberty. They

intervene on the wills and ideas of non-liberal groups. Thus, where is the liberty they claim for? I think that this charge left them in a desert without a droplet of water to sip and react for this charge. Liberals are in a massive ever struggle for a capability like Hobbesian conception on characteristics of man. According to him, man is in “a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceases only in death” (Leviathan XI 1) and liberalism/neoliberalism trade an anarchic system to individuals, but still a means for a global hegemonic system. Wealthy global elites are as chiefs in the international level. Because the system lets individuals, at least in principle, to live their lives, almost, without constraining or limiting structures within each state. While globally, the limiting block is choices, interest, will of the hegemon and the system itself.

In order to perpetuate the current global system, structure, pattern of social, economic and political domination, different forms of societies and individuals forced to hold back their potential. There are vices of injustices and irrationalities within process. In its deep structure, each moment of human life in the system constitutes a kind of a possible way to be slaves to the system. It crucially present itself as everyone ‘chooses’ it and a path in it, but simply forced to continuing unthinkingly along it. Since in principle at least and within certain limits, one always had, and still has, the capacity and capability to take a different path everyone guided into almost a single one. Self-chosen/initiative life is badly missed. The system is good at making fallen selves and drives them safely. That is the way how the system and structure orchestrated.

Popular consciousness, attitudes and perceptions of a political, social, administrative, business, technical and cultural elites and common peoples are intended to reflect the principle of the system. This show us how much the system, structure and its values and principles immersed into every aspect and reality. “In less than one generation, neoliberalism has become so widespread and influential, and so deeply intermingled with critically important aspects of life” A. Saad-Filho and D. Johnston, 2005:10. The system and its philosophy have an agent who seeks to consolidate towards every segment of humanity, individual and their aspects. That is what I call anthropomorphizing of it. That is how the system is doing in every reality. It attribute, judge, evaluate, shape and guide almost every reality. That system become a structural imperative to different forms of society.

The system’s way of approaching and dealing global affairs, issues problems as backed by its own philosophy and principles is driven by the hegemon. The hegemon is a most capable state/s. The hegemon has epistemological claims, political programs, practical ambitions/measures and

financial means to form, control and maintain the international status quo and to derive it as of his will. The hegemon has every means to its geopolitical goals and to rationalize and preserve the system. That system and its process left the majority of humanity with limited intellectual space, alternative and comfort. It allows less hospitable and less space to other paradigms and left them irrelevant. It is very difficult and very threatening condition to challenge it.

Chapter III

Democratic Developmentalism as a New Social and Political Concept

3.1 Introduction

Today development has become a struggle for survival in an openly competitive world. The international interaction and the race for development lead to a condition of “Social Darwinism”, a conception that belongs to H. Spencer. The globally open and anarchic condition, the act of cross-national capital investment and inter-penetration of capable states and few wealthy interconnected corporates precisely defined as “ultra-imperialist” by K. Kautsky. H. Ferguson and W. Mansbach, in *Remapping Global Politics*, suggests that a state is losing its capacity, legitimacy, and authority to remain the primary actor in world affairs and they claimed that, our world is being transformed into a more complex “post-international universe”. I would like to introduce my point through this brief discussion of the international system, structure, pattern and relations.

Taking the above global conditions, liberalism is a dominant system of thought and practice behind it. That system failed to bring as good and enough changes and transformations in Africa and South America, like what it brought in Europe and North America. Elsewhere, the practical reward of statist view in the Asian Tigers is also an implicit charge on the system. Some scholars, writers, and narratives charge the system’s social and political philosophy, political economy and development paradigm as responsible for the economic failure and underdevelopment in most peripheral states. Meanwhile, one may critically ask for a justifiable logical link between liberal theories, principles, policies, programs and practice in those states and their alleged poverties, socio-political problems and under development. But, the most prudent charge to that system is, creating international bureaucracies capable of extracting resources from peripheral states to the center. It has also a structural imperative for most peripheral states. Apart from the conceptual limitations it has, most of its charges seem to fit the dependency theory that states, the core improved at the expense of the periphery. These conceptual and practical problems of that liberal system of thought and practice are the backgrounds for a new alternative.

We need a speculative analysis, critical examination, employment of logical methods and construction of rebuttal arguments for the western-born ideas that govern the world. It is a push to liberate from an unworkable dogmatic attachment of the paradigms of the West and an attempt to support new ideas, conceptions and paradigms. In the attempt to find the likely and pragmatic one

to the setups, forms and contexts of socio political organizations. It is a search of a development paradigm, political economy, a socio-political philosophy that can solve their existing social and economic problems, poverty and underdevelopment thereby to give them an outlet to development. This could be a good push of African political philosophy. One of the possible alternatives is a conception of democratic developmentalism. It became a hegemonic and historical in development policies, socio-political debates and ideological and political corridors of the global south, see through work of (*Fritz V. and Menocal R.2007*). Here to examine its nature, values and potential viability based on a research is very important. Thus, my critical work, in this chapter, will not be an empirical approach nor normative one to this conception. It will be an analysis of that conception, dealing with its genesis, its practicality, even its desirability in third world states.

3.2 Limitations and Critiques of Liberal System

The liberal system of thought and practice has many limitations and problems. It disrupts local communities' ties and relations, is a source of deviant behaviors, and is a wasteful and rent-seeking system for communitarians, republicans, statistes respectively. In the last chapter, I clearly discussed issues. The liberal system of thought is based on a view of the natural theorist who believe that humans are absolutely free beings by nature and they might argue to replicate self-autonomy and absolute liberty in a political state. They confirm their conception by social contract theory. But, humans are not that way naturally and their confirmation is a mere thought experiment to generalize about a man. Even I argue that the system leads into social and political sadism in which, a self obtains personal pleasure, gain, benefit and advantage, from inflicting pain, stress and suffering on others. To add more, I will discuss how the system is financially fascist, class favored, anti-environment, hypocrite, inequality-enhancing, structurally imperative etc. But first, I must discuss some of its inadequacies and controversies.

On clarity: Liberals fail to explain liberalism, its principles and its values in a simple and clear languages. Furthermore, there are many jargons and unclear terminologies in it. Lack of precise definition of terms lead into controversies on their applications. For instance: (A) Liberty; it hasn't a precise meaning and limit to what extent is liberty to be enjoyed. That becoming a source of confusion and threat for some forms of communal ties. (B) Plurality: It is unclear whether it is to be tolerated towards good-of-a-self or right-of-a-self. If it is towards either of them the one will remain not tolerated. If it is towards both, both are not always the same and compatible with each other. (C) Freedom: It is a luxury to some forms of societies. What essentially drives people is not

the pursuit of freedom in the abstract sense. To create a capability, ability and conditions to satisfy their most basic needs are the most pressing drives of peoples. Sometimes it is also incompatible with pluralism. Thus to apply freedom everywhere equally and in a smooth compatibility with plurality is problematic. (D) Minimal state: Is it procedural or formal? Has a state to pursue a substantive conception of good and other essential affairs or not? If it is a total withdrawal of a state from pursuing a common good it seems a will against a symbol of a state. If otherwise, to what extent is toleration warranted when others truly miss the substantive good. (F) Market: Liberal system relies on the force of market rather than trusting intelligent agent for an economic balance. Allowing a market to have that status is controversial in itself because letting to run a system itself without an agent could not be just and to hold that function deserve for an intelligent agent.

On Morality: I am critical of liberal system's political morality and the logic behind it. Giving the economic conditions, a liberal person might incline to use his practical and intellectual excellence for a maximization of his interest. His approach towards resources, environment and others is more likely self-interest and profit maximizing oriented. Thoughts and acts based on that approach may prohibit promoting others' interests. They mainly promote selfishness based decisions, intentions and actions. Thus, morally, that self-interest and profit enhancing nature of the system missed some authentic aspirations of human society. Caring, sharing, welfare, respect and the like human instincts and ties towards others are indispensable for humans, but dominantly missed in that system.

Liberals' core value of self-autonomy, is the idea behind that condition. It is almost impossible to see clearly the difference between both I and the other. To identify both in a widely webbed social interaction and dependency, one could face a blurred boundary between them. The self is 'embedded'. And there is no logical consistency to promote self-interest in that situation. One can encounter and apprehend an individual physically. But a metaphysical/epistemological picture of a man as a human being could be difficult out of a society. Thus, the conceptions of autonomy and 'right politics' of liberals have conceptual limitations and need to be banned for shared meanings and 'common good politics' like the arguments of some communitarians, see Kymlicka, 2002:213. Liberals felt that, if individuals are autonomous enough to choose and act all their actions they will act right/good deeds. As the result, it is supposed that the prevalent evil of humanity will be

reduced with the prevalence of autonomy. How can autonomy guarantee right/good deeds/outcomes?

This is a false and unguaranteed hypothesis of liberals. To think that, the absolute autonomy of individuals' only lead them towards good deeds that promote the well-being of all humanity is not a rational stand with a ground to defend itself. It is a very weak argument. What if X subordinate his conscience/moral commitments to other sorts, like personal, political, religious, instant, and aesthetic interests/projects. In the like fashion, others do the same. Guaranteed autonomy does not necessarily lead to good deeds, neither do evil deeds. If autonomy is guaranteed, logic entails that both bad and good deeds are encouraged almost equally. Under that line of thought, there is no such a necessary pattern that lead to a fixed outcome. Thus, the possibility to happen the unexpected outcome is still open. Autonomy-good/right act link is a false hypothesis of liberals' moral view.

Liberals may argue that final moral authority is conscience. But I argue that an individual conscience might not be enough in a communal life of 'embedded self'. Like individual conscience, I think that there is a communal conscience of community-hood. That also need to have a say on a moral fabric of a given society and a self. Individuals are part of a culture, community, region, state so forth and they share some common experiences and values. The common experiences and values of the community have a say in an individual's life too. There is a spirit and enclosure of community-hood that serves as a hidden agent of a self. Thus, the hidden agent of the self should have a say on the accounts of each self. The concept of responsibility needs to transform from the autonomy motive of ethical responsibility to the collective motive of ethical responsibility. The ethical commitment could be improved through that line. Liberals' conception of autonomy and individualism are promoting moral permissibility. That might be a threat to moral order, while an individual is, in fact, 'embedded' and part of the order.

On Society: Liberals would not welcome any interference or redistribution of sorts in a process of a market. They may claim that market itself is just. Likewise, liberals reject any design or plan for a society - religious, utopian, or ethical. They believe that the form of society should be the outcome of processes of interaction among members of a society. Society needs to be open to the market process. They claim to have an open society. In that way, some sort of an individual will reveal by a discourse of an open society out of a market of that sort. The market is not only the economic market but also markets of many other sorts. Moral values out of a moral market, truth

out of truth market, religion out of a religious market and so on. But what do liberals mean by that process? Where is the process to take place? What is the line of the process? What is the system, structure, principle, values... of that process? Does not the structure, the line, and the principles of the process/market binds all activities? Then the system does not let everyone free, rather all are to be regulated by the system in the process. The binding aspects of the system and structure are there. That is the process and how the game of the system works. It seems a system for freedom and openness but it is a game plan that keep all society to the same path. Through that process and system, it intensifies the monopoly and dominance of the system. It seems an intent to drive all to that path.

Every born child through his time is subject to indoctrination by parents, schools, media and the general system to think that success is material gain and resources, which make sure that success, are limited. Happiness, contentment, and relationships are secondary to profit and income. Through this, a competitive profit-maker and egoistic self-glorifying self are developed. The system and its constructed culture become part of almost everyone's practice and thought. Then after, most people possessed and obsessed by their material pursuits, maximization of one's utopian self-interest, profit and gain maximization. Till the system lasts, what a system and structure sets you to do is what you should to do to survive. Our society is currently indoctrinated and enslaved by that system. Literally it is slavery of humans. Slavery is a mere preservation of one's life. The possessed and obsessed nature towards the above-supposed values is also a mental slavery of humanity.

In the age of neoliberalism dominated by a pursuit of egoist self-glorification, individuals are losing their intimate relations with other human individuals and their belongingness to their family, community, society... Losing one's sense of belongingness become a massive threat to well-being and well-functioning contemporary community or society. And I question the culture a pursuit of egoist self-glorification. Here is a critical observation of it by sociologist C. Wright Mills.

We do not meet one another as persons in the several aspects of our total life, but know one another only fractionally, as the man who fixes the car, or ... who serves our lunch... The humanistic reality of others does not, cannot, come through. Mills, from a speech delivered in Canada, 1954

I question that whether that system and organization of people on that line could bring self-sustaining, family, communities, society and state or it is a gradual process to disintegration, destruction, based on individualistic relativism and ethical permissibility. And I am optimist on other alternatives to get a spirit and space in the international realm to respond to these conditions

and problems. Especially, my hypothetical alternative of democratic developmentalism, which is a source of optimism for me.

Fascism: Fascism could differ in its form, structure, ideology and socio-political context. It can have also social, political and economic version. If we see the idea of 'Fascism' Nazi Germany or Mussolini's Italy or other regimes... we can understand the differences. They have little in common. These regimes belong into a very imprecise fascist framework or connotation. Thus, there is no set of conditions that give a single definition of fascism. We can only understand the fascist tendency of a regime/state or thoughts/ideas or practice/movement. The term is with different denotation and varied connotations. In general fascism is a system that thrives on an inherently warring air. A fascist might pressure or coerce to implement policies and programs. It has attributes like war and war preparation, foreign invasion and conquests and in its approach it is cruel, corrupt, arrogant, anti-working-class.

The national debt and usury structure in liberal system is a financial fascism and fraud. But because it is practiced by capable states, it is deemed liberal and legal financial system and structure. Ninety-nine-plus percent of liberals are not too stupid to know, that it is wrong. The mystery is it serves them and they would argue for it in a rhetoric fashion to their death. It is only backed by a neoliberal rhetoric; "Let the markets decide". A totally unplanned economy and self-interest drove for glorifying profit maximization and greed of hard cash is an economic irrationality. Narcissist individuals who believe on material gain and glorifying profit maximization are believed to be rational agents of a market, while they are irrational. More than 99 % persons who are out of this irrationality are the losers despite the fact that they are rational. That is why I strongly claim that most capable states and few interconnected wealthy corporates are continuing to practice financial fascism, which is irrational. Thereby, they are outplaying the majority.

"Let the markets decide", thereby, economic and social conditions, under the system is hyped to be gradually moving towards its equilibrium and perfection. An authoritarian reliance on financialized economy, global market and irrational agents and elites are considered the means to that end. Financialization of an economy, a flow of states' resources towards a global center and economic elites by the name of privatization, deregulation and capital investment are processes that allow capability accumulation for economic elites and center states. That capability building of a few is a fascist act. This is a system in which the majority are ruled and retained by the system but few enjoy/thrive in the system. An egalitarian and genuine economic democracy are missed.

Why wouldn't an agent who enforced market competition and deregulation be considered as fascist? Why is the one who use the liberal financial principles as a means to exploit the majority be considered as fascist? Why is the one who thrives by the means of national financial conquest, cruel sovereignty debate and usury, global raw deal ... not considered as fascist? Neoliberalism is based 'economic liberalism' (M. Friedman). The financialized economy of capitalism, liberalism and neoliberalism have fascist ties; towards nature, towards resources and towards humanity. The dominant global hegemonic consolidation of the liberal system of thought and practice is a form of resource accumulation, political centralization, financial fascism, and imperialism. There are some indications of financial fascism and "imperialism [as] the highest form of capitalism" (Lenin, 2017). In a long run, it could be a worse system than any other historical fascist regime. Fascism may not be officially authoritative but in its nature. Like the liberal system that officially claim for 'pure democracy' while really it is financial diabolism. The commitment of liberals towards liberty, equality, pluralism, freedom and minimal government and rule of law are formal and the system end up be with financial fascism.

Harsh to Environment: The worst conditions that liberal system of thought and practice bring in a moral, social, political, economic and environmental aspect of humanity are obvious. It is not enough to introduce and have a system like liberalism. It is more important to organize wellbeing of society, welfare of humanity and sustainability of environment accordingly. If not, it is to question the foundations of that system.

The over emphasis of liberals on autonomy is undeserved. The fruit and flower of the tree ought not to deserve priority over the roots and stems that support them to their very nature. The same goes to an individual in a community. Not only that, the individual and the community do have a further base. Their lives and essence are a mere dependent sort of things on their environment. The profit was driven and self-interest maximization oriented nature of activities and interactions put environment to be used and raped as a will of everyone. I can sum up with a critical observation of Dr. W. Kelbessa, on contemporary social, political and economic structure which is dominantly organized and structured on the line of that system.

It seems inevitable that humanity must either change the nature of our current growth-oriented and profit driven modes of living and development, or the ecosystem of our earth and of which we are mere children will collapse. (Kelbessa, 2005:22)

The poor, who make up the majority, are vulnerable to a wide variety of additional human rights violations and other miserable conditions. It would be harsh if that system lasts unchecked. So,

alternative ways of looking at the environment are necessary. Practically, it seems almost, impossible for some states to break out of that system and to try out other alternatives despite those limitations, inadequacies and overreaching power of it.

De-contextualization: Some states undergo development as they are set and guided by their own social and political systems, principles, structures, values and pattern of doing. Thus, having one's own system, structure, values and principles of social and political philosophy which are relevant to a particular setup, context and project of a given society is worth pursuing. That means they thrive their own structure, system, principles and values thereby have an end to pursuing it. In contrast, there are other ways of using a derived or intimated system, which is alien and has external agency. That means they have not their own structure, system, and political space to deal as well as an end to pursuing through that way, unlike the first one. To employ just a bit of formalized logic, we could say that system S serve as an economic, social and political philosophy for society in a context C –S-in-C. S also actually initiated development in context C. But it does not mean that system S is equally applicable and viable to all other infinite contexts C_2, C_3, C_4, \dots . Because S is not universally founded and viable.

We can see that there appears to be a context problem to have an alien system for a society. Society A in context C is moved by System S, while system S is original to that context C. Society B is moved by S. Society C is moved by S, so on and so forth, while S is not equally applicable and viable to these societies. The question is, why society B, C, D ... go to found and justify an alien system of S to their context? Is it the system or a context that require being adjusted in order to fit the other? A more a system is alien and a stranger to a society/context the context/society is de-contextualizing by that system and structure. More importantly any system should not set as a standards for other forms of societies/contexts, irrespective of its viability and applicability. A system should have a rational ground to apply elsewhere like what it did for a first society/context. Or it must be proved the list worst from other possible alternatives. That is why I call that the system is a means of de-contextualization for different forms of societies. Society should not be a subject of an experiment for alien systems.

In Equality-Enhancing Nature: Many people, at least defenders of liberal system, might claim that feudalism and its structure has been condemned. However see the vice of feudalism that few peoples own the land while others have nothing but determined to be serfs by the given system. In a neoliberal age, the global economic order let few elites/corporates to dominate the wealth,

resources... while others left to be poor, despite there is no such an officially declared plan. Thus, this liberal system reinstates some problems of inequality. Consider the inequality and poverty among the majority while wealth and resources are concentrating into the hands of the few in that system. One can see some important discussions that show how the wealth inequality and poverty is prevalent for the majority in (Sargent 2009:50). One can compare the nature and condition of lords and serfs of feudal with the poor and wealthy few of liberal systems, respectively. Despite the fact that, both systems are different and happen at different times, both do have some points in common. If one critically looks at man's conditions under a liberal system, in some sense, man seems to replicate those supposed conditions of a feudal system. The wealth inequality, economic injustice and the less-capable status of the poor are some of the indicative conditions. Under this system majority of humanity are almost replicating conditions of wealth inequality and some economic injustice. It seems a system has inequality-enhancing nature and structure.

Nature of the System: The liberal system has some practical and conceptual problems as I discussed here above. Despite that it has strong proponents. Its proponents are dominant, most capable states and institutions of the west. They are always harping for 'ill-advise' for the global south to have that system for their socio-political and economic developments. It is like "kicking away the ladder they used to climb" (Ha-Joon Chang, 2003) to their current status and hiding the secrets of their success. It seems to force individuals, groups and states to hold back the potentially right way. Its extended domination transcends different forms of societies. Since, in principle at least and within certain limits, one always had, and still has, the capacity and capability to have a different outlook/path. Almost all humanity are forcing into a single outlook/path of the liberal system. It crucially presents itself as if it is 'chosen' by everyone. While everyone simply forced to continue unthinkingly along it. Meanwhile, the system becomes a 'conceptual limitation', is a structural imperative (Meles, 2006) and is a 'predatory system' (Saad-Fiho A. and Jhonston D. 2005:24) to different forms of society. Most dependency theorists may also argue similar notions. But still, some indicate that it is possible to leave the neo-liberal thoughts, practice and path of the system to look for an alternative way.

Class system: The liberal system once emerged as dominant one. It is backed and entertained by most capable states and institution. Their capability, dominance allow them to give 'ill-advise' for the global south to have a minimalist state for their socio-political and economic development.

If a state has liberal social, economic and political setups, state's borders, resources and businesses are open to a global market. As a state open itself and get into the global market, it is a wide and open competition with the most globally capable institution, states and elites. The market, is not about industries, goods, prices, supply and demand, but also about states, individuals, the social relationships and structural setups between them. The market is part of the system. The market is not only economical but also both political and social. For less capable states, to be part of the system is to be raped and exploited by the international raw deal of that system.

The principles of that system are not cosmopolitan in their practical term, it is a state or class centered system. Even within a particular segment of humanity-state- it becomes a system of thriving for some while a system of strive for others. Thus, it has a class favored social, economic and political principles in practice. In a global sphere, it seems a system for all mankind, but it could not allow all humanity to thrive alike, at least at a near distance. It is a consolidation of class system based on economic status. In class system there is a higher class and lower class. In such, there is unchecked privilege of the higher class, an influence of the higher class, and power dictation by that class and as a result general assault on poor and working people. That system plausibly lead into a maintenance of the power of the higher class, political elites and their enrichment at the expense of the average people. It seems the inevitable to see invisible economically authoritarian regime in it. Any segment organized by this line is a class system. While there are ardent proponents of it and call it liberal democracy. It is really inconsistent claim to have a liberal democracy and end up with a class system.

Hypocrite System: Although liberals' believe in equality, liberty.....under their system, humanity faces a worst condition of inequality, the wealth gap and uneven distribution of burden and benefits than ever before in history, (see Sargent 2009:50). In general, the promises and real outcomes of liberalism are different things. So, the system is disloyal to its values, principles, theories and conditions that it claimed to bring. Defenders of that system preach peripheral states something different and they rape something else. Their system remained as a pretense of having beliefs, standards, virtues, qualities... which it does not actually have in real terms. The system ended up with hypocrisy. Thus, one could say that liberalism always tends to be a hypocrite and precarious social and political system.

Generally, this system has some epistemologically plausible ideas. But it is a hypocrite, socially a means of inequality-enhancing and exclusion, culturally and practically a means of de-

contextualization and in favor of moral permissibility, politically imperialist and centrist, economically fascist and class favored, environmentally exploitative and not responsible. These all give a way to subordination and suffering of the poor. It runs into a self-contradiction, as it shows signs of overreaching its own power.

Many critical commentators view the current crisis and the attendant legitimacy problems for free-market capitalism as an opportunity to make the case for financial re-regulation ...against globalizing markets. (Konings, 2009:1)

Likewise, a demand to look another way than that dominant system become a serious and a timely issue. I will go towards democratic developmentalism as its alternative.

3.3 The Idea of Democratic Developmentalism

... Development process has been ... revolved around two major trajectories: the Minimalist state and the maximalist state. The former, shaped by the liberal/neo liberal {dogmas} ... [to] with the "market" and its associated forces... On the Other hand, the maximalist state perspective asserts that the state should have a prominent role in the development process.... In spite of the hegemony of [the first] several states in the "Global South" have experimented with various models of ... "developmental state:" authoritarian (e.g. Singapore and South Korea) and democratic (e.g. Botswana and Mauritius). (Kieh Jr, 2015, 2:2)

The maximalist state model/developmentalism has two version; the democratic and authoritarian nature. Developmentalism is widely conceived as entertained and implemented by authoritarian regimes which have a bad record of democracy and human rights. Despite that, it has a good record of economic transformations, solving poverty and social inequality in our contemporary era. Democratic developmentalism is derived from that conception. Theoretically, the aspiration of democratic developmentalism is to take positive aspects of developmentalism model and to correct its negative aspects, mainly its poor nature of adherence to democracy that incite heavy critics. The concept of democratic developmentalism is based on the premise that democracy and development are complementary.

Democratic developmentalism can be defined based on its institutional attributes, objectives and capacity of a state. These three measures are central points in its conceptual framework. On institutional attributes; like be autonomous, coherent, being effective on procedural democracy, ensures broad-based alliances with society and popular participation in the governance and transformation processes. In case of objective, it is dedicated for a timely-targeted socio-political and economic transformation based on a development orientations, policies and strategies. The capacity is also a notion to guide and promote goals of development and transformation by coherent and stated-led governance based on accountability, inclusiveness, stability, ability to generate consensus and popular participation.

In the last chapters, I stated how internationalization and financialized global economy influence on a national economy, politics and capability matters. In a national level, the aspiration to democracy threatened by poverty, global inequality, economic capability, swift internationalization, environmental degradation. These all challenges states' search for a capable governance and structures to deal with development, sustainability and democracy. What does democratic developmentalism model mean in different cultural, economic and political contexts? The term developmentalism, require a state to "...possess sufficient capacity to influence, direct and set the terms of operation for private capital and effectively manage both domestic and foreign private economic interests" and "...Professional and efficient state bureaucracy...meritocratic recruitment..." (Ha-Joon Chang, 2003) are also part of it. A. Leftwich, M. et al, Johnson and Meyns, have some similar ideas, stated that the main goal is to set economic development at the top priority of government policy, and that needs empowering, capable and depoliticized bureaucracy to design and promote effectively.

The notion and conception of democratic developmentalism have more in common with developmentalism. Meanwhile it has more democratic aspirations. Edigheji, stated:

Democratic developmentalism "has the institutional attributes of the classical developmental state... being autonomous and coherent... [And] ... the attributes of procedural democracy. In addition, [It] is one that forges broad-based alliances with society and ensures popular participation in the governance and transformation processes. Although [It] it is guided by the goals of coherence and authoritative governance, accountability, inclusiveness, stability, ability to generate consensus and popular participation." (Edigheji, 2005)

I think that the conception is an attempt to combine capacities, visions, norms and/or ideologies to solve and transform political, social and economic conditions and to promote democracy in the same track and at the same time. Democratic developmentalism is not the idea that development first then after a democracy, as if the end justify the means. It is an idea or nature of a state that justifies both conditions of democracy and development in the same process. It is a call for a genuine defense of democracy and human rights with in a development oriented state. Widening the scope of democracy in the process of development is very important part.

3.3.1 The Authenticity of Democratic Developmentalism

In post-colonial time, some African states like Angola, Somalia, and Mozambique tried Afro-Marxism model. While, some like Tanzania, Algeria, Ghana, Mali and Guiana tried Afro-socialism

based on a real Africa root. Both models become unviable and eventually died. In contrast, the capitalist-liberalist model lasts in most parts of the continent. Despite that they missed development and democracy. There are some reasons for the development failure of many post-colonial African states: Edigheji argues, it is due to their “undemocratic nature, while Meles contend it is due to the limitation of neoliberalism, while others contend otherwise among other possible reasons. It seems that the development paradigm they used to have since their independence period must to take its own share of the blame. Mostly, the western oriented liberal system was misleading mentality and track of development in the liberated post-colonial African. Later, western-driven Structural Adjustment Program for Africa in the 1980s has the same limit. Thus, I can argue that, part of the reason for their underdevelopment is the development paradigm they used, which has never grown out of the very socio-economic context and setup of Africa. And it is clear that the system does not effectively work for Africa, during their struggle to development, since their time of independence.

Perhaps, they might not genuinely apply liberalism. Apart from that system, various writers, philosophers, politicians, economists, are engaged to search a truly transformational development paradigm which its theory and practice deeply rooted in the realities of a given context. Lately, the same initiative takes place in Africa.

The ... renaissance of Africa is an issue that continues to preoccupy Africans and non-Africans alike. Various methods ... have been proposed ... the neo-liberal paradigm is a dead end incapable of bringing about the African renaissance, and that a fundamental shift ... is required to effect a revival.the focus is on the ...limitations of the neo-liberal paradigm and the need ... to move towards becoming developmental. (Zenawi, 2006)

In general, apart from my previous original critics of the liberal system, many statist like Meles (2006), accuse it as ‘socially wasteful’ and ‘rent-seeking’ system. While others accuse it as ‘predatory system’ (Saad-Fiho A. and Jhonston D. 2005:24). Still some dependency theorists accuse for its structural imperative and for its exploitative nature for some sides. Alongside that, a demand for a paradigmatic shift and a rediscovery of the importance of the state and the need for a more capable and effective state in a development process has been taking place in Africa, just lately in the 1990s, (see Mkandawire, 2001 and Fritz and Menocal, 2007). And, recently, some African states tried an authoritative and democratic statist model. The democratic statist model could be a better alternative. It is a demand to move towards democratic developmentalism. That was forwarded by some African scholars. But here are some different claims on the relation of socio-economic development and stable democracy: socio-economic development is a

precondition of stable democracy (Lipset 1981, Meles 2006), democracy is a pre-condition for development (Przeworski 2000) and no necessary relationship between democracy and development (Leftwich 2000:133). Despite these claims, there is an attempt and claim of democratic developmentalism conception in Africa (Mkand Awire 2005, Meles 2006), among many others. It is to promote both at the same time.

Theoretically, it has some relation with successful Keynesian model and statist model of Asian Tigers. The intervention and maximalist nature are at the heart of the conception. But, how a democratic statist can promote both the notion of intervention and democracy, as they claim to promote both at the same time? It could be argued that intervention varies in its degree, type over time, scope and content. Development and the components of good governance are clearly stated and promoted in some democratic developmentalist view. One can see; Grindle, 2004; Khan, 2005 and M. Zenawi, 2006. *Thus, according to them, development and democracy are indeed the chief ends of democratic developmentalism and one can get some justifications in these materials.* ‘Democratic developmentalism’ has been lately presented to an international audience. Furthermore, it is becoming a hegemonic paradigm in political corridors of Africa in general and in Ethiopia in particular. See this remarkable fact, that in 2007 a forum organized at Columbia University, where former premier M. Zenawi of Ethiopia had been invited and declared ‘the neo-liberal paradigm’ failed in Africa, thus he argued for a paradigm shift is needed and he outlined a 51 pages paper presented at the forum, titled *“African Development: Dead Ends and New Beginnings”*. The nature of that insight is more relevant to this paper than to whom it belong. If so, it is how that insight views the relationship between democracy and developmentalism a central point. In history, that question deemed unanswerable and unsettled apart from Japan. But some signs in both Botswana, *Mauritius* and South Africa are positive. Meanwhile, I deemed the proposed ideas, insights and conceptions related to the democratic developmentalism in Africa are indicative of how they demand a new and unique paradigm to solve social, economic and political problems thereby to sustain democratization and development. Following that, it is an attempt of how Africans view the relationship between democracy and development. At least, that provides a general picture.

I presume, the liberal system of practices and thoughts create formidable market failures and institutional inadequacies that led to vicious circles and poverty traps or unable to fight these vicious circles and poverty traps. The democratic developmentalism valued the content and values

of democracy in the course of solving and transforming social, economic and political conditions, unlike the poor record of democracy under developmentalism model. *We could have an experience of a maximalist model in South Korea, Singapore, Botswana and Mauritius. These African states try it out as democratic, amid the authoritarian nature of their Asian counterparts. So that, the conception has some authentic African origin. I am not to claim it as the only African insight I strongly argue for states to emulate that conception of a democratic statist model because it has a good potential to be a fulcrum of development and democratization in to the context of Africa.*

Recent trajectory of our state could be plenty of up and downs in case of democracy and development but it has much more in common to the notion of developmentalism. We can see maximalist nature of a state, the development success and role of a state in it are indications. Whereas the government claimed for democratic developmentalism without a genuine effort.

3.3.2 Democratic Developmentalism as Alternative to Liberal system

Despite I question their genuine effort to apply it, some regimes and states claimed to have democratic developmentalism. And they give it some existential issue in its absence.

Historically speaking many doubt the so called democratic developmentalism elsewhere, in contrast to Japan. While others argue that some states in South America, Asia and Africa have done it pretty the same. ...Brazil, India and South Africa, as well as Mauritius and Botswana, are examples attesting [it]. (Fritz V. and Menocal R.2007:6)

Whatever the real history, the conception of democratic developmentalism has no logical contradiction to promote both democracy and development consistently at the same time. There are no ideal criteria to determine a democratic developmentalism. But one can refer to literature to make sense and to determine a specific state accordingly. The case of a maximalist role of the state in development, “a common factor among developmental states appears to be a committed leadership that is embedded in the ‘right’ context of demands.” Ibid 2007:4. In addition to the ‘embedded autonomy’ conception of Evans in maximalist nature of the developmentalism, democratic developmentalism is also in search of democratic aspirations.

Here I require stating some conceptions of democracy and democratization. Schumpeter conception of minimalist view of democracy; ‘that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote’ (Schumpeter, 1942). Dahl’s formal/substantive conception of democracy that includes the basic civil liberties to be an inclusive process. This gives more emphasis to the role and importance of accountability, while vertical, horizontal and societal forms

of accountabilities are part of it (more on O'Donnell, 1996 and Schedler et al., 1999). Beside these two conceptions of democracy, there are also three phases of democratization: 'Liberalization', 'transition' and 'consolidation' (O'Donnell and Schmitter, 1986; Linz and Stepan, 1996). In the case of conceptions of democracy the second one is a more advanced form of democracy and in the case of phases, the last is more important one.

Once we have the above conceptions and phases of democracy in mind. Then if a context remains with a demand for the second conception of democracy and advanced phase of democratization, it is likely to be improved alongside other developments. I think that question of economic justice, equal opportunity, essentials of human existence, balanced economic empowerment and higher state of living are also issues of democracy like other principles of democracy, such as electoral democracy, social and political equalities, economic and political freedom... In the absence of these, I feel it is hard to talk about principles and values of democracy. What if there is poverty, I am less capable, no economic justice but guarantying these principles of democracy? It is nothing to do for me. Here is a western saying "starved man don't know reason" and the principles are nothing in practically neglecting conditions.

Growing "...inequalities undermine democracy in two basic ways; first, by fuelling social discontent and political instability...second, through the persistence of poverty, by excluding ... the population from access to the political process and its fruits." (Gordon, 1998: 28)

So some principles of democracy, which are central to the liberal democracy are short-living principles in the inequality-enhancing nature and structure of the liberal system. Thus the question of democracy need also to consider economic justice, capability demands.... and I feel social economic justice and capabilities issues are at the heart of democracy. The understanding of liberal democracy need to be incorporating and consider other conditions to its principles and claimed values.

A number of authors has criticized the liberal democratic framework for excluding social and economic aspects of democratization (Mkandawire, 2001; Sandbrook, 2000). It has been also criticized as being too formal, too elitist and as some aspects of participation are neglected, (Pateman, 1970, Chambers, 1996). Based on their view, it appears to be more formal than substantial conception. Democracy must be made to deliver some economic empowerment and a higher state of living, a sort that liberal democracy criticized for, (see Eme Awa, 1991) It is not only a question of formal democracy and democratization that matters the most, the scope and substantial conception of democracy are also important, which are considered as missed in the liberal conception of democracy.

A democratic developmentalism may embody more control and guide of development, empowerment, capabilities, economic justice... which in turn could give full meaning of the other principles of democracy and human rights. That is why I call for democratic developmentalism that internalized based on the demand and context of a given society. That is the conception that I projected in my mind. A state with orientations of both development and democracy. In the course of socio-political and economic transformation, policies, strategies, political intervention to design, plan, shape the scope some violations of principles of democracy and human rights seem inevitable.

...democratization often entails diffusing power more evenly across a greater number of actors both within and outside government, whilst strengthening state capacity may call for greater centralization of power and autonomy in the decision-making process. (Fritz V. and Menocal R.2007:6)

But, I argue that the goal and genuine demand of the state and society matter over some principles. Thus, the liberal-minimalist conception of democracy and democratization should not be all in all a reference point for the democratic aspiration of democratic developmentalism. But, we should not trade external systems and lifelines, rather we need to look inward towards our context, demand, resources and creativities.

3.3.3 Merits and Demerits of Democratic Developmentalism

There are merits and demerits of democratic developmentalism. Some scholars, writers and politicians criticize it for its demerits and problems. Here is one that dominates academic debate about the discourse of democratic developmentalism.

One of the supposed demerits and problems of democratic developmentalism is a dilemma reconcile that, a dominance of one party and a long-term rule of that party with allowing political pluralism. Thus, some claim that democratic developmentalism seems incompatible with the notions of democracy and human rights.

“A democracy that cannot deliver on the basic needs of the people will be short-lived...democracy and development must go hand in hand ... are mutually reinforcing. Thus in the view of some scholars, socio-economic justice is at the heart of democracy.” (Igbuzor and Edigheji, 2003).

So some opinion that assume both require different institutional settings is mistaken. Swift democratization along developmentalism seems uncommon trajectory and the transition may seem very difficult. Because developmentalism is usually associated with despotic states. But the truth is that it is quite possible to establishment a democracy in the process of transformation through developmental state instead of a violent overthrow of a despotic state. Developmentalism and democracy are not in contradiction. They are reinforcing notions

Liberalist may claim that, if there is a state agency, it might be against free will of individuals. So, maximization of self-interest is implicitly rejected in it. That system might create a paternalism for individuals, households, communities, civil societies and private companies. But a meaningful exercise of human rights and democracy requires adequate capabilities and economic resources, security, health care, education and so on. So, if its prime goal is to make sure these affairs along the development project, its paternalist nature is not contradicting to democracy.

In this system, I feel that a poor institutional and structural setup and poor quality of manpower in the bureaucracy could cost the system itself. A question of political space and statesmen must be genuinely addressed. Because that type of conception is not a system-led affair, like minimalist conception that governs by market forces on plenty of affairs. It is not system-led but state-led. The maximalist conception is in danger of failure of the state-led or individual-led conception and this could be also potential demerit on its structure.

Considering historical, structural and conceptual challenges of the current dominant liberal global system, a qualitative, quantitative, speedy and effective social, political, economic and democratic transitions and transformations seems more to come from a democratic developmentalism than from a liberal system. Thus, both democratic and development dimensions under a maximalist oriented democratic statist view is another new alternative idea and could be considered as a merit.

To transform conditions according to the far-sighted, dedicated, inspiring and motivating nature the common goals, democratic and development projects as targets are a primary business of a state, in contradistinction to the neutrality politics of liberal system. These traits of the conception have a merit of welfarism and effective and speedy transformation. Having external and internal conditions, this merit seem indispensable for least capable states.

The maximalist democratic state must banish the economic injustice and wealth gap of liberal system. The middle class needs to grow, the poor need to join the middle class. A big capable middle class is great for the economy, democracy and state. And creating this condition could be also a merit of it.

The deregulated global liberal system is inadequate to regulate the world and re-regulation based on the aspirations of democratic statist view is demanded. The global centralization of everything towards the core is also not legitimate, both in terms of democracy and economy. In a democratic statist view, a state is there to punish, excessive diffusion of power and authority, unnecessary rent seeking that allows global centralization. Thus, to have a powerful state on these aspects is another

merit of the system. Thereby, profit oriented and self-interest maximizing behavior of individuals in a liberal system of thought needs to be banned in a democratic 'statist' conception. Trying that conception shows how other forms of societies' divergent political, social and cultural ideas that grow out of their context could make meaning than the alien system.

3.4 Some Philosophical Defense for Democratic developmentalism

Logically speaking, all authoritative states are not developmental nor vice versa. In the same case, all democratic states are not developmental nor vice versa. There is no necessary relation between a regime of a state and its development track. It is confirmed that; "...there is no necessary relationship between democracy and development", (Leftwich, 2000:133). But, be a democratic and developmental state at the same time, it is a sufficient condition to improve more social, political and economic affairs. Whether statist could respect human rights and aspect of democracy has been asked critically by many scholars. Authors like Vicky Randall have done it pretty well than anyone else. Historically it could be a good and right critic. But conceptually there is no such an open space to criticize, because both are possible to promote consistently.

Developmental state is often conceptually positioned between liberal open economy model and a central-planned model. The theory of developmental state isn't capitalist or socialist. The developmental state is based on combinations of positive advantages [of] private business and the positive role of government. (Bolesta, 2007)

Adding some ardent aspirations of democracy and human rights, the same is true about the democratic statist view. In terms of social-political economy, democratic statist view conceptually find itself between open liberal political economy and overall government-regulated communalist political economy. In terms of democracy, between individualistic liberal democracy and crude communist/socialist model. A democratic statist is not capitalist/liberalist/neoliberalist nor communist/socialist, it is a form of maximalist-democrat state based on the 'embedded autonomy'. A successful and speedy transformation of state and society without having a state centered development maxims and projects seem unlikely. States withdrawal from the deregulated global system is unnecessary to transform itself in a short term. Thus the statist conception and the demand for democracy in developing world is indispensable. Democracy includes good governance and good governance require forming and consolidating an effective and strong state. Decentralization and power diffusing state in a liberal system do not necessarily mean real democracy. Only that may not improve other affairs of a society and a state. Rather that seems to

contradict with forming and consolidating of an effective and strong state, which in turn is part of weakening democracy.

Since the experience of democracy in developing states is low or poor they need to synthesis the democratization processes, in their development projects, in their social and political philosophies, in their political economy and in their governance. The social, economic, political transformation and its sustainability should be also supported by a democratic evolution to be complete process.. Thus, combination of democracy and development could be an insight into a great potential to transform overall condition a society/state. A poor agrarian less capable and less democratic societies/states are in demand of this conception in contrast to a liberal, secular, civilized and most capable societies/states. Thus, identification of conditions and the right context which is in demand for it is also an important issue.

It better to have a genuine and internalized discourse, based on a given context instead of imposed discourse/system. For that, I personally go for a discourse of democratic developmentalism. That must be based on an internalized, culture and context. Thereby, a capable and effective state with soft power relation is needed to be established as prerequisites for both development and democratic aspiration. Western-oriented liberalized African theories, policies and models of social and political philosophies, political economy and development paradigms was not effective. Despite there are some questions whether they were genuinely applied. However, it is an abstract, imposed, non-internalized system/discourses and need to be banned.

Most literatures presuppose that more or less effective state exist before democratization process starts, Linz and Stepan, 1996. There is also growing international opinion that state's/state institutions', orientation, effectiveness are critical to the fail and success of development goals, Fritz and Menocal, 2006. Effective and strong state is critical for both development and democratization. "The appeal of ...authoritative-led state... (Has) ...expediency... [While]... messy and time consuming procedures [are] typical of democracy", Halperin et al, 2005. It seems that policies of formal conceptions of democracy, that has the conception of fragment, diffuse, divide power among all, are too chaotic and unpredictable to provide strong and autonomous state structure to development and substantial conception of democracy.

Despotic regimes have more positive relation on promoting economic development, Sen, 1999. Democracy has a positive impact on social and economic development, Yi Feng 2003. Democratic regimes have more steady and stable growth patterns than despotic. Halperin et al, 2005.

Przeworski and his collaborators, 2000, in their study taken on 135 states from 1950-90 they claimed that whatever the regime development is open. So we do have no conclusive finding about the relations of democracy and development. No linear relation between them. If so, different regimes could have similar development policies and achievements. Therefore a development orientated state is possible for any regime. It is also possible for an authoritative state to provide a meaningful reduction of inequality, provision of education, political stability, rule of law, basic social services, and protection of property right, which are parts of substantive conceptions of democracy, see Leftwich 2005, Zakaria 2003. Thus, a state with a conception of democratic developmentalism is possible without a contradiction.

Chapter IV

Critical Analysis and Remark

4.1 Introduction

I am critical of the liberal system. Because, it has its own theoretical and practical problems. That, it has conceptual limitations and practical inadequacies. The structural imperatives that it bring to some forms of societies are still part of my critic. Next, I will contend its practical dominance. Because that system could not serve as the only means of socio-political philosophy, a political economy and development paradigm for all segment or forms of humanity. At the end. I will go for a democratic developmentalism as an alternative. It could be a conception based on a given identity, context and culture. It could be also a means to uncover historical, current and strategic concerns of different forms of society which poorly depicted, represented, and addressed by the liberal system.

4.2 Critical Analysis

Tree metaphor: Commonly speaking, a tree has three main parts – the branches and leaves, the trunk and the roots. In the parts and structure of tree, each and every part seem to have its own independent function and structure. Yet, the structure and system of a tree is a complex whole and the parts are the way the tree appear to be. The interdependency of independent parts and their function are indispensable. For a long time, I have considered prevailing principles embodied in the design and structure of a tree as it relates to human society. The systems and structures of a society and a tree resemble each other. Parts of both and their function too. Some people are like the leaves, the roots and a trunk in the system and structure of a society. Individuals are only there for a reason in a social system, like every part of a tree is. The structure and system of a tree are also worth living for the parts as well the parts for the whole. Likewise, family society/community can depend on individuals because they are there for a reason, like a particular part of a tree and its function. Likewise, an individual is there to be benefited from the well-structured and webbed social system as a unit. But, like a particular leaf cannot undermine the tree-ness of the tree the same goes to an individual. This metaphor is to show that the primacy of an individual in the liberal system of thought is ungrounded, false and misleading.

Sadist-Masochist Thought Experiment: Sadist is one who drive pleasure through pain to others, while masochist is one who derive pleasure by harming himself or being harmed by others. If one

is a sadist and no one as masochist around him, he is to commit a crime, however if one is a masochist and no sadist around him, he need to be both a sadist and masochist at the same time or he requires to get a sadist not to commit a crime. The moral of this tale is; one may have a will, determination and guts to be a sadist and pro- sadism. But, the will, determination and guts of an individual are nothing to actualize his will around a public sphere. Because the yes factor of a public sphere or context around him is decisive. Individual's thought, will, claim and rights are not actual rather they are potential. The confirmation and endorsement of a context alongside them are the base of all rights and justice that transform potential sorts into actual sorts. Life and living in a civil society is a complementary condition. An individual is there to get an endorsement, confirmation and recognition for a realization of his potential rights and wills. And all are waiting for the same reciprocal decisions from the context or society at the same time. Thus, any individualistic claim of right, liberty to practice is a potential one and has no place out of the society or context. A meaning of transcendent context is very important to claim such rights.

Ethiopia: Ethiopian identity, culture, tradition and history, like some Africans and Asian, is not individualistic oriented. While most westerners celebrate and entertain radical individualism. There are no means that required to entertain liberal social and political philosophy to that context. For some Africans, that system is integrated part of their educational, political, economic...systems, thereby it decontextualizes the new generation throughout. It, systematically and persistently, denies being-an-Africa-in-Africa, being-an-Ethiopian-in-Ethiopia. Thus, likewise, having that system/discourse/narratives in Ethiopia is a process of de-contextualization of generations.

Having its limitations, inadequacies, imperative and pseudo epistemological narratives, some elites have accepted that system without questioning its nature and genuine viability. They are either reluctant, or lack courage, or deny their rational soul to reject that unviable system that corrupts identities, cultures, religions, systems and conceptions out of its context. We need to have a spirit of person/community-hood to question and challenge it in a pragmatic and rational way.

Nowadays, some states of Africa, i.e. Ethiopia, claimed to have a concept of democratic developmentalism. Our government may officially claimed for it and give it an existential issue. But, I feel that, it required to take it genuinely in a real terms. There are no real intent towards democratic developmentalism, despite some indicatives of developmentalism. One can consider the democratization, political leadership and the nature of bureaucracy of the state against the

claimed nature of democratic developmentalism as autonomous and coherent... [And] ... the attributes of procedural democracy... broad-based alliances with society...accountability, inclusiveness, stability', Edigheji, 2005. And I sympathetically argue that a conception of democratic developmentalism could be a good alternative to the liberal system if it genuinely applied. Democratization along the developmental state could be a new trajectory and is quite possible. In the wider spectrum of political philosophy, I feel that democratic developmentalism could have a space to be an alternative way of looking at the reality of a given society. This alternative concept could serve as a way of contextually opening up at the socio-political realm. Also as a means of uncovering way to the historical, current and strategic concerns of least capable states, which were poorly depicted, represented, and addressed in that liberal system.

Democratic developmentalism seeks to provide a framework for understanding the less capable states' injustices associated with the liberal system and globalization. That alternative could serve as a vent for developing fresh ideas, practices, and justifications for how socio-political institutions and practices should be or ought to be organized and reconstructed. I argue that a move toward democratic developmentalism will engender an appropriate social and political conditions. It can be a nice surge to the well-being of a society and well-fare of a state. Alongside it, an exercise of soft power to achieve swift and sustainable development, democratization and peace, within the context is very important.

4.3 Critical Remarks

I don't feel that many things are exactly opposite, namely individualism versus collectivism, constructivism versus realism, objectivism versus subjectivism, agency versus system/structure, liberalism versus communitarianism/developmentalism, authoritative versus democratic. These supposed opposite dichotomies are just two ways of looking at the same sort, only they are some out of the many possible ways of outlook. Likewise, democratic developmentalism is another way of look to the socio-political reality. I would like to remark that, it is not a radical opposite of a liberal system.

Today, many individuals, state-men, groups, states... are criticizing the liberal system. But, who does give us a satisfactory solution, or at least one that isn't downright absurd answer, to the limitations and problems of the system? Different schools, claim to have something, but they provided none of the real answers. Do radical/liberal/conservative liberals give us that? I do not believe so. It seems the solution is out of that liberal system. The liberal system of thought and

practice; disrupts local communities' ties and relations for communitarian, a source of deviant behaviors for the republican, a wasteful and rent-seeking system for some statist. I stated in the last chapter that, how the system has conceptual limitations, practical inadequacies and structural imperatives. Thus, it requires being open for revision. And I think, a genuine alternative that succeeded by subverting liberal dogma is welcome to the less capable states.

The conceptual limitations, practical inadequacies, structurally imperative, the inequality-enhancing nature and structure and international law deal of the system are well stated. There are also poor, oppressed, hegemonized and exploited sides under that nature of the system. These sides will always yearn to have a transcendence invention that takes them beyond their current human condition of the system. The transcendence invention is to serve them as an alternative. We need to create and protect government with spaces for that, based on democratic, communal, cultural and contextual aspirations. So that majority of the people do not feel they have to go to market for everything and outplayed in competition by the few in every aspect of their lives. That new invention must question the system, most capable states and powerful institutions like BWI. It must force them to rethink about their commitment towards the system, the logic behind it, including the limitations, vices, schemes and rationalization it has in real terms. I hope an alternative to be a democratic developmentalism.

In my short life, I've seen our overall culture – including the political and social culture– change a lot. Most of the time the change is driven from the top to the bottom – from state elites or government to the general public or from foreign to the interior of our state through elites. One can see our recent three regimes. Let, we abandon and condemn foreign systems, their structures and their philosophical foundations. Then, look inward to ourselves and invent our own socio-political philosophy which is viable to our identity, cultural, political, social and economic needs. How do we make sure that we are not the engineers of our new system and push forward to have our own socio-political conceptions/discourses that could serve as a viable alternative to that alien liberal system? Meanwhile, if one is totally absorbed by imposed systems it is very difficult to consider an alternative within its boundaries. It could be also impossible to escape from a system. But context based internalized discourse could make sure it.

Y may happen to live in a context of prosperous, industrialized, most capable, hegemon and exploitive state/society and not to the context of X which is least capable, oppressed, hegemonized and exploited side. Y and his context may welcome and value the liberal system and its basics.

What about X and his context? It is in a high demand for political security, economic security, well-being, welfare, strong moral fabric and social ties, happiness and development. X might be rational enough to give conditional prioritization over the basics of liberalism. It is not a total denial of them but rational prioritization based on a context. Thus, the basics are not the standards for all humanity. Based on the above X-Y arguments, I think that everyone deserves basic needs and important resources to have available and accessible. The right to basic needs, important resources and lives should prioritize from the right to make a profit. Those aspects of human needs should not be sacrificed in a case for some to gain more profits. If we let the liberal system flourish in every aspect of the state and society, just privatize water, food, cloth, schooling, healthcare, industries, agriculture... and who will make these things at cheap/bargain price or accessible at an affordable price for the poor? If we privatize things like water/food, everyone will go to maximize his self-interest and make a profit out of every possible thing and condition. These are basics for lives, still some people will be excluded. Perhaps, all the poor will strive to make these things for them. It became that conditions are denying access for the poor. And the result on the well-being of the poor who make up the majority is negative. Roles of state: to redistribute resource, basic needs and wealth are demanded for the like matters. A system, structure, plan, pattern to that measure is required for a state. Maintaining and sustaining basic needs make both an individual and state strong and positive. Thus, I am not afraid to go for a state/government which is strong, effective and rational on these interventions.

A swift socio-political transformation as well creating a capability, ability and conditions of citizens to satisfy most basic needs are demands of most societies. That may require some necessary, rational, legitimized and timely state intervention to plan and regulate so as to have equitable, or at least balanced, development and transformation. And to make sure that development and transformation of that state along democratic transition may require equal demand. For that, I argue for the idea of capable, effective state with experience of soft power and growing democratization. That is a typical nature of democratic developmentalism and it could be a good alternative. One can see Ha-Joon Chang, 2003.

If there is no such a capable and effective government in a given state that state can face governmental collapse, which could be an outlet to a crisis, insecurity and political instability. Political insecurity might be the worst and cause of other plenty types of insecurities. In the absence of that security, a condition could allow the dominant international system and most

capable states to install their apparatuses and to exploit whatever they need. Because the system is anarchic and allow the most capable states and few wealthy corporates to enjoy. Without a stable political system almost nothing is possible within a given society/state. Political security could be a means to other securities. Self-interest, freedom, liberty, life security, property of an individual is only possible with the presence of stable political system and that make sure these sorts. The primacy of strong, effective government with absolute authority indispensable. Justified restrictions and intervention on redistribution as well as liberty and freedom of individuals, even in an economy is not bad nor wrong. There is no such a fundamental principle that holds intervention and restriction away. Whatever liberalism claims in favor of this, it is a pseudo claim. What would be the liberals' perception and position towards inflation-fighting by central banks and towards the position, influences and measures of BWI on a global economy and financial affairs? And what is the logic behind the appreciation of liberal scholars and states towards these institutions: Practically they never abstain intervention and restriction.

Are there any cultural and social conditions that individuals must have for their good and effective lives? Unless there is a social-communal formulation of the good, there can be no normative foundation upon which different individuals and groups have to value among diverse possible alternatives. An overriding-good always based on the concern of well-being, welfare and securities of a community is important. That could also give individuals rich web of social relations and substantial degrees of security, rights and freedom. That way is an urge to seek a prudential common ground, culture, aspiration and objective for an individual and the society. The tree metaphor and sadist-masochist scenario in the above shows that how the context and interdependence of individuals and societies important. To have a position of an amalgam of person-hood and community-hood is indispensable. Generally, principles that have a potential to govern human thoughts and actions in a webbed society should be discovered through that way. Humanity expects or deserve values like; integration, ties, survival, security, well-fare, well-being, good lives, development and happiness from the socio-political philosophy they used to have. The atomized and self-interest maximization nature of the liberal system is not a good philosophy to that end.

Who is there to set a universal socio-political principle that can serve as guidelines for socio-political organization and interaction in every form of community? Such an attempt claimed by politicians, books, scholars, classics. Those claims never fit into the history and realities of politics.

And no one has a God eye's point of view on politics. Contexts are not rigid and are subject to perpetual and frequent changes. Principles can arise in the course of political engagement, deliberation, and discussion alongside the fluid nature of a context. Thus, one can have more or less general principles of politics, but that can hardly claim universality. Internalized and contextualized discourse/concept is worth perusing for every context than imposed liberal system. Having such very complex issues in the area of politics it is not such an easy task to have a universal guiding political system or principles. Nor is it possible to stick to promised guiding political principles throughout. Contexts are fluid. A man is curious and active by nature. Through his active engagement and curiosity man change his outlook, way of life and condition of a society through time. To live, act and think on the so called promised aspects of a contract throughout human lives is a riddle without a solution. The long standing conception of SCT must be questioned.

If one think that changing the current Anglo-American based framework of values, pattern of thought and practice, which is attributed to the liberal system is expensive or impossible, let modern slavery to interrupt human history and allow hegemony, economic fascism, de-contextualization, inequality on human lives. Social and political philosophy must base its thought on morality as ever. Fighting some social and political conditions, like inequality of wealth, starvation while others accumulate... which are preventable by state plan might have some moral foundations. Public control and guide of the economy from the private sector may have some justifications. Thus, in that line and guide it is possible to have better alternative of human insight.

Conclusion

In the first chapter, I have discussed some conceptions of social and political philosophy. I discussed the liberal system of thought and practice in general and the relation between liberalism and neo liberalism as part of it. I argued that both have the same basics and commitment. Nevertheless, they have a difference in the extent and emphasis they have towards the common basics. Regarding the notion social and political philosophy, I have also seen other system of thoughts and practices and conceptions, like communitarianism and developmentalism. I discussed the origin, nature and principles of these three conceptions.

In the second chapter, I discussed how the liberal system of thought and practice become a dominant system as backed by powerful institutions and states, in which globalization and

internationalization are part of it. I also stated that, how communitarianism and developmentalism emerges as challenges to the liberal system. The general challenge of both communitarianism and developmentalism are based on limitations, inadequacies and imperative of that system. Especially, I stated how the communitarian thought challenge some conceptions of liberals' i.e. 'undue emphases' of autonomy and 'neutrality politics'. While, developmentalist challenge the 'predatory' nature of liberal political economy and the relay on market forces. However, no matter how they successfully challenge it, I showed that, the system remains to be dominant behind most thoughts and practices of different societies and states.

In the third chapter it goes like this. Despite the fact that, the liberal system has some epistemologically plausible ideas I stated: First, it charged as it disrupts local communities' ties and relations, as it is a source of deviant behaviors, and as it is a wasteful and rent-seeking system for communitarians, republicans, statist respectively. Second, I argued that it is hypocrite, socially a means of inequality-enhancing and exclusion, culturally and practically a means of de-contextualization and in favor of moral permissibility, politically imperialist and centrist, economically fascist and class favored, environmentally exploitative and not responsible. Third, I stated how these all give a way to subordination and suffering of the poor. Then I showed how the limitations, inadequacies and imperative of the system become challenges to apply it universally. I also argued how it is abstract, imposed, non-contextualized system to other forms of societies. Then I appear to claim that poor, oppressed, hegemonized and exploited sides require to have context and culture based internalized alternative conception. That can uncover historical, current and strategic concerns, which poorly depicted, represented, and addressed by that system. I stated democratic developmentalism as an alternative. I have also stated some arguments to discuss the nature, viability and merits of the conception.

In the last chapter, I presented some critical analysis and remarks. First, in the tree-man metaphor, I showed that the primacy of an individual in the liberal system of thought is ungrounded, false and misleading conception. Second, in the Sadist-Masochist thought experiment, I tried to argue that a scope and meaning of transcendent context is very important for the notions of autonomy and liberty. Third, I argue that any system could not be transplanted equally into foreign context, where it has not a cultural and traditional foundation. These all shows that my intent to favor and defend an internalized conception of democratic developmentalism. I am adamant and hopeful to see it in a ground with a genuine effort.

Bibliography

- Alina Rocha Menocal and Verena Fritz. (2007). Developmental States in the New Millennium: Concepts and Challenges for a New Aid Agenda. *Development Policy Review*, 25 (5), 531-552.
- A.Przeworski, E. Alvarez, A. Cheibub and L. Frontmatter. (2000). *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abrahamsen, R. (2000). *Disciplining Democracy: Development and Good Governance in Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Alfredo Saad-Fiho and Deborah Jhonton. (2005). *Neoliberalism: A critical Reader*. London: Pluto Press.
- Alina Rocha Menocal and A. Rogerson. (2006). Which Way the Future of Aid? Southern Civil Society Perspectives on Current Debates on Reform to the International Aid System. *Overseas Development Institute*, Working Paper.
- Alina Rocha Menocal, Verena Fritz and Lise Rakner. (2007). Democratisation's Third Wave and the Challenges of Democratic Deepening: Assessing International Democracy Assistance and Lessons Learned. *Overseas Development Institute*, Working paper 1.
- Amitai, E. (2003). A 308. "Communitarianism," *Encyclopedia of Community: From the Village to the Virtual World*. Sage Publications, 224-228.
- Bolesta, A. (2007). China As A Developmental State. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, vol. 3, no. 5, 105-111.
- Chambers, J. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925-1975*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chambers, S. (1996). *Reasonable Democracy*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Edigheji, O. (2005). *A Democratic Developmental State in Africa? A concept paper*. Johannesburg : Centre for Policy Studies.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: .
- Fabre, C. (2011). *Contemporary political theory: liberalism and its critics*. London: University of London.
- Fukuyama, F. (2005). "'Stateness' First". *Journal of Democracy*, 16 (1):84-88.
- Gary, J. (2000). *Two Faces of Liberalism*. New York: New Press.
- Glaston, W. A. (1991). *Liberal Purpose: Goods, Virtues and Diversities in Liberal States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Gordon, W. (1998). 'Constructing a Democratic Developmental State.' in Robinson Mark and White Gordon (eds). *The Democratic Developmental State: Political and Institutional Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- H. Ferguson and W. Mansbach. (2004). *Remapping Global Politics: History's Revenge and Future Shock*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ha-Joon, C. (2003). *Kicking Away the Ladder: The 'Real' History of Free Trade*. Not indicated: Foreign Policy In Focus (FPIF) special report.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Igbuzor Otiye and Edigheji Omano. (April 7-10, 2003). '*Constitutions, Electoral Process and the future of Democratic Governance in Africa*' A paper presented at the African Conference on Elections, Democracy and Governance. Pretoria, South Africa: organized by the Independent Electoral Commission of South Africa (IEC), the African Union (AU) and the African Association of Electoral Administrators (AAEA).
- Jeffries, R. (1993). The State, Structural Adjustment and Good Government in Africa. *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 31 March 1993: 28.
- Kekes, J. (1999). *Against Liberalism*. Ithac and London: Cornell University Press.
- Kelbessa, W. (2005). *The Utility of Ethical dialogue for Marginalized Voices in Africa, Discussion Paper*. London, United Kingdom: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Khan, M. H. (2009). Governance, Growth and Poverty Reduction. *Economic and Social Affairs, DESA Working Paper No. 75*.
- Konings, M. (2009). Rethinking Neoliberalism and the Subprime Crisis: Beyond the Re-regulation Agenda. *Competition and Change Vol. 13, No. 2*, 108–127.
- Krouse, R. W. (1982). Polyarchy & Participation: The Changing Democratic Theory of Robert Dahl. *Palgrave Macmillan Journals*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 441-463.
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Leftwich, A. (1995). *Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Leftwich, A. (1995). *Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Leftwich, A. (2001). *States of Development: On the Primacy of Politics in Development*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Leftwich, A. (2001). *States of Development: On the Primacy of Politics in Development*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Leftwich, A. (2005). Democracy and Development: Is There Institutional Incompatibility? *Democratization*, 12(5):686–703.
- Leftwich, A. (2008). *Developmental States, Effective States and Poverty Reduction: The Primacy of Politics*. Geneva, Switzerland: Draft Prepared for UNRISD Flagship Report: Combating Poverty and Inequality.
- Lim Hyun-Chin and Jang Jin-Ho. (2006). Between Neoliberalism and Democracy: the Transformation of the Developmental State in South Korea. *Development And Society*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 1-28.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy, Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53(1):69-105. .
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy, Economic Development and Political Legitimacy . *American Political Science Review* , 53(1):69-105. .

- Lipset, S. M. (1994). The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited: 1993 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1, 1-22.
- M, Peter and C. Musamba (eds.). (2010). *The Developmental State in Africa: Problems and Prospects*. Duisburg and Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Menocal, A. R. (2004). And if there was no state?: critical reflections on Bates, Polanyi and Evans on the role of the state in promoting development. *Feature Review: Third World Quarterly*, 765–777.
- Menocal, A. R. (2007). Analysing the Relationship between Democracy and Development: Defining Basic Concepts and Assessing Key Linkages. *Wilton Park Conference on Democracy and Development*, (p. Background note (1)).
- Meredith, W.-C. (not dated). *The Ties that Bind? Autonomy, Embeddedness, and Industrial Development*. Chicago: Northwestern University.
- Meyns, Peter and Charity Musamba (eds.). (2010). *The Developmental State in Africa: Problems and Prospects*. Duisburg and Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Mkandawire, T. (1999). The Political Economy Of Financial Reform In Africa. *Journal of International Development*, 321-342 .
- Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about Developmental States in Africa'. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 35(3):289-313.
- O. Igbuzor and O. Edigheji. (April 7-10, 2003). 'Constitutions, Electoral Process and the future of Democratic Governance in Africa' A paper presented at the African Conference on Elections, Democracy and Governance. Pretoria, South Africa: organized by the Independent Electoral Commission of South Africa (IEC), the African Union (AU) and the African Association of Electoral Administrators (AAEA).
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plattner, F. (1990). *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.
- Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. .
- Robinson Mark and White Gordon. (1998). *The Democratic Developmental State: Politics and Institutional Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, Mark and White, Gordon. (1998). *The Democratic Developmental State: Politics and Institutional Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sargent, L. T. (2009). *Contemporary Political Ideologies: A Comparative Analysis*. Boston: Suzanne Jeans.
- Schumpeter, J. (2003). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York and London: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Sen, A. ((1999). Democracy as Universal Value. *Journal of Democracy*, 10.3, 3-17.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Thandika, M. (1999). *'Crisis Management and the Making of 'Choiceless Democracies'.* in Joseph Richard (ed). *State, Conflict and Democracy in Africa*. Colorado and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.
- Verena Fritz and Alina Rocha Menocal. (2006). (Re)building Developmental States: From Theory to Practice. *Overseas Development Institute*, Working Paper 259.
- Weiss, L. (1998). *The Myth of Powerless State; Governing the Economy in a Global Era* . Cambridge : Polity Press.
- White, G. (2006). Towards a Democratic Developmental State. *Institute of Development Studies*, *Anthology*, Bulletin Volume 37 Number 4.
- Williams, A. (2005). *Liberalism and War: The Victors and the Vanquished* . London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- Wolfe, C. (2003). *Liberalism at the crossroads : an introduction to contemporary liberal political theory and its critics* . New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. .
- Zenawi, M. (2006). *African Development: Dead Ends and New Beginnings*. Preliminary draft.
- Gaus, Gerald, Courtland, Shane D. and Schmitz, David, . (2015, April 16). <http://plato.stanford.edu/> . Retrieved from The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/liberalism/>
- Debord, G. (1967). *Society of the Spectacle*. Retrieved from Marxist Internet Archive:
<https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/debord/society.htm>