



Development: reading into representations of the concept

*Bourouaiah yazid**

*The multidisciplinary laboratory for applied humanities and social sciences for development
Faculty of humanities and social sciences*

University of jijel, 18000 jijel (Algeria)

yazidbourouaiah@gmail.com

Boukelmoune daoued

*The multidisciplinary laboratory for applied humanities and social sciences for development
Faculty of humanities and social sciences*

University of jijel, 18000 jijel (Algeria)

ess2014final@hotmail.com

Abstract ;

The researchers aim to evoke the historical context of the concept of development, which contributed greatly to building representations of it and worked to consolidate it so that it became the direction of the behavior of societies in their political, economic, social and cultural aspects. For this reason, the researchers sought to analyze the structure of development by identifying its main dimensions, which constitute a rich semantic field. It has a general meaning, and the study concluded that the meaning of development cannot be understood if it is reduced to one of its dimensions. Rather, we should pay attention to the other dimensions, especially the social ones, as it is the incubator of the practices in which the various meanings of development are articulated.

Article info

Received 28/01/2024
Accepted 24/03/2024

Keyword:

- ✓ Development
- ✓ Society
- ✓ Economy
- ✓ Representations

* Corresponding author

1. Introduction

It is noticeable how the issue of development in the world manifests through its very semantic structure. Development forms an endless blend of social interactions, practices, and constantly evolving systems aimed at adapting to new human requirements. It is an incubator for numerous forms of living, lifestyles, and endless social scenes. This highlights its influential power in directing and framing societies. Hence, it becomes important to delve into the meaning of the concept and to unveil the understanding or understandings that societies hold as social imaginaries and representations of development, which are invoked in their daily life practices, orientations, and perspectives on specific topics.

Our daily practices and interactions are expressions of our understanding of the reality we live in or wish to live in. Consequently, the concept of development has become a doctrine governing these practices and interactions due to its importance in directing social dynamics and determining the status of societies worldwide, whether in economic, social, political, or cultural aspects. This places us in the midst of a vast semantic field, whose anthropological structure greatly magnifies its significance for analysis, considering its long and qualitative historical process that has contributed to the establishment of its meaning, as well as the stages and situations in which the meanings and understandings about it have fluctuated, expanding and contracting from one stage to another.

Often, studies revolving around the concept of development focus on its operational nature and the apparent causal relationships it is based on, representing a set of processes that lead to direct results, thereby neglecting that it represents a mental structure carrying specific perceptions and symbols. Today, the problem needs to be approached from a different angle, assuming that all societies have developed, but in their own way. This leads us to say that the meanings we hold about the concept of development have differed and varied from one society to another and from one period to another, also assuming its subjection to the requirements of the lived historical situation and its outcomes. Therefore, there is no way to understand the implications and meanings of this concept if we confine it within a specific ideological pattern or a particular practical paradigm.

The concept of development, through its apparent influential power in societies, confirms that it transcends the overt contents attributed to it and the various impacts it creates. In this article, we assume that we can pinpoint the general meaning of development if we can examine some historical milestones that established the widespread understandings in social circles. The concept of development, whether as a process, a phenomenon, or otherwise, is inseparable from the social mental structure. Moreover, understanding the differences within the nuances of the concept is crucial, as they are decisive in the developmental orientations and practices of any society. Therefore, we aim to delve in detail into the dimensions that form the structure of the concept to encompass the meanings it has taken. Thus, our focus is not solely on the forms and institutions of development but more on our understanding of it. Development is not just an operational system but also what enables this system to exist in the first place through the meanings we attribute to it.

Here, I have a modest goal I wish to achieve: to highlight the socio-historical context and its role in mobilizing and translating the meanings and implications of development. Furthermore, I aim to elaborate on these through its various dimensions that touch all aspects of social life, without which it would be challenging to decode the semantic code of the concept.

2. Development, A Historical Context

The concept of development has garnered significant attention from researchers across all scientific disciplines since its emergence in the scholarly arena. This is due to its historical centrality in shaping and structuring societies, whether in terms of political ideology, economic systems, or even social dynamics, which has given it a somewhat unique importance in scientific studies. Therefore, when dealing with the concept of development, it is crucial to expand our semantic perspective beyond the reductions imposed on it by most political discourses and some academic studies, which have become a veil obscuring consciousness and preventing a comprehensive view of the concept across various fields: political, economic, socio-cultural. Here, our aim is not merely to mention this reduction but to present it through explanation and analysis in order to understand the multiple meanings and implications of the concept and how they are adopted.

Tracing the development trajectory of the concept of development draws our attention to the idea that cultural interpretations have always been associated with the historical contexts experienced by societies. This has intensified the difficulty of dealing with it and defining its clear meaning. Its constantly changing nature places us at the heart of the dialectic of "the founder and the offspring," meaning that the concept of development, with its various meanings, implications, mechanisms, and dimensions, can be the offspring of a specific historical situation, while it can also play the role of the founder for a particular historical situation or specific societies. This enhances our awareness of the difficulty of dealing with this concept due to its various branches and contents, which have been subjected to distortion and reduction according to its uses and requirements.

The emergence of the concept of development was closely linked to the end of World War II and the attainment of independence by most Asian and African countries. This connection between the appearance of the concept and historical events is not coincidental at all. The use and definitions of the concept were shaped by the economic and social conditions of that time. The economic perspective played a significant role, especially among political leaders, where materialistic thinking dominated political thought and the understanding of the meaning of development. Nevertheless, the concept of development has deeper and more historical roots despite the absence of the commonly used term today to express it. Otherwise, how can we explain the development of Western societies and their advancement over other societies? Thus, we deemed it necessary for the researcher to delve into historical milestones in the concept's evolution and explore the meanings and implications that laid the groundwork for individuals' representations of the concept.

The absence of the term and the emergence of dimensions are the phrases that can describe the history of development before the invention of the concept. All societies around the world followed a path of development. Even the societies that today describe themselves as advanced were, at some point, developing societies working on restructuring themselves and creating more advanced economic structures and social systems. This indicates the essence of development, specifically. However, the term was not in common use at that time. Therefore, the research into interpreting the meaning of development places us at the heart of two different directions. The first direction points to the idea of progress or natural historical development. It considers development as an ancient phenomenon that predates the history of societies, linking it to the process of evolution. This argument is based on the belief that there have always been advanced societies compared to others, even before the division initiated by President Truman in 1949.

Advocates of this approach trace the origin of development to the Neolithic Revolution. For them, the concept of development follows the path of natural evolution or growth. They view development as subject to both material and economic aspects. In another perspective, scholars seek to provide a rigorous interpretation of the history of development, considering it as a therapeutic necessity that emerged from awareness of the phenomenon of underdevelopment. This perspective is broader, more open, and multifaceted in terms of the meaning and implications of development, and it seems that we will work within this framework in this research paper.

The concept of development seems to have begun to emerge in the late 1950s with a few isolated works that were directly and explicitly linked to the phenomenon of underdevelopment. This gave us a glimpse into defining its dimensions and boundaries. In French, the term "development" in its economic sense was completely absent from the dictionary of economics published between 1956 and 1958 under the supervision of Jean Romoff. It was used intermittently in an article titled "General Theory of Economic Progress" (legoute, 2001, p. 09). This article can generally be considered a discussion of development, focusing on its material dimension, which was considered more important than other dimensions at the time. This position was justified by the urgent historical need to build the global economy. In another context, François Perroux was one of the most prominent theorists who used this term, explaining and analyzing it in his book titled "La Coexistence Pacifique" in 1958. It also appeared in his other book "**L'Économie de la XXe Siècle**" in the third chapter, titled "**The Idea of Development**".(legoute, 2001, p. 09)

Until the end of the 1970s, the term "development" was not widely known. It began to be used in economic dictionaries in 1968, such as in the Kotla dictionary for economics. It also appeared in the small dictionary of economic sciences by Wujul and in Gilbert Mathieu's dictionary in 1970. (legoute, 2001, p. 10) The contexts in which the term appeared indicate the dominance of the materialistic idea. Its widespread usage was largely influenced by the historical circumstances and experiences, particularly during the period of economic take-off, especially for third-world countries. These circumstances played a significant role in shaping its meanings and implications in this context. (Arif, 2001)

On the other hand, the concept of development was completely absent from the economic and financial dictionary by Birnard and Coll in 1975, as well as from the general economics dictionary by Canevi in 1979. This absence from many dictionaries explicitly suggests a cautious approach in using the concept. This caution might be due to the ambiguity of its dimensions and its true meanings. Consequently, the concept remained isolated in its usage, primarily associated with material and economic growth.

Moreover, recent dictionaries have only incorporated the concept of development, while still maintaining its connection to underdevelopment, considering the economic context in which it was used. This context reflects the economic level or economic disparities between developed and underdeveloped countries, a model endorsed by the United Nations. Therefore, the economic value of the concept of development has gained increasing importance, particularly due to media campaigns and political speeches that have contributed to the adoption of this idea. It has become almost a doctrine that defines the meanings of the concept and shapes social practices within societies, or at least in most of them.

In another context, the very modern nature of the concept of development does not exclude rare early uses of the concept. For instance, the term appeared in the French translation in 1908 for Gustave Schmoller's classic book titled "**Principles of Political Economy**," where the final chapter of Volume V was titled "**Theories of Economic Development**." Going back to classical economics, we can find intellectual insights into the concept in the 1930s, particularly in 1934 thanks to Joseph Schumpeter's book with the English title "**The Theory of Development**," (ivrii, 2016, p. 03) which is a literal translation of the German work published in 1911. Schumpeter's work is one of the most prominent in the field of economic theory and economic growth. The uses of the concept by classical economists have always been within the realm of economic content, indicating that the initial terminological structure of the development concept was synonymous with the concept of material growth. This had clear connections to the Industrial Revolution and its societal consequences.

In this context, we believe that the global social situation at all levels contributed to shaping the map of the concept and defining its characteristics in this way. The economic dimension became the defining element upon which individuals built their mental images and representations of the concept of development. It gave meaning to individuals' social practices. Additionally, it should be noted that the term "development" was found in early uses in 1909 when the British Parliament established the Development Committee, whose main goal was to promote the economic development of the kingdom and explore ways and mechanisms to improve the standard of living, especially concerning its material aspect.

The search for achieving military sovereignty and highlighting the kingdom's international status in the global economy was among the most important reasons for establishing a symbolic system for the concept of development, which took an economic or material direction. Material indicators were favored over other social indicators, which were marginalized in a hierarchical relationship. However, we are indebted to the Marxist current

in applying this term to the English economy, where the first English translation of Karl Marx's "**Das Kapital**" was published in 1987. This translation used the term to refer to the historical stages of production patterns. (Shahine, 2021, p. 12)

On the other hand, some historians of the British Empire also used the term "development" since the 1920s, but with a different content. They used it to mean the exploitation of natural resources for the advancement of the kingdom's economy. All of this indicates that the concept continued to be focused on its material representation, which began to form a culture in society around the issue of improving the economic conditions of the British monarchy.

However, if we can say that the term appeared in the Anglo-Saxon world before the 1930s, its generalization came later. The term "economic development" first appeared in a British context in 1959 in the context of an article about the Development Bank, and a specific article about it was not presented until 1963. In general, the introduction of the term "development" into economic literature occurred gradually during the transition from the figurative idea to the realistic idea or to the state of the concept. This was achieved by adding the economic term. As pointed out by Serge Latouche in 1988, (Faye, 1960, p. 321) this indicates that the concept did not possess a literary identity until the stage of defining indicators and criteria for classifying the developed world and the underdeveloped world. This classification, which has always been based on material aspects, helped the concept of development acquire an economic literary identity through the addition of the economic term. Here, we are not talking about the novelty of its meaning in this regard, but about the common use of the term and its identification.

In general, the true acceptance of the term "development" in both English and French languages is directly related to an awareness of the problems of underdevelopment. The historical dimension of this phenomenon, characterized by evolution, has always been linked to the period associated with the onset of the Industrial Revolution. During this period, the deep divisions between industrialized or advanced countries and non-industrialized, underdeveloped countries began to take shape. As observed by **Frayssinet.j** and others, the phenomenon of development in the world has historical roots that extend over three centuries in England, despite not being shared by all researchers in the field. Therefore, the inherited truth remains that the emergence of the concept of development, which transitioned from its figurative identity to a conceptual one by incorporating defining content that outlines its dimensions and meanings, prevailed in the post-war era, specifically in the 1950s. This era followed the identification of the characteristics of underdeveloped and advanced societies in the world.

Even today, the concept of development continues to exert strong influence and centrality in both local and international policies, whether it pertains to advanced or underdeveloped countries. Despite the mysterious nature of its contents, the concept is recognized in all languages and appears in all dictionaries today. Its diverse uses and its connection to all aspects of life, as well as its presence on various levels, place it at the heart of global

concerns. It has permeated individuals' imaginations and solidified in their representations, carrying with it sufficient justifications for its acceptance and legitimization of its practices. It has been aided in this by the dissemination of official political speeches and the mobilization of the hopes of many masses who see in this concept a ray of hope leading to salvation from the depths of poverty and ignorance. Thus, it no longer faces opposition, and it is no longer possible to question its validity, especially among the populist segment of society. The practices it is based on, the ideology it carries, and the ideals it conveys make it positive, desirable, or even necessary. Furthermore, its current power and globality serve as irrefutable evidence of its singular strength.

It seems that this brief review of the contexts in which the concept of development appeared and the uses through which it emerged has allowed us to explore some aspects of the history and origins of the concept. Nevertheless, to understand its semantic essence, we need to analyze and detail it further. Its constantly changing nature makes it a concept under construction, subject to continuous transformation and distortion. To gain a clearer picture of the structure it carries and to provide a broader understanding of its formation and evolution, we have decided to delve into the various dimensions on which it is based

3. Overview of the Dimensions of Development

3.1 Economic Dimension

The awareness of economic underdevelopment experienced by the vast majority of humanity was the main reason for the invention of the term "development" and the inclusion of its meanings, especially during the formative period of the concept. This was achieved through the emergence of development economics and various development theories, which gave it a distinctive economic content. Circumstances and nature imposed this on it, as expressed by Adam Smith in his book "**The Theory of Moral Sentiments**," where he argues that "Nature made us admire the status and position more because the social system is more secure if it is based on visible differences rather than on the qualities of virtue and wisdom, which are less conspicuous".(gandreau, p. 44) In another context, Bonnie Campbell in 1997 and Louis Emery tell us that development was viewed at that time as synonymous with economic growth, as it was seen as a problem of capital formation.(legoute, 2001, p. 19) Thus, the concept of development, in one way or another, was subject to its economic element or component.

In this context, where growth and development are considered almost interchangeable concepts, they do not mean more than achieving a series of positive economic growth rates. American economist Walt Rostow is among the most prominent theorists who presented a model aimed at overcoming underdevelopment and achieving linear development. According to him, the transition from underdevelopment to development can be described as a series of steps or stages that all countries must go through. Rostow defined these stages as follows: the traditional society stage, the preconditions for take-off stage, the take-off

stage, the drive to maturity stage, and finally, the age of high mass consumption stage (Dib, 2021).

This perspective follows a linear trajectory of development, proposing a strategy for achieving goals formulated as a series of stages, primarily based on material foundations. Therefore, this model took on the task of defining development as a social phenomenon with a primarily economic dimension. The focus was on material growth and technological innovations that would expand the share of investments from the national income, which should constitute 10% to 20% of it, allowing production to grow at rates higher than the population growth rate, according to Rostow.

We cannot deny the importance of the material aspects in the development process, as they always seek to improve the standard of living, raise individual income, and other economic indicators that represent the well-being of society. However, the rigid perception of development contained in Rostow's model and some models that reduce development to its purely economic content may need further discussion. Based on this observation, it can be said that development in the years immediately following its emergence (i.e., in the 1960s) was balanced with the growth of individual income in underdeveloped countries. On this basis, most of its representations were associated with and condensed within the strict economic dimension. However, the dominance of material and technical perspectives on the economic dimension of the concept's semantic content will become a subject of questioning as soon as there is a separation in the definition of growth and development, giving them different representational definitions.

The failure of most development models based on the purely economic paradigm is considered one of the most important reasons that led to the redefinition of the concept of development and the emergence of the social and cultural dimensions. The concept underwent a semantic awakening that led to its expansion and explosion. This is evident in the definitions related to the concepts of growth and development, which worked to highlight the precise differences between them. The thoughts of French economist François Perroux, known for his precise definitions, may help to highlight these differences and clarify them.

According to Perroux, growth represents continuous long-term increases in local economic output, while development represents the cumulative and sustainable mixture of mental and social changes in populations that make growth possible. (emmerly, 1997, p. 04) In Perroux's expression of the concept, development encompasses growth by creating and preparing the social conditions that ensure the continuity and sustainability of growth. This means that it is impossible to reduce development to the strict universe of growth alone. While growth is undoubtedly the dominant or apparent dimension of the concept, it is essential to explain its multiple aspects and dimensions. Growth is quantitative and represents an increase in the proportion of economic products. It is considered one component of the complex phenomenon, which is development. Even though it remains a fundamental requirement for any development effort as it involves improving the standard of living and achieving social

well-being, it is important to constantly remind ourselves that development is much broader than that.

The understanding provided by proponents of the quantitative approach in interpreting development emphasizes the central role of the economic dimension in defining the concept. However, at the same time, it opens up avenues for us to understand its shortcomings in ensuring the sustainability of the development project. Therefore, it does not represent a sufficient condition for achieving development. This reinforces our awareness that the concept of development is based on other qualitative dimensions that are worth exploring in order to determine the full meaning of the concept. Hence, let us take a look at the social and cultural dimension of development.

3.2 Social and Cultural Dimension

The failure of purely economic logic and the awareness among various social groups about the shortcomings of development models based solely on improving the economy and increasing production and technology, which were accompanied by neglecting basic human needs and individual aspirations, has highlighted the importance of reviewing developmental concepts and approaches. Therefore, redefining the concept and specifying its meaning and content became necessary.

The prosperity of economic development strategies in the 1960s and 1970s marked a form of inflation in the human returns of development. This era witnessed a change in human needs and the way the world was represented. The 1970s can be seen as the period when the true face of development as a social phenomenon was revealed, emptied of its real rational content. Thus, it began to lose all its rigor and authority over individuals' imagination and became a mirage for all aspirations. Moreover, the concept, through the integration of social and human dimensions, was part of a real semantic revolution against the economic representation that had been brutally imposed. This necessitated a true redefinition of the concept.

The redefinition of the concept today requires us to shed light on a set of concepts that summarize the social and cultural dimension of development. This dimension is gaining the utmost importance in shaping individuals' perceptions of the phenomenon of development as a whole. Therefore, concepts such as self-development, social justice, participation, human development, independence, and others gain central power in restructuring the concept and shaping its meaning. These concepts act as the link that reconciles the process of growth with the social well-being that societies seek, similar to their participation in structuring the ideological field of development and defining their mental perceptions through invoking the new dimensions they carry and translating them into daily practices.

To clarify the social dimension of the concept, it is essential to recall some concepts that support this dimension, define it, and provide it with symbolic meanings. One of the most prominent concepts in this regard is the concept of social justice, which represents the new

approach in the understanding of development and has gained significant popularity in the scientific arena, commensurate with its importance.

The early beginnings of the emergence of the concept of social justice were initially somewhat exclusive, despite indicating a new societal awareness about the governance systems within society. This awareness was originally among the outcomes of development. However, societies, both in advanced and developing countries, no longer believed in mere economic growth. This shift led to a semantic reprogramming of the concept, reflecting the transformation in beliefs, values, and social representations in the world we live in. Consequently, some criteria have receded to the margins, while others have advanced to the forefront of social concerns.

The symbolic system of the concept of social justice in its early stages was linked to the processes of distributing economic output, individual income, and financial returns. This indicated its inability to break free from the economic framework and its confinement under its authority. However, this new image quickly shifted towards the exploration of other social determinants, such as status and self-roles, as evidence of the continuous expansion of the social dimension's power and its influence on the general semantic field of development.

In this context, the recognition by the President of the World Bank, McNamara, in 1971 of the importance of the concept of social justice in income distribution from economic growth and output is a significant indication of its prominence. He stated that "growth did not reach the poor equally, and he saw that growth was often accompanied by a greater degree of income inequality in many developing countries" (Trembla, 1999, p. 19).

Furthermore, it can be observed that the semantic expansion of the social dimension continues through the emergence of the principle of popular participation in achieving social progress. The goal of this principle was to remove the constraints imposed by states on their citizens by focusing on bureaucratic authoritarianism. Daniel Léger, one of the leading pioneers of development ideology, emphasizes "the participation of modern society in the development process, unlike traditional society. Social activists and field workers who joined the development movement were the hope that sought to achieve the prosperity of nations and lift them out of the darkness of poverty and ignorance" (Perroux, 1996, pp. 239-240).

However, they encountered the harsh wall of realism, which made questioning development criteria a necessity. These criteria were often attributed to the marginalization of the affected communities from all processes related to the design and implementation of development projects. Most of them quickly called for the end of development strategies based on top-down hierarchy and the inclusion of popular participation and collaborative interaction as essential dimensions of development. This belief in the necessity of popular participation in the development program did not come out of nowhere but was the result of in-depth studies on the mechanisms that ensure the effectiveness of development projects.

Both the economic and political aspects were among the prominent foundations on which this perspective was based. Additionally, the concept today is no longer viewed as a threat

to the state's authority. Thus, economic development has accompanied intellectual development, contributing to the expansion of the semantic field of the concept of development, seeking ways to ensure its effectiveness.

To support and clarify the social dimension's vision and its significance, we can shed light on the issue of human needs, which has garnered significant attention from development leaders and organizations. "The World Bank emphasized in 1972 the need to pay more attention to basic human needs such as improving nutrition, health, education, and employment for the population" (Sachs, 2009, p. 243). This indicates the emergence of a new approach that clearly considers the social aspect of development as one of the fundamental dimensions of the concept.

The impact of this approach on the mindset of individuals in society was very strong, especially as it addressed the popular segment of society. It became a form of social emancipation from the constraints of the materialistic view of human needs, liberating them from intellectual prisons. In this context, populist reflections aimed not only to improve the living standards based on meeting material needs but also aimed to establish a social scene highlighting the new social well-being envisioned by individuals, which is based on the service dimensions that can be provided.

In this framework, the relationship between the economic and social dimensions can be clearly discerned. It has become a reciprocal relationship influenced by the level of each dimension. The mentality of societies now works towards achieving the mutual exploitation of these dimensions according to their importance in social development. This relationship has emerged as a result of the transformations that have affected the perceptions and visions of individuals regarding the desired social scene. The language of needs has acquired new meanings beyond the threshold of economic need. Previously, need symbolized the individual and societal lack of necessary material goods. Now, it symbolizes a form of lack of social services that can be met and provided. Consequently, the social reality has become difficult to explain within the predominantly materialistic conceptual frameworks.

This new understanding of human needs and its strong impact on society has been supported by various scientific and political opinions. Its beginnings can be traced back to the speech of American President Kennedy when he said, "People in huts and villages half a world away are struggling to break the bonds of mass misery...and we pledge to help them help themselves" (Sachs, n.d). Kennedy's speech was marked by the symbolism of consensus that most people are in need, and giving them these needs translates into rights and entitlements in terms of care. According to what he said, these needs are not purely economic but also encompass the need for social progress and the fulfillment of human needs. This is of great importance because without social development, only a few benefit from increasing abundance.

Based on this, this understanding has expanded and spread, and the new attention that the world is paying to development as a social phenomenon has been accompanied by a set of social practices that express a change in the mental structure of individuals. It also reflects a

new awareness that has provided a different definition of development. This change can be observed through the transition from the development of things to the development of humans, as advocated by the 1974 Cocoyoc Declaration. It expressed the adoption of a new symbolic and practical system and added that "the growth process does not lead to the satisfaction of basic needs, and in fact, it hinders their satisfaction. It distorts the idea of development"

The cultural dimension of development is of great importance, and it is essential to analyze it as it is intertwined with the social dimension. Cultural development, or cultural development, is an independent concept that expresses the expansion of the semantic content of the concept of development embraced by society. The term has gained significant popularity, especially among international organizations and researchers, due to its fundamental role in ensuring the quality of the development path for any society. Therefore, it is not less important than the economic and social dimensions because if the social dimension includes various social practices that allow interaction among individuals within the society, the cultural aspect represents the framework for all these practices as a whole.

Much has been said about the importance of the cultural dimension in the development process, and this issue has gained significant popularity with in-depth analyses using rich conceptual frameworks. Some have adopted the term "cultural development," while others have used "culture of development" and "cultural evolution," among other concepts that refer to the phenomenon of development in its cultural aspect. This makes the reader question the specific meaning of each term. In this context, we aim for a practical concept that does not fall at the philosophical level of ideas and values, nor at the level of anthropological analysis, but at the practical and applied level aimed at developing society according to the effectiveness of developmental paradigms inspired by external cases that often do not correspond to the social structure of this society.

In this regard, Gilbert Rist states, "Cultural development represents the imposition of a single and unique model worldwide, and even if it is possible to duplicate signs of development everywhere, it does not mean that it is logical." (Rist, 1996, p. 13). The significance of culture in Rist's words is clear, as different models have often faced failure in many countries because the criteria and values that are being entrenched do not correspond to the cultural system of the society we are working to develop, nor do they align with its cultural heritage. Therefore, the cultural dimension of development has been a subject of extensive production, especially in the 1980s.

In another context, the concept of cultural development represents a state that is more closely related to society and more authentic. It expresses an authentic representation of the concept and a symbolic and semantic system that gives meaning to our practices and interactions. It reflects a way of life that has been founded and shaped by the roots of social and cultural society. It has emerged as a result of the dialectical interactions of humans with their specific environment, taking into account the cultural and social uniqueness, including the principles of what is acceptable and unacceptable in society. This makes it more flexible because it has been created from within the society itself.

The cultural factors in the public's mindset are shaped during their social upbringing stages, allowing for their assimilation, retranslation, or standardization in society. Therefore, these cultural factors have always been handled with caution as important causes of development. This is confirmed by Jones when he argued that culture can be understood as a set of filters that have the power to accelerate or slow down development activities (Sachs, 2009, p. 192). As Marx said, the development of any society is a prominent cultural process; culture must be intertwined with development because it constitutes the dynamic element that gives societies the ability to slow down or accelerate the process of social change (Heathen, 2014, p. 31).

Our focus here is not on how a society's culture forms around specific topics but rather on the importance of culture in development or the dialectical nature that links culture with development. At some point, the cultural dimension of development became a dominant idea that cannot be avoided, where it became a decisive factor in the basic direction of development. Thus, it gained great importance even in shaping the semantic content of the concept. Therefore, we have chosen to discuss this importance on two axes that we see as central in highlighting the importance of culture for development.

3.2.1 Culture as Social Capital

The concept of social capital is one of the topics that researchers have explored and analyzed, and it holds great importance in understanding the nature and characteristics of societies. This concept has often appeared in discussions that address the interrelationships between culture and development. It is a concept that does not inherently focus on the global nature of cultural factors that facilitate development. Instead, it allows for a certain flexibility in defining the values that should be adopted to benefit the development project. It also identifies the types of values that may conflict with the project's objectives.

For example, values such as trust and respect can be considered as components or even pillars of culture that are essential for the success of development processes. Fukuyama considers them as "lubricants that increase the effectiveness of social relationships because they are the most important in determining the social capital of societies" (Rist, 1994, p. 703). Thus, differences in the level of social capital in societies depend, in particular, on what he calls the "radius of trust," which is the extent of a group of individuals where values of trust, honesty, and reciprocity are common.

In another context, the informal norms created by social capital are also important determinants of cultural society. According to Fukuyama, this is not only in the economic sphere, where it reduces transaction costs, but also in the political and social fields, where it allows the creation and maintenance of a healthy civil society. Therefore, the various determinants of culture, which represent social capital for any society, work to create the necessary flexibility for managing development processes. They also allow for their maintenance and the determination of the interaction methods that need to be adopted and followed.

3.2.2 Culture as a Driver of Development

It is not uncommon to classify culture based on its role as a driver of development or the development process in general. Each society has a cultural system that influences and is influenced by others. On this basis, every society tries to adapt to cultural inputs in a way that corresponds to the inclinations and perceptions of its members regarding the social reality. Here, the role of culture becomes evident as it helps in adopting development choices that can be adapted to or those that do not conflict with the cultural foundation of the society. Without adaptation, progress would not be possible.

Understanding things from this perspective allows us to emphasize that culture is one of the factors in shaping development choices, transmitting them, adapting them, and following them. Thus, we need a change that comes from societal awareness, where culture becomes the main entry point for effecting this change. Through culture, societies can orient themselves toward development factors that align with the local culture. This dynamism, which characterizes culture, leads society to respond in an authentic way to new changes sought by its members, which, in turn, leads to social, economic, and cultural progress.

It appears that the concept of development is multidimensional and includes various aspects and contents, especially since it is not limited to practices aimed at achieving progress and development. It also encompasses the outcomes resulting from these practices. In this regard, the words of Satch are quite provocative when he says, "We are dealing with a complex whole that cannot be easily divided into successive layers or even slices, where economic, social, cultural, and political aspects are closely interconnected in the development process because its sources exist at all levels" (Legouté, 2001, p. 21). Based on this statement, it seems undeniable that development is a social and economic project, and the various modeling and coordination processes associated with it rely on various state institutions. This leads us to discover the political dimension of development.

3.3 The Political Dimension

The concept of development, at its core, represents a political vision and project aimed at improving the economic level of the state and achieving social well-being for individuals. Therefore, the content of the concept is inseparable from the effects resulting from the political aspect's intervention in the development process, despite its social applications. Going back to what Fortado documented, the development discourse in the 1950s focused on the problems where the political aspect was influential and decisive, such as the deterioration of foreign trade conditions and the imbalance in the price system in directing investments, among others. Nevertheless, this multifaceted subject has always been dealt with under concept frameworks that are not entirely sufficient.

Returning to the analysis of macroeconomics presented by Keynes, which shifted the focus of policy towards the economy, it seems that the increasing interest in decision-making centers and granting them the necessary importance has continuously emphasized the significance of the political dimension in development processes. This is despite the reductionist classical view that confined it to economic hindrances. However, at some point, societies began to see the political project as the path to escape poverty. The importance of

the political dimension in development revolves around the crucial role that the state must play in economic development and even in social transformations by providing the necessary infrastructure required by various development projects.

Therefore, it becomes challenging to separate the political dimension of the development concept from its other economic, social, and cultural dimensions. We can realize the extent of mutual influence between them. It has been proven that these dimensions overlap in any development perspective because struggles for independence and sovereignty have often played a decisive role in enhancing economic development and creating the necessary conditions and structures for the required social transformations. Additionally, the belief in national independence and sovereignty, which often accompanies the concept and prioritizes the state in development choices, is one of the central dimensions that highlight the power and authority of the political dimension in translating the concept of development or even establishing it in the minds of society members at various levels.

Despite the globalization of development projects and policies, their application remains national or regional. Thus, politics always gives significant authority in shaping the concept. However, it still carries an implicit model of ideological dominance, and therefore, it conveys a movement of increasing or decreasing political intervention in the development process. In this regard, a study conducted by Campbell revealed that democratic participation is highly revealing, as it highlighted the transformations that affected the role of the state as conveyed by development strategies. According to Jean Cossi, the decades of the 1960s and 1970s followed the modernization model, subject to interventionist economics, where institutions and political decisions were presented as simple tools with minimal contributions to supporting development practices. (verdugo-vllao, 2018, p. 19)

However, the view changed during the 1980s, which witnessed structural adjustment programs that separated the state from market-related political decisions through liberalization. In the early 1990s, the concept of governance was introduced into the literature of development, as advocated by the World Bank, as a strategy to support political intervention through various mechanisms such as public sector management, legal frameworks, accountability, etc. This had a significant impact on restructuring and organizing the role of the state in development strategy.

The concept of governance, as described by Campbell, "despite denying its political concerns by claiming satisfaction with technical proposals in favor of good economic and social management, conveys a project not only for institutional reforms but also for gaining and exercising power with significant political and ideological stakes". (Cambel, 2000, pp. 12-14) Additionally, the World Bank's promotion and solidification of the concept of governance in development management can be considered a real recognition of the priority of politics.

Through this modest discussion, it becomes clear that the political dimension, with its importance and centrality, cannot be marginalized or reduced by the role assigned to the state. Therefore, it must be taken into account in every attempt to understand the semantic content of the development concept and how it is formed, no matter how humble this

attempt may be. This is crucial for understanding the multiple aspects of development and its ongoing implications.

This exploration, which we have worked on to clarify the dimensions of the development concept and its variables, leads us to the necessity of seeking its meaning by examining the various definitions assigned to it.

4. In the definition of development

Often, those studying the topic of development encounter various definitions dedicated to this concept, where intellectual sources interested in development are diverse, and life fields differ in themselves. Each intellectual field simplifies its view of the subject through specific definitions that carry the meaning of the concept according to the specificity of the research field. Therefore, it is not productive to attempt to compile these definitions that correspond to our research perspective, and which contribute to enriching our idea about the subject and guiding it in an attempt to derive a general definition that aligns with our current research perspective.

Serge Latouche tells us that development is "the aspiration to the Western consumption model, to the magical power of the egg associated with the lifestyle" (Latouche, p. 07). It is clear that this definition describes the condition of the masses in underdeveloped countries, as they aspire to achieve the social status enjoyed by societies in America and Europe in terms of interaction methods, communication systems, and consumption patterns, considering them the ideal model of social life. It also signifies, for the governments of weak countries, joining the group of powerful nations and major powers. In another not-too-distant definition, Robert Rist says, "The semantic content of development represents a country or region that has not yet reached the level of North America and Western Europe in terms of its economy" (Rist, 1996, p. 13). This indicates that this perspective reduced the development issue to various processes aimed at raising the economic level to reach the ranks of major industrialized countries. This underscores the importance of the economic aspect in determining international status and gaining respect at the global level.

On the other hand, François Perroux doubts the seriousness and utility of the clear and rigid division between social and mental variables on the one hand and material variables on the other hand. He defines development as "a combination of mental and social changes in the population that enable it to increase its real and cumulative GDP sustainably" (Perroux, 1996, p. 15). The importance that can be observed here is that Perroux was able to highlight the close relationship between the mental and social aspects and the material aspect of development. The mentality and perceptions of individuals, in addition to their interactive systems, are capable of controlling whether social progress continues or not. Through this definition, Perroux was able to overcome the limitations of classical reductionism that confines development to the material aspect, thereby giving the concept its true realism.

As for the Dictionary of Development Economics of the Third Science, Environment, and Society, its perspective forms an exceptional view by focusing on the accompanying effects of development. It defines development as "an economic and social process that

encompasses various components; it constitutes the process of economic and social improvement resulting from increased production, along with justice and rationality in distribution" (Kalhoon, 2021, p. 248). In this definition, the importance of blending material and moral aspects of society to raise living standards and ensure higher income levels and all types of consumption such as health, education, and freedom of choice can be discerned. Development that relies on one aspect remains a crippled development incapable of standing straight.

In a definition not far from it, the United Nations organization in 1990 considered development as "the process of expanding the available choices for people by providing the necessary resources and requirements to ensure social well-being, along with the necessary capabilities for their development, building their self-confidence, enhancing the sense of achievement, and self-respect" (Al-Rahman, 2003, p. 15). This affirms the shift in the developmental perspective worldwide towards focusing on human development, considering humans as the primary and real resource that ensures the sustainability of economic and social growth and development. Furthermore, the United Nations' view came to express the new face of development and as a prelude to the new path that the general meaning of the concept will take, especially after its affirmation in 1991 of promoting participatory democracy that gives individuals the opportunity to participate in society's decisions and enjoy economic and political human freedoms.

On the other hand, UNESCO, through Aimontiel, presents a definition in which it states that "development is no longer seen as a mere race to catch up with economically preferred countries, but as an exploitation of the potential of developing countries and a demand for a more just distribution of wealth at the local and international levels. Through this, development will highlight the right to express the values of civilizations rooted in history and the specific social conditions of developing countries, without denying the enormous contributions of other cultural regions and some forms of authenticity claimed to be developmental factors" (Montiel.e (Unesco), 1986, p. 10).

This definition presented by Montiel is very interesting because it touches on the most influential and contributing dimensions in the development process, namely popular will and the authenticity of developmental understanding. It dispels the darkness surrounding one of the most important factors that contribute to the success of development in all countries in the world and that many developing countries have suffered from under the Western development paradigm's authority. Here, the spirit of nationalism and pride in the values of the original civilization emerges, and through it, the understanding of development is built on more flexible foundations because it is more closely related to the culture of the society and its mentality. Although developmental policies are global, they are implemented at the regional and local levels, and thus we find the weight and significance of local culture here in ensuring the effectiveness of the development process.

Explaining the importance of the relationship between the authenticity of the development-conveyed understanding and the methods that represent it in acquiring the ability to achieve political sovereignty and independence can be found in the 1990 report by the South

Committee. It defines development as "the process of liberating people from the fear of need, political exploitation, and economic and social oppression. Through development, political independence gains its true meaning." It presents itself as a growth process rooted primarily in society, and development must rely on its own human and material resources, fully exploiting them to meet specific needs.

Through the presented definitions, which represent a diverse intellectual history of opinions and viewpoints, it is crucial to acknowledge that development is a concept that is difficult to precisely define due to its ever-changing nature. However, we can grasp its meaning by highlighting its dimensions without neglecting any of them. It is defined in one way or another by the connotations and interpretations that the concept encompasses from all angles and from various schools of thought engaged in defining it. Therefore, it is necessary to define it and present its meaning, even if understanding it requires integrating multiple perspectives that contribute to its definition.

In this regard, we can define development as a dynamic structure that involves a system of symbolic meanings and debates, shaping a vision of our social world that we desire to construct and establish. It translates and embodies reality through a set of practices and interactions, all aimed at fully utilizing various material and human resources to achieve social well-being and create the desired social landscape.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion of this modest discussion, it appears that the concept of development is deeply rooted in the history of all societies worldwide, as evident in its multifaceted meanings and connotations that touch upon virtually all aspects of life. This has endowed the concept with a substantial intellectual momentum, contributing to its authority over societies, not limited to those in the third world but extending to even advanced Western societies. Reflecting on the meaning of development and analyzing it leads us to several conclusions:

- Development is not merely a project aimed at achieving social welfare; it encompasses diverse and evolving patterns of life and social scenes that vary across historical periods.
- The concept of development represents a manifestation of diverse intellectual content, visions, and symbolism that enable us to shape and establish the desired social world. Thus, all societies worldwide engage in the process of development in ways that align with their social mentalities. Development is no longer confined to state institutions but permeates the depths of daily social life as values, standards, and daily interactive practices that shape social existence.
- While the economic aspect of development has occupied a significant place in intellectual discourse and popular discussions, our limited focus on this aspect has revealed significant shortcomings in the understanding conveyed by development. This has rendered it an incomplete concept unable to keep pace with the changes occurring in the mental structures of societies. As a result, it necessitates openness to its comprehensive scope that extends to other social, cultural, and political domains.

- The historical context through which the concept of development emerged goes beyond the aftermath of World War II and the economic takeoff phase that the world experienced. The true historical connection delves deep into the histories of all societies. Otherwise, how can we explain the various transformations witnessed globally and across different fields today?
- The historical origins of the concept of development are often associated with the aftermath of World War II and the emergence of the economic takeoff phase that the world witnessed. However, the true historical connection runs much deeper, spanning all societies and historical periods. Without recognizing this profound historical linkage, it would be challenging to explain the various transformations that have occurred globally and across different fields that we observe today.

5. Bibliography List:

Books:

- Abd Al-Rahman, O. (2003). *Development of Underdevelopment and Development Management (Development Management in the Arab World and the New International System)* (2nd edition). Center for Arab Unity Stud
- Calhoun, C. (2021). *Dictionary of Social Sciences*. (M. Rumaih, Trans.). Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.
- Chemillier Gandreau, M. (n.d.). *Monique le discours juridique sur le développement et sa fonction idéologique*
- Emmery, L. (1997). *Economic and Social Development in the XXI Century*. Washington, D.C: Inter-American Development Book.
- Hethin, B. (2014). *Reflections on Development*. (N. Al-Zeftawi, Trans.). National Center for Translation.
- Ivrii, B. (2016). *The Theory of Economic Development of J.A.S Schumpeter: Key Features*. National University of Kyiv Mohyla Academy
- Latouche, S. (n.d.). *Fou-il refuse le développement? Essai sur l'antiéconomique de Tierrmonde*. Économie en Liberté. Presses Universitaires de France
- Rist, G. (1996). *Le développement: Histoire d'une croyance occidentale*. Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques
- Sachs, W. (2009). *Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. (A. Mahmoud, Trans.). Egyptian General Authority for Books.

These:

- Arif, A. E.-R. (2015). *Cultural Determinants of Development: A Sociological Study of Development Values in Folk Heritage in the Biskra Region (Folklore as a Model)*. Doctoral Thesis in Sociology with a specialization in Development Sociology. Biskra University, Algeria.
- Verdugo-Villao, F. (2018). *Role de la culture dans le développement durable: Portrait des débats et analyse des ODD*. Mémoire présenté comme exigence partielle de maîtrise en science politique. Université de Québec

Article:

Dib, T. (2021). Review of the Book "The New Social Imaginaries" by Charles Taylor. (A. Al-Nabhan, Trans.). Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.

Faye, J. P. (1960). Marx et la théorie de développement. *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale*, 38(03), 320-321

Legoute, J. R. (2001). Définir le développement : Historique et dimensions d'un concept plurivoque. *Cahier de recherche*, 1(1).

Montiel, E. (1986). Fou-il refuse le développement. Cité par Serge Latouche. Presses Universitaires de France

Perroux, F. (1996). Les blocages de la croissance développement. *Tierr-monde*, 7(26), 239-240

Shahine, A. E.-H. (2021). The Historical Evolution of Growth and Development Theories in Economic Thought. *Development Studies Journal*, 71.

Tremblay, S. (1999). Du concept de développement au concept de l'après-développement. Trajectoire et repère théorique. *Travaux et Études de Développement Régional*.

Zaouel, H., & Rist, G. (1994). La culture otage du développement in *Tierr-monde*. Louverture hétérodoxe politique et réforme pour les années 1990, 35(139), 701-703.

simenar article:

Campbell, B. (2000). Gouvernance: Un concept a politique? Séminaire d'été des Haut Conseil de la Coopération Internationale : Quel modèle politique et sous-jacent un concept a politique de gouvernance? Université du Québec