Modernization Theory and the North-South Divide

By

Wobo Stephen N.
Department of History and Diplomatic Studies
Faculty of Humanities
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
stephenwobo86@gmail.com
08062619677
&
Kingdom E. Orji.
Department of History and Diplomatic studies,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,
Rumuolumeni P.M.B 5047. Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
orjiekekingdom@gmail.com

Abstract

The use of the term 'modernization' in its present connotations is of relatively recent origin, becoming an accepted part of the vocabulary of American, if not international, social science only in the decade of the 1960s. Despite its relatively rapid rise to currency, the popularity of the term does not appear to be matched by any widespread consensus concerning its precise meaning. The proliferation of alternative definitions has been such, in fact, that the ratio of those using the term to alternative definitions would appear to approach unity. The popularity of the notion of modernization must be sought not in its clarity and precision as a vehicle of scholarly communication, but rather in its ability to evoke vague and generalized images which serve to summarize all the various transformations of social life attendant upon the rise of industrialization and the nation-state in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These images have proven so powerful, indeed, that the existence of some phenomenon usefully termed 'modernization' has gone virtually unchallenged. While individuals may differ on how precisely this phenomenon should be conceptualized and a number of critics have addressed themselves to the relative merits of alternative conceptualizations, both critics and advocates alike tend to assume the basic utility of the idea of modernization itself, treating only the manner of its conceptualization as problematic. This paper discusses the modernization theory in relation to the north and south divide.

Keywords: Modernization. North-South, Divide, Theory.

Introduction

Modernization is a process of multi-dimensional transformations in all spheres of society existence and life, which are characterized by different dynamics, have expressions, both in quantitative indicators, and in qualitative characteristics, are interrelated and need targeted management in order to synchronize changes. Processing scientific papers devoted to the theoretical comprehension of modernization processes allows distinguishing several approaches that can be taken as the basis for current research in the context of identifying the basic regularities. Socially oriented approach considers the evolution of social relations as the primary source of the totality of modernization processes. In the early stages of scientific research, the theory of modernization was considered, mainly, through the prism of the development of society: agrarian, industrial and post-industrial. Exploring trends in the development of social order, calls post-industrial society, on the one hand, an objective reality that embodies the results of all changes, and on the other hand, an analytical construct that makes possible to carry out the comprehension of reality. Using the developed principles, he conducts research and juxtaposition preindustrial, industrial and post-industrial societies. The fundamental nature of his work is based on the application of the integrated approach, which allowed considering the role and nature of the impact of science and technology on the transformation of the social structure. The example of the countries of East Asia shows the complexity of relations between the state and society, as well as the peculiarities of the cultural traditions of the countries of this region in the form of neo-Confucianism. At the same time, the need for forming a balanced view of the role of culture in the economic development of the country is emphasized. Thus, the processes of modernization are embodied in the development of society and the modernization of social relations. Socio-cultural and religious differences determine the peculiarities of the evolution of social relations in certain countries, but the general tendency of development for individuality, initiative, and leadership becomes of particular importance for the expansion of modernization. The territorial approach is based on the recognition of the existence of a certain localization of modernization processes in the world, their dynamics in those or other regions. Territorially, modernization is associated, first, with the countries of the West, which at the beginning of economic modernization already had the established democratic system, passed the period of the industrial revolution and had the society prepared for the change.

Conceptual Clarification

Modernization Theory

Modernization theory studies the process of social evolution and the development of societies. There are two levels of analysis in classical modernization theory: the

microcosmic evaluations of modernization, which focuses on the componential elements of social modernization; and the macrocosmic studies of modernization focused on the empirical trajectories and manifest processes of the modernization of nations and their societies, economies, and polities. However, there are two key sources of problems with classical modernization theory. The first is the determinism implied in the logic of modernization, while the second relates to the specific development patterns that modernization theory must contend with. A contemporary theory on modernization relates structural change at a higher level of analysis to instrumental action at a lower level of analysis, doing so within a stochastic framework rather than the deterministic one that classical modernization theory implied. In addition, the refocused attention of social scientists on the process of development has led to a renewed interest in the characterization of the relationship between economic development and democratization. The transformation of knowledge into economic development can be examined by looking at the weightless economy—a collection of "weightless" knowledge products such as software, the Internet, and electronic databases. It is closely connected to a weightless political concept called the credible polity, which is a government that creates institutions that credibly protect property rights and are also transparent in their functioning to all members of its society.

Fundamentally, modernization theory studies the process of social evolution and the development of societies. Given the complexity that arises from tracing the multidimensional development of social processes, the goal of discovering a single definitive social theory of evolution is perhaps the most ambitious research goal in all of social science. It is therefore unsurprising that, with the benefit of hindsight that is advantaged by cumulative research, we find classical modernization theory unsatisfactory due to its Western bias, capitalist ideological underpinnings, and an overall social Darwinism in its logic. Most troubling, though, is that it displays a poor understanding of the socioeconomic development process, especially when it comes to issues such as economic sustainability, political freedoms, and social emancipation. Empirically, too, the logic of classical modernization theory has been shown to be unsophisticated at best and expressly erroneous at worst. So there is a strong case to be made for arguing that, in fact, modernization theory is extinct and hardly deserves an essay devoted to it in this compendium.

However, this essay looks ahead and suggests a considered methodical resuscitation of social evolution theory – a new modernization theory that attempts at providing a social-scientific meta-structure within which the constituent development processes relevant to sociologists, political theorists, and economists all form contributory substructures. As

such, it suggests salvaging not the message, but rather the spirit of classical modernization theory, which attempted a single conjoint explanation for social development processes, democratization, and economic growth.

North-South Divide

The terms North and South are used in scientific as well as political discourse to describe the relationship between the rich and industrialized countries on the one hand and the poor, less industrialized countries on the other hand. Despite the geographic connotation, the dividing line between North and South is not a spatial one since several countries from the Southern Hemisphere belong to the North and vice versa. Instead, central to the concepts of North and South are different economic, political, and social structures, which together generate a specific level of development, which can be measured using a variety of indicators such as gross domestic product (GDP) per head, productivity, unemployment, illiteracy rates, infant mortality, life expectancy, and the like.

While economic and social indicators describe the structural aspects of the North–South divide, a political analysis of the North–South conflict has to deal with the emergence of different coalitions and institutions, representing the interests of South or North in the domain of international politics. The history of the developing countries also plays an important role in this context since it was the experience of colonial subjugation and oppression which contributed to the formation of a common, anti-colonial identity in the South. This article makes use of both definitions of North and South: one of them describes the structural features of the North–South relationship and one relating to North and South as political forces, themselves shaping world affairs.

The origins of the North-South divide lie in colonialism. The colonial encounter devastated the indigenous civilizations of Asia, Africa, and the Americas, and enabled Europeans to appropriate and exploit their lands, labour, and natural resources. Colonialism converted self-reliant subsistence economies into outposts of Europe that exported agricultural products, minerals, and timber, and imported manufactured goods. Mining, logging, and cash-crop production destroyed forests, dispossessed local communities, and dramatically altered the ecosystems of the colonized territories. International law justified the colonial enterprise by constructing native populations as racially and culturally inferior and by asserting a moral duty to "civilize" them through compulsory assimilation to European ways. Influenced by Enlightenment scholars and philosophers, international law decreed the domination of nature and the development of industry as the key obligations of civilized states. Societies that lived in harmony with nature were pronounced "uncivilized" and in need of "modernization" and "development." Colonialism universalized European

notions of nature as a commodity for human exploitation while creating a global economy that systematically subordinated the global South. For example, post-colonial states in Asia, Africa, and Latin America were integrated into the Northern-dominated world economy as exporters of primary commodities and importers of manufactured products. Because the terms of trade consistently favoured manufactured goods over primary products, the nations of the global South were required to export increasing amounts of their output in order to acquire the same amount of manufactured goods. Efforts to boost national earnings by increasing the production of minerals, timber, and agricultural products generally glutted global markets with primary commodities and depressed prices, thereby reducing Southern export earnings, exacerbating Southern poverty, and reinforcing the North-South economic divide. The North's control over a large part of the world's resources from the colonial era to the present fuelled the North's industrial development and enabled the North to maintain levels of consumption far beyond the limits of its own natural resource base. As historian Feldman observes, "Much of the price of that achievement was paid by the population of the Third World in the form of exploitation, poverty, and human suffering." (Feldman, 1966, pp 378-395)The South's economic dependency on export production enabled the North to exploit Southern resources at prices that did not reflect the social and environmental costs of production. Far from producing prosperity, export-led development strategies depleted the South's natural resources, harmed human health, and reinforced social and economic inequality by imposing disparate environmental burdens on the communities targeted for petroleum extraction, mining, and other forms of resource exploitation. Much of the environmental degradation in the global South has been caused by export-oriented production to satisfy the needs and desires of Northern consumers rather than local consumption.

The Modernisation Theory of Development and the North-South Divide

The modernization the movement of the 1950s and 1960s is an economic theory that is rooted in capitalism. The concept of modernization incorporates the full spectrum of the transition and drastic transformation that a traditional society has to undergo in order to become modern. Modernisation is about Africa following the developmental footsteps of Europe (largely the former colonizer of Africa). According to modernity, policies intended to raise the standard of living of the poor often consist of disseminating knowledge and information about more efficient techniques of production. For instance, the agriculture modernisation process involves encouraging farmers to try new crops, new production methods and new marketing skills. In general, modernization led to the introduction of hybrids, the green house technology, genetically modified (GMO) food, use of artificial fertilizers, insecticides, tractors and the application of other scientific knowledge to replace traditional agricultural practices. The above view is endorsed by Smith who pointed out

that modernisation is about exchanging of older agriculture practices with something more recent. Agriculture societies can therefore be regarded as modern when they display specific characteristics. The extent to which these characteristics are exhibited gives an indication of the degree of modernity that has been reached. The characteristics are cited succinctly by Delacroix (1978, pp. 123-50) as:

(i) Readiness to accommodate the process of transformation resulting from changes.
(ii) Continuous broadening of life experiences and receptiveness to new knowledge.
(iii) Continuous planning, calculability and readiness towards new experiences.
(iv) Predictability of action and the ability to exercise effective control.
(v) High premium on technical skills and understanding of the principles of production.
(vi) Changing attitudes to kinship, family roles, family size and the role of religion.
(vii) Changing consumer behaviour and the acceptance of social stratification.

Notably, modernisation strategies and policies are common to both the pre and post-colonial states in Africa. On their arrival in Africa, whites tasked themselves with the responsibility of modernizing the continent. No wonder why they labelled Africa as "dark continent" which needed to be enlightened (modernized). It is the enlightenment idea that motivated Cecil John Rhodes and his entourage (composed of missionaries, engineers, farmers etc) to settle in Africa. It is also part of the reason why Rhodes' British South Africa Company (BSAC) embarked on the mission to build a road from Cape of Good Hope in South Africa to Cairo in Egypt. The form and strategies for Africa's development have always been changing in light of the changes in technological and ideological views of the developed world. The then United States of America (USA) president Harry Truman's January 20, 1949 presidential inaugural address captured these sentiments:

"We must embark on a bold new programme for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. The old imperialism- exploitation for foreign profit- has no place in our plans . . . (Levy 1967, p. 30)". Apparently, the responsibility of developing Africa is placed in the custody of the metropolitan states. The metropolis implicitly or explicitly implied that sub-Saharan Africa's development was lagging far behind other regions of the world because of the obvious 'innate' inferiority of black people to master the socio-economic and technological environment in order to improve their social and economic conditions. The above view by the proponents of modernity is malicious and misdirected. In the book "How Europe underdeveloped Africa" clearly demonstrates that in the fifteenth century (period of first encounter between Europeans and Africans), the continent had already established empires in the East, Central, West, and South of the continent. The empires of Mali and Songhay in West Africa, Tshaka in Zululand, Mossi to the East of Mali

and the kingdom of Dahomey in the central part of Africa where some of the most powerful in wealth and territorial expansion. The economies of the above states were composed of farmers, artists (gold and silver smiths, weavers, wood carvers, cloth makers, medicine men – experts in naturopathy), and sculptors of wood, iron and terracotta. The economies had advanced methods of preserving food. Scholars claim that the economies in Africa used advanced African technology and techniques. The above revelation shows that before the first encounter with the Eurocentric ideas to development, Africa had already founded its path to development. The arrival of the Portuguese in Africa in 1444 had an influence on Africa's development. At the entrance of the West into Africa that brought about a paradigm shift on how Africa should develop. The West desired to change Africa's development course in favour of theirs. The "enlightened" then tasked them with the responsibility of developing Africa along a new course. They claimed that Africa's development had to pass through distinct stages. The Rostowian theory identifies the stages as:

1. **Primitive society:** The stage is characterized by subsistence farming and barter trade.
2. **Preparation for take-off:** The characteristics of the stage are; specialization, production of surplus goods and trade. Transport infrastructure is developed to support trade. The stage encourages savings and investment
3. **Take-off:** At this stage industrialization increases and the economy switches from agriculture to manufacturing.
4. **Drive to maturity:** At this stage the economy diversifies into new areas and there is less reliance on imports.
5. **Period of mass consumption:** At this stage, the economy gears on mass production and service sector becomes increasingly dominating.

With the above scheme, it is possible to plot African nations on the linear development path. The above view is rather too theoretical. Most economies in Africa invest in agriculture, manufacturing and tourism. It is therefore not easy to classify economies into neat categories as suggested by the Rostowian linear development theory. The linear development paradigm is also shared by scholars who argue that the basic argument of the movement to modernity is related to the increase in the so called modern values of production such as automation, the use of computers, specialization, and application of science in production of economic goods and services. Modernity theorists believe that nations advance to modernity at different paces depending on their adaptability and versatility. There is an element of truth in the above idea. However, it must also be appreciated that wars, conflict, natural disasters and pandemics may force poor countries

to move back and forth on their way to development. The recent devastating political conflict in Zimbabwe and the current conflict in Libya and Sudan have robbed the nations of their development gains. The above idea demonstrates that the road to development is not always smooth, it has ups and downs. Modernists erroneously present the development theory as a dichotomous movement from an original terminal situation to an achieved situation with the help of the developed countries as Shaw (1994, pp.139-146) writes:

"Like a towering lighthouse guiding sailors towards the coast, development stood as the idea which oriented emerging nations in their journey through post war history . . . the countries of the south proclaimed modernization as their primary aspiration after they had been freed from colonial domination".

The above idea depicts modernization as a process of change whereby external factors have an impact on the individual and on culture. In this case, modernization of a person needs to provide motivation, to go along with the changing social and economic situation. It is about the abandonment of an individual's cultural values in favour of that of the former colonisers. Put differently, the development of Africa should come after de-culturalisation of the African people. Modernization of culture entails a change in the broader values, norms and attitudes of the larger contexts within which people in Africa find themselves. The theory is criticized for failing to consider the poor as the centrepiece in poverty reduction initiatives. By ignoring the involvement and participation of the target community, modernity achieves the marginalization of their commitment, creativity and support of the intervention strategies. The intervention strategy becomes an imposed strategy and such a strategy fails to construct adequate notions of both the causal powers of social structures and the role of human agency in shaping social relations in general. Perhaps the most crippling weakness of the modernization theory is its oversimplified view of social change. Human nature has a propensity to resist change in favour of the status quo. Change is resisted because it brings in elements of uncertainty. For instance development strategies such as New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) were drafted, packaged and sent to Africa for implementation. Because of its elitist nature, NEPAD has received condemnation from many African Heads of States and Government. The post-colonial states in the continent need to engineer a new theory to socio-economic prosperity of Africa. The other intriguing weaknesses of the modernisation theory is that it is based on deterministic reason which states that within the linear model of socio-economic development, changes are initiated externally. The determinist reason gives little room for the reciprocal relationship between causation from within the developing region and from outside the developing region. The premise encourages the foreign powers to

prescribe the route to Africa's development. For instance, in the 1980s Africa was victim of the failed IMF-imposed economic structural adjustment programme (ESAP). The ESAP project failed because it was developed with a total disregard of the cultural, social, political and traditional values of the recipient countries. Broadly expressed, the ESAP project was a 'Eurocentric' experiment which failed to pull the continent out of poverty and underdevelopment. Modernization is associated with development aid from the developed countries. The idea was borrowed from the Marshall Plan of the post-World War II. Apparently aid can be negotiated either bilaterally or multilaterally. Whatever type of arrangement, aid (except humanitarian aid) has strings attached to them. These strings have tended to beneficiate the metropolitan states more than the recipient countries (Africa). Today China is one of Africa's biggest trade partners because it has arranged aid at conditions that are more favourable to Africa than those of the West. But the story still remains the same that China is interested in exploiting Africa's resources ahead of Europe and America. A balance sheet of trade between China and Africa will reveal that the former economy has more to gain by exporting its agriculture ideas, manpower and technology to Africa. The surplus economic value that is extracted by Chinese capital may be externalized in the form of profit remittances back home and some of it could be spent on conspicuous consumption. No wonder why Smelser (1964) thought that the only way to manage the exploitative relationship was through a political revolution. Modernity correctly notes that technology is one of the major avenues through which monopoly capital penetrates and integrates the economies of Africa into the Chinese capitalist system Smelser (1964, pp. 268-274). Classical economists such a Smith, Marx and Marshall gave technological innovations pride in their analysis of economic progress in Africa. Marxists have argued that the difference between the modern world and Africa is purely technological and determined by the international division of labour. In other words, the West produce manufactured goods for itself and Africa while the later produce raw material for the West and for its large subsistence sector. Modernization impoverished Africa through colonialism and imperialism by the West and this trend is with us today as the East takes its turn to deplete the continent's resources such as oil and minerals. Africa needs to outgrow poverty and underdevelopment but this may not be possible as long as we still believe in the power and strength of modernity at the expense of promoting new theories for Africa's development. Fighting Africa's poverty involves much more than a simple displacement of the traditional society by the modern society. Ideas of modernization impoverished Africa. The theory failed to recognise the creativity and initiative of the Africans. Instead it places value on externally sourced aid without attending to the inhibiting conditionalities attached to such aid. The failure of the theory to attend to such conditionalities may demonstrate the hidden hand behind the metropolitan states' application of the theory to Africa. The theory's emphasis on the

supremacy of the metropolis in the development of Africa is a cause of concern in contemporary discourse on Africa's develops- ment. It is this supremacy of the metropolis that altered Africa's superstructure of beliefs and value system. The colonial conquest that followed the 1884 to 1885's Berlin Conference (partition of Africa) established a comprehensive economic and political domination of Africa by the West. Africa's endogenous development path was discarded in favour of an 'external driven development path' which was and is still manipulated by the metropolis. There has to be a paradigm shift if Africa is to reclaim its right to chat a new way to development.

The Dependency Theory

Discontentment with the modernization theory in the 1950s precipitated new strands of thinking which resulted in the dependency theory. The theory came as a critical reaction to the conventional approaches to economic development that emerged in the aftermath of World War II. Smelser (1964), in his analysis of the post colonial state, has argued that classical development theories such as modernity are misleading in that they fail to articulate the true relationship between the developed world and the poor regions of the world. For Frank, modernity distorts the truth about the motive of the developed countries on their former colonies. In the same vein, the Brandt Commission (1980), made up of 'elder statesmen, men and women of statue', set up by the United Nations in 1977 reported that development based on modernity had failed. Accordingly, the hope that faster economic growth 'modernisation' in developing countries by itself would benefit the broad masses of poor people has not been fulfilled and no concept of development can be accepted which continues to condemn hundreds of millions of people to starvation and despair. The above view gave impetus to the dependency theory. Social anthropologists consider the dependency theory to be both pessimistic and structural. At macro level, the main premise of the structural dependency theory is that it would be impossible to understand the processes and problems of Africa without considering the wider socio-historical context of Western European expansion (industrial and mercantile capitalism) and the colonization of these places by the Western economies Smelser (1964, pp. 268-274). Colonialism was not merely a system of exploitation, but one whose essential purpose was to repatriate the profits made in Africa to the so called home land. From a dependency perspective repatriation of profits represents a systematic expatriation of the surplus values that was created by African labour using African resources. Hence the development of Europe can be viewed as part of the same dialectical processes that underdeveloped Africa. In other words, the domination of Europe over Africa retarded the economic development of the continent. For five running centuries, Europe capitalized on its encounter with Africa. The above situation is succinctly expressed by whose analysis of the relationship between Europe and Africa is that during colonialism, Europe organized

herself, accumulated capital gained from her colonies in Africa, shrewdly invested the surplus in productive economy, steadfastly increasing national wealth and riches for its people. Africa was and continues to be dominated economically as well as politically by external centres of power. Most noticeable here is the economic, political and cultural dependence of the continent upon America and Europe. The dependence is also noticeable between rural areas and urban areas. Writing about the situation in Southern Africa, Tipps (1976) noted:

"Imperialists partitioned the countries in Africa and then forced the African peasantry into reserves, deliberately planned to be inadequate for the purposes of ensuring the failure of subsistence in earlier traditional forms. The discovery of the mineral riches of Southern Africa (such as gold and diamonds in South Africa, copper in Katanga in Zambia) just when capitalism was entering a new stage of monopolistic expansion inspired a particular form of colonization of the economy of the reserves". Tipps (1976, p. 15)

The above contribution shows that while Europe and America are busy exploiting Africa; the urban areas are also busy exploiting their rural areas. Within those rural areas one finds rich people exploiting poor individuals and the chain goes on and on. Therefore dependency may loosely be viewed as linear and multi-staged. The economic development of rural areas signifies the establishment of metropolitan-satellite relationship at different levels in the socio-economic structure of the economy. The relationship is based upon regional control of economic and political resources between regions, sectors of the economy and different social groups. Accordingly, the underdevelopment of Lower Gweru, Chibi, Mhondoro Chirumanzi and many more districts in Zimbabwe and Amathole District in South Africa is squarely a result of this exploitation. In the same vein, the poverty of an individual worker is a result of the exploitation of that particular individual by the system or the employer. Thus poverty at all levels is attributable to inhibiting relationships (internal colonialism) between the developed communities (urban areas) and their satellites (rural areas) and also between individuals with different economic powers. The relationship is one in which a metropolis or center exerts pressure upon its satellite or periphery. The South (Africa) has become an external sector of the North (Europe) - a source of materials, cheap labour and educated people (through brain drain). The pillage of resources from Africa continues to exacerbate poverty on the continent and rural communities suffer the most. Notably, Africa deprived (by Europe) of politic and economic decision power, and lacking sustained investment funds, trod the reverse path, sinking deeper and deeper into non- development and poverty. The dependency theory has made Africa a dump for waste and excess labour and a market where the terms of trade work to the advantage of the developed world. For

instance, Africa is positioned to specialize in marketing raw material while the developed world market finished products. There is no convincing explanation to why Africa is not manufacturing airplanes considering that the continent has aluminum and copper which can be alloyed for aircraft construction. It would be grossly unfair to think that Africa has always been a victim of external influence. On the contrary, African leaders have allowed the developed countries to exploit it. For instance, by signing the World Trade Organisation (WTO) agreements in 1995, Africa has abdicated a lot of its power to map its way to development.

The Way Forward

Environmental justice provides a compelling moral framework for the reconceptualization of international environmental law. The primary cause of global environmental degradation is the over-consumption of the planet's finite resources by global elites located primarily in the global North. However, the South and the planet's most vulnerable communities bear a disproportionate share of the pollution and resource depletion caused by this unsustainable economic activity. In response to this inequity, transnational environmental justice movements have emerged in both the North and the South, including grassroots social movements for climate justice, food justice, energy justice, and water justice. Emphasizing intra-generational justice, many of these movements have framed their demands for environmental justice in the language of human rights. Human rights tribunals have concluded that failure to protect the environment can violate a variety of human rights, including the rights to life, health, property, privacy, the collective rights of indigenous peoples to their ancestral lands and resources, and the right to a healthy environment. A robust conception of environmental justice also includes inter-generational justice, or the rights of future generations, and the rights of nature. For example, the principles of environmental justice articulated by the delegates to the 1991 First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit held in Washington, DC, recognize both inter- generational justice and the rights of nature. Principle 1 "affirms the sacredness of Mother Earth, ecological unity and the interdependence of all species, and the right to be free from ecological destruction." Principle 3 "mandates the right to ethical, balanced and responsible uses of land and renewable resources in the interest of a sustainable planet for humans and other living things." Principle 17 emphasizes the ethical obligations of present generations to nature and to future generations by requiring: that we, as individuals, make personal and consumer choices to consume as little of Mother Earth's resources and to produce as little waste as possible; and make the conscious decision to challenge and reprioritize our lifestyles to ensure the health of the natural world for present and future generations.

In order to implement these principles, some scholars have proposed specific criteria for equitably allocating the planet's resources between humans and other living creatures. Finally, environmental justice has important North-South dimensions. North-South environmental inequities manifest themselves in the form of distributive, procedural, corrective, and social injustice. The North-South divide is grounded in distributive injustice because the North reaps the economic benefits of natural resource exploitation with little concern for the environmental consequences. Northern excesses have produced potentially irreversible environmental harm that will constrain the development options of present and future generations, particularly in the global South. North-South relations are characterized by procedural injustice because the North dominates decision-making in the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO, and multilateral environmental treaty negotiations. The views of Southern countries are frequently marginalized. North-South relations are marred by corrective injustice because Southern nations (such as the small island developing states facing the imminent loss of their territories due to climate change) have generally been unable to obtain compensation for the North's prodigious contribution to global environmental degradation or cessation of the offending conduct. Finally, North-South environmental conflicts are reflective of social injustice "because they are inextricably intertwined with colonial and post-colonial economic policies that impoverished the global South and facilitated the North's appropriation of its natural resources." With this normative framework in mind, this section provides a very preliminary sketch of potential paths forward. Because it is impossible to re-invent international environmental law in a few short paragraphs, this section provides an illustrative rather than exhaustive list of possible alternatives to the status quo.

Conclusion

A systematic examination of the North-South perspective can expose the historic and contemporary inequities that have compromised the effectiveness of international environmental law and hindered our ability to address the pressing environmental problems confronting the global community. This paper has deliberately not looked at modernization theory as a constant theoretical idea that was proffered in an inviolable format to social scientists. Instead it has favoured a view to modernization theory that, while in its classical form is indubitably in need of reformulation, is a twofold gift to social scientists. First and foremost it provides an endogenous theory for social modernization. The gauntlet that empirical discoveries of irregularities and fifty years of research on social, economic, and political development has laid down is a significant challenge for constructing a contemporary endogenous modernization theory, but it is a task worth pursuing and, as this essay hints, not entirely insurmountable. Second, modernization theory is not the purview of political science, sociology, or economics. Seen as such it will

fail to progress into the next century and will likely be seen as an amusing exercise in grandiose theorizing by our predecessors. Progress will likely be most fruitful when provided through the minds of rigorous and methodological social scientists who borrow from the traditions of social science without bias and fear of unorthodoxy.

References

Delacroix, J. & Ragin, C. (1978). Modernizing institutions, mobilization, and Third World development: A cross-national study. American Journal of Sociology 84(1), 123–50.

Feldman, A.S. & Hurn, C. (1966). The experience of modernization. *Sociometry 29*(4), 378–95.

Levy, M. (1967). *Social patterns and problems of modernization*. Prentice-Hall.

Smelser, N. (1964). Toward a theory of modernization.Basic Books.

Shaw T. M. (1994). Beyond any world order: The South in the 21st century. Third World Quarterly, 15(1), 139–146

Tipps, D. (1976). *Modenization theory and the comparative study of societies: A critical perspective*. Free Press.