

Modernity and Gender: A Critique of Modernization Theory

✍ Youba Raj LUINTEL, Ph.D

Abstract

This paper provides a bold critique of the hegemonic dualism in the light of insights that Tariq Banuri has offered. It also demonstrates the contours of gender asymmetry as an outcome of the masculine impersonal map of modernization. Highlighting the alternative model of development, it seeks to see the implication it has in the context of gender. The first section introduces the context with some of the questions to be focused on. It follows by a discourse of modernization and by an appraisal of Banuri's main arguments on cultural maps and knowledge hierarchy. Conceptual contours of modernization and gender are sought before the final section puts forward empowerment as an alternative thesis.

Keywords: culture map, gender, knowledge hierarchy, modernization, Tariq Banuri.

1. Introduction

Tariq Banuri's meticulous critique on modernization is one of the unique scholarly responses towards the intellectual hegemony of the West (Banuri, 1990). It is very recently that (the Third World) scholars such as Banuri have been courageous enough to articulate their voices effectively that modernization has but discontents. It is not that Banuri is the first to comment, but it is he who offers a) extensive arguments from culture standpoint; and b) proposes an alternative model for the development of Third World countries. Like most other discussions on development theories, Banuri does not even touch on gender issues (neither in the discussion of modernization nor in his formulation of alternative paradigm). This paper attempts to fill in this gap. This paper primarily summarizes the main points that Banuri has raised. Highlighting the alternative model of development that he offers, this paper seeks to see the implication it has in the context of gender. The primary objective of this paper is, however, to review the basic premises of Banuri's article on modernization.

This paper has been organized into four sections. The first section introduces the context with some of the questions to be focussed on. In the second

section, discourse of modernization has been problematized followed by an appraisal of Banuri's main arguments on cultural maps and knowledge hierarchy. In the third section, conceptual contours of modernization and gender issues have been sought. The final section brings this paper to an end offering an alternative to overcome the problems associated with modernization perspective.

Tariq Banuri's paper was published at the time when development theories were facing a sort of crisis and stagnation, often called the "development impasse." It is in this context that Banuri tried to understand the cause of crisis in development thinking. Soon he came in a conclusion that to understand the so-called "development impasse" we should look at the impact of the entire "corpus of modernization" theories, and not on specific instances of their implication. It was, he said, an outcome of fundamental differences over the "ways of seeing" the world. Therefore, instead of being engaged on facial and superficial parts of the problems, Banuri made an effort to operate the modernization paradigm itself.

Banuri organized his paper in three parts: The first section initiates a discussion on the main premises of development theories, followed by second section which is relatively long in size and rich in contents. Here Banuri elaborates his central thesis, making simultaneous review of modernization paradigm. Basically, he derives his arguments out of apparent dissatisfaction with the dualist proposition of development theories including modernization. The third and final section of his paper offers a proposition on development vision for the Third World, which he says an "alternative development" paradigm. Before we move directly to Banuri's main thesis, it will be contextual to have a snapshot discussion on some of the basic premises of modernization theory itself.

2. Basic Premises of Modernization Theory

The theory of modernization has its roots in the ideas of linear progress.

¹The linear theory of social change and progress claims that the natural course of society is to move from simplicity to complexity, from homogeneity to heterogeneity, and from "tradition" to "modernity," etc. That the Western European and the North American societies are the "civilized" and "ideal" ones, towards which all the other should opt for, is the underlying assumption behind it. Like ²Durkheim, it was argued that the shift from limited economic relationships of "traditional" society to the "innovative," complex, economic associations of modernity depended

on a prior change in the values, attitudes and norms of people. Table 1 represents the perceived notion on how does development depend on “traditional” or “primitive” values being displaced by the “modern” ones.

Table 1: Parsonian “Tradition-Modernity” Distinctions

Cultural criteria	“Traditional” society	“Modern” society
Value of tradition	Tradition is predominant; people are oriented to the past	People are not slaves to tradition; they will challenge anything seen unnecessary
Kinship	Decisive reference point for all social practices	Weakening kinship ties; hard-work and achievement motivations
World view	Emotional, superstitious, and fatalistic approaches	People are forward-looking and innovative; strong entrepreneurial spirit and rational approach

Source: Adapted from Parsons, 1951 (cf. Webster, 1984:49-50).

The early sociological distinction between “traditional” and “modern” societies soon became a means to elaborate the “stage model” of development espoused by W. W. Rostow (1960)³. It was thought the “traditionality” that the Third World societies hold is the impediment to development. Therefore, modernization “project” became the only desirable model that could remove all those impediments, and help the growth increase.

Eisenstadt (1966, cf. Webster, 1984), one of the contributors to modernization theory, argued: “(h)istorically, modernization is the process of change towards those types of social, economic and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America... .” Banuri, however, maintains serious doubts about the wisdom of many aspects that modernization theories presume. He finds a sort of “tension between the universe of those who study the Third World and the universe of those who inhabit this world” (Banuri, 1990:73). Hence, instead of following the arguments and claims forwarded by modernization theorists, he starts reviewing the very basic mode of enquiry: from definition to basic elements of culture, and tries to locate differences that the West and the Third World societies possess. Doing so, as Banuri maintains, it will take into account more centrally the problems and failures of the process of

modernization.

“The elegant and pedigreed assumption of modernization world-view,” as the Western knowledge system puts it, is that the “impersonal relations are inherently superior to personal relations” which Banuri calls the “impersonality postulate” (Banuri, 1990:74). The impersonality postulate according to Banuri concentrates its intellectual energies only on those aspects of social behaviour, which can be encompassed within “an objectivist matrix.” The bias which modernization theory holds is the fundamental bias that contributed to provide growing doubts, disappointment and disillusionment with the record of almost half a century of modernization project at work⁴. Critics such as Banuri argue that the harmful consequences were inherent in the process of modernization itself, which can only be properly understood if we understand the underlying intellectual, moral and political bases of modernization.

3. Banuri’s Main Tenets

According to Banuri, theories of modernization emanate from the West, which are a very important tool to understanding the sense of personal and impersonal maps. In other cultures, however, there is tension between “traditionality” and “modernity.” The tension he argues “provides dynamic of cultural evolution and social change.” In this section we would try to elaborate Banuri’s postulate on culture maps.

3.1 Postulate on culture maps

Banuri defines culture as a super-structural system that fills the information gap between what our bodies tell us (the “hardware”) and what we have to know (the “software”) in order to function (Banuri 1990:77). The “impersonal” map is a culture in which every person sees himself or herself as having only personal relationships with three key dimensions of a culture - people, nature and knowledge. Sense of identity of this kind is created through identification rather than through separation. Unlike this, the “impersonal” map is a culture in which everyone perceives to have impersonal relationships with the “other” people, the “other” environment, and the “other” knowledge systems. In modern culture, an individual will perceive him/herself being detached from social, physical or intellectual environments (Banuri, 1990:78-79). Banuri then elaborates the postulate of culture maps in terms of ontology, epistemology and cosmology.

The **ontology** of impersonal map gives value to individualism in the first place. In impersonal map individualism provides a sense of personal,

independent relationship to other people, nature and knowledge. Every man is an embodiment of humanity; as such he is free and equal to every other man. Alternatively, the ontology of personal map is characterized by value placed at first in the “conformity of every element to its own role in society, the society as a whole” (see Table 2). It is a map based on relationalism: that every unit exists in a meaningful relationship to other. The relational (personal) culture, unlike the “modern,” tells us what it means to be a spouse, a neighbour, a patron, a client, etc. However, it remains silent on what it means to have preferences, attributes, or rights independent of their cultural contexts.

Table 2 Knowledge hierarchy based on culture maps

Perspective	Impersonal Map	Personal Map
Ontology (theory of self)	Individual identity	Relational identity
Cosmology (theory of the universe)	Instrumentalism	Relationalism
Epistemology (theory of the knowledge)	Positivism	Reflectivism

Source: Banuri, 1990, pp.78-81.

Likewise, the **cosmology** of the impersonal map is represented by “instrumental” context while that of personal map is represented by “relational” context. Instrumentalism, for example, sees anything (from material commodities to even family members) as a source of gratification, and as replaceable. Alternatively, the relationalism finds everything unique and irreplaceable. A home, to take an example cited by Banuri himself, is not just the place where one is living at the moment, but also an integral part of being, becoming and knowing the sense and meaning of the total context.

Finally, the **epistemology** of the impersonal map is represented by positivism. The concept of positivism – as formulated by early sociologists such as August Comte – argues that valid knowledge derives only from the “separation of the observer from the object of knowledge.” The epistemology of personal map, however, believes that valid knowledge derives from identification with the object of knowledge” (Banuri, 1990:80-81). It means that meaningful knowledge emanates through personal - not impersonal - relation between the observer and the observed.

Once we approach reality in this way – the way personal and impersonal maps see it from different standpoints – social values, decisions, individual and social behaviour, demands and aspirations, etc. become

more meaningful and contradictions clearer in the context of specification of cultural maps. It is not that these two maps are necessarily oppositional; rather every culture contains tensions due to their mutual conflict.

3.2 The knowledge hierarchy

At the later half of the second section of his paper Banuri concentrates more on knowledge hierarchy created by modernization. He says:

The project of modernity has taken the “confessed task of ‘rationalizing’ the whole world, of placing the world in a conceptual grid, and therefore of separating the two halves of human consciousness and strengthening one at the expense of the other” (Banuri, 1990:82-83).

Problem arises when the modernization perspective takes itself the task of distinguishing between the two maps by asserting a hierarchical relationship between them. The “way of seeing” in modern culture is motivated by a powerful asymmetry, which Banuri calls the “impersonality postulate”: assumption that the impersonal relations are inherently superior to personal relations. This is the most pervasive, Euro-centric and the most dominant postulate upon which modernization paradigm has been based. This is the root the entire Western discourses - from Christianity to human rights discourse, and from democracy to development discourse, etc. - stem and spread from. Modernization is the discourse that creates an explicit dichotomy between the two forms of self-definition. It concentrates only on the imperatives of the impersonal aspect in its articulated form, relegating the personal (the relational) connections to a “supervenient private sphere.”

The impersonal considerations has become the standard form of behaviour, so the “objectivity,” “positivism” and “instrumentalism” have become the only acceptable form of knowledge system. Neo-classical theory, for example, focuses on conflicts between different objectives within the impersonal sphere alone. Political science legitimizes the existence of the modern “nation-states” with impersonal and bureaucratic authority for the regulation of the behaviour of its citizens. These social science disciplines have helped to legitimize the asymmetry of impersonality and made it an important and valued aspect of Western culture⁵. This is a sort of hegemonic knowledge discourse, so to speak, that embraces “the other” visions as “traditional.” It penetrates so-called “tradition” and tries to transform it to “modern.” And, hence, modernity becomes the yardstick to evaluate reality. Since the lens through which tradition is seen is not apolitical, according to Banuri, it serves the interests of the West to

dominate and subordinate the “other.”

4. Modernity and Gender

4.1 The contours of linkages

Modernization, as a paradigm, guides, shapes, directs and redirects the Western outlook towards the Third World societies. First, we can understand modernization on the basis of the very time it emerged. The temporal conjuncture of modernization reflects its project-like nature, a project of the West that had to facilitate and perpetuate its hierarchical dealing with the former colonies. The way the West sees the Third World tacitly reflects its colonial and presumptive superiority (see Table 2). It is the same lens the West employs to look at the women in general and Third World women in particular (Table 3).

Second, the theory of modernization precisely shares the ethnocentric assumptions of liberal philosophy whose inherent deficiency has been to highlight the dualist existence of reality: modern and tradition, public and private, rational and conservative, etc. The whole series of gendered dichotomies in which masculine traits are valued and feminine ones devalued (Table 3) is what modernization is characterized by (Hooper, 1999)⁶. To put it in another way, modernization has never been gender-neutral. It is therefore precisely political. Just as power and knowledge hierarchy matters in international relation, so does it in gender relation. Table 3 summarizes how the asymmetric gender relations are produced through different discourses.

Table 3 Hierarchy of gender relations in different discourses

Discourse	Hegemonic position	Subordinated position	Source
Modernization	The impersonality map	The personal map	Banuri, 1990
	Masculine impersonal world-view	Feminine relational world-view	Gilligan, 1982 (cf. Banuri, 1990)
International relation	Men and masculinity	Women and femininity	Hooper, 1999

It is clear that every discourse portrays a different sort of gender relationship. They are, however, common in the sense that all of them subjugate over the women, over the Third World women to be precise. All of them are different but also common in the sense of a sort of masculine discourse,

having different actors/interpreters but sharing the same perspective. As an explanatory construct, modernization - like colonization (see Mohanty, 1988) - almost invariably implies a relation of structural domination and a discursive or political suppression of the heterogeneity of the Third World, and the women there in. So the conclusion is although modernization discourse does not express anything in relation to gender specifically⁷, its relevance – and unfortunately that is negative – to gender is pronounced in scope and political in nature. In the following section, we seek to situate specific gender issues in the context of modernization discourse.

4.2 Gender implications of the impersonality postulate

One can locate Banuri's thesis of "impersonality postulate"⁸ on practical life situations variously. In this section we try to see how does this postulate help us to understand the way gender asymmetry exists cross-culturally? We will do so with reference to the works of Chowdhry (1995), Galtung (1990), Hooper (1999), and Mohanty (1988).

Fault ontology. The modernization theory is as extension of liberal discourse. Based on the same premises of freedom and individualism, the masculinist ontology has shaped the market model of community, based (not on cooperation but) on competition and achievement orientation. So modernization depicts women as "tradition-bound conservatives and therefore obstacles to modernization" (see fn. 9). While accepting dualism, modernization theories assert that economic development in the public sphere would naturally trickle-down to women in the private sphere (see Chowdhry, 1995). In practice, however, none of these speculations proved to be correct.

Irrational cosmology. The instrumental (the "masculine") cosmology, that modernization shares, sees everything (from land and chattel to family and wife/husband) as replaceable. The relational (the "feminine") cosmology identifies all things and truths as unique and irreplaceable⁹ (Galtung, 1990). Modernity has developed a stereotype vision on the basis of which almost all societies and social science disciplines today negate the cosmology¹⁰ of the others (including that of women)¹¹. This is a device that creates, reinforces, mystifies, manipulates and controls the image of the "other" always from the "positional superiority" of the West (Chowdhry, 1995).

Distorted representation. The forms that gender relations take in any historical situation are specific to that situation and have to be constructed

inductively. It can neither be read off from other social relations nor from the gender relations of other societies (Young et al., 1981: vii). One of the basic motives of modernization was to homogenize, and to essentialize the Third World (Chowdhry, 1995). Even (Western) feminism did the same to the Third World women. Geeta Chowdhry argues that Western feminism reproduced the image of the Third World women by a distorted image of homogenous identity. It did so basically in three ways: a) one is through the *zenana* representation¹² of Third World women: “typical housewife, always veiled, cloistered within the confines of a masculine sphere.” b) Secondly, through the representation of them as sex objects: “erotic, unclothed, native women.” c) Thirdly, through portrayal of them as victim of tradition, and that of patriarchy¹³.

Each of these three representations displays elements of the modernist discourse: modern and traditional, liberated and non-liberated women (Chowdhry, *ibid*). In reality, women are, like men, constituted as women through the complex interaction between class, culture, religion, and other ideological institutions and frameworks (Mohanty, 1988:72). They cannot be understood as an already constituted category.

Legitimacy to violence. According to Galtung (1990), when one postulate of culture (say, the impersonality postulate) predominates the other (say, the personal postulate) and tries to legitimize that hierarchy, it is a sort of violence¹⁴. The way the practice of honour killing is religiously justified in Pakistan, and that of clitoridectomy in parts of Africa sufficiently indicate that the (masculine) impersonality postulate affects the men-women relationship based on domination and subordination. When a culture legitimizes the structural hierarchy in society (such as, “male:female: :culture:nature”) it is another form of violence. Galtung mentions six sites that legitimize cultural violence. They are religion, ideology, language, art, science, and cosmology. We see that, the identity and freedom needs of women are ignored in all these sites, because based on impersonality postulate they fall under “public” (masculine) sphere which “women do not belong to.”

The concept of cultural violence is important to gender in two senses. First, when the personal map of a culture is replaced by the impersonal map (that modernization wants to do) it is highly likely that the cultural violence gets changed into a sort of violent culture. Second, most of the incidences of violence, if not all, are manifested in society as violence against women (VAW).

Production of hyper-masculinity. Modernity also reproduces and glamorizes masculinity. To take one example, the sector of war has been exclusively a male sphere. Masculinity of soldiering and historic exclusion of women from combat has played a large part in defining “what war means to a man” rather than to a woman. As a result, international relations symbolically form a wholly masculine (rather say, hyper-masculine) sphere of war and diplomacy. Hooper (1999) presents some important areas of international relations (IRs), such as war, military, sports, media, foreign policy, colonialism, etc., in which masculine hegemony has been predominant. Hooper challenges the modernist assumption that claims that IRs and the politics of identities have no important relationships. These sites of IRs are reproduced out of masculine ontological contexts, and in turn the latter help maintain the masculine hegemony.

5. Conclusion: Empowerment as an Alternative Approach

Development theory uncritically accepted the notion that progress in the Third World is identical to a progressive emulation of the social, political and economic institutions in the Western countries. This assertion has been proved to be untenable in the context of growing problems and crises, such as environmental crisis, cultural violence, continental disparities, alienation and anxiety, loss of meaning in people’s lives, etc. The crux of the problem lies on the underlying ontological and cosmological assumptions which modernization inherits¹⁵. By that cause modernization tries to “modernize” (thereby homogenize, and epistemicide) all other social and knowledge systems that do not conform the so-called “modernity” (thereby “rationality,” “impersonality,” and “masculinity,” etc.). Even the Western feminists employed the same lens to look at the Third World women.

This is in this context that this paper has provided a critique of the hegemonic dualism in the light of insights that Banuri has offered. This paper has also demonstrated the contours of gender asymmetry as an outcome of the masculine impersonal map of modernization. Some of the specific grids of gender asymmetry, viz. violence, IRs, distorted representation of the Third World women, imposition of the chauvinist ontology, etc. have been illustrated. We conclude this paper offering an alternative approach to gender and progress (let us not talk about “development” any more) in the Third World, called the empowerment approach, being evolved effectively in recent years.

Hooper in the context of IRs posits that gender cannot just be grafted onto existing explanatory approaches, which are profoundly “masculinist.” An adequate analysis of gender, she says, “requires more radical changes, including an ontological and epistemological revolution” (Hooper, 1999:475). For this, we need to:

- Demolish the existing impersonal culture map that has reproduced and glamorized the masculinity and so-called rationality as something the only real and true.
- Remove the power structure that controls diverse knowledge systems. The current power hierarchy exists with the systematically created dualist ontology that has been responsible for the growing epistemicide.
- Empower the people themselves through their own organization, activism, and resistance.

Once we challenge the established system of discourse, there arises a need for a new definition of progress (now onward, say “no” to development). Ashis Nandy, one of the eminent scholars in modernity debate, defines progress as “an expansion in the awareness of oppression” (Nandy, 1987). Banuri finds in this definition a unique combination of originality in the sense that it accepts a) awareness as a precondition of any change; and b) it logically provides outlets for resistance. The unique contribution of this definition is of two folds. First, it is emphasized that people’s agency, not the experts’ idea, should be decisive in the change process. Second, the eventual actors of progress are the people themselves, not their “representatives.” People are capable enough to articulate their choices and voices.

To be an approach empowerment-oriented, Escobar mentions three basic features of progress at the grassroots level¹⁶. They are:

- the interest in local knowledge and culture as the basis for redefining representation;
- a critical stance with respect to established scientific knowledge; and
- the defense and promotion of localized pluralistic grassroots movements (Escobar, 1992:418).

These movements are essentially local movements, motivated not only by economic terms but also by local history, local specificity, local culture, communal aspirations, etc. Methodologically, they are not designed on top-down approach. They grew out of experiences in popular education and grassroots activism (often known as participatory action research) (Escobar, *ibid*). The empowerment as an alternative approach emphasizes

a critique of oppression, affirmation of the humanity of the oppressed, and evaluation of the experience of the oppressed as a source and criteria for truth (Sanders, 1995:1)¹⁷.

When we compare some of these premises of empowerment with Parsonian model of tradition vs. modernity dualism (see Table 2.1), it does challenge the validity and applicability of cultural criteria (in terms of value of tradition, kinship, and the world-view). The empowerment approach also denounces the faulty ontology, irrational cosmology, and the hegemonic epistemology of the so-called impersonal culture map. It tries to reassert relational identity, holism and reflectivism. It does not accept sweeping generalization of any discourse and does challenge the imposed hierarchy of knowledge.

In this alternative vision (of progress), the discontinuous, the imposed and the “quick fix” formula invoke a series of crisis to be replaced by a continuous change. And, as the definition implies, this change takes place as the result of resistance, protest and challenges from below (Banuri, 1990). In the context of women, gender and progress, as Moser puts it, the empowerment approach is drawn “less from the research of First World women and more from feminist writings and grassroots organization¹⁸ of Third World women” (Moser, 1991:106). Groups like Gabriela in the Philippines, the Self-employed Women’s Association (SEWA) in India, and the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh are examples of the success of empowerment through grassroots organization Chowdhry (1995).

The empowerment approach draws many insights from the socialist feminist and postmodernist feminist perspectives, which are often oppositional. This approach is much more interested on political and economic issues on the one hand, and it depends more on feminist writings and grassroots organization on the other hand. Rooted in the concrete and contextual realities, experiences and wisdom of Third World women, this approach calls for a new kind of thinking and action (Chowdhry, 1995).

Unlike modernization discourse and the Western feminism, the empowerment approach does not generalize women as the victims. It is also not accepted that women and men are essentially antagonistic against each other. Rather what is highlighted is that class, ethnicity, caste and race intersect with gender to form alliances between men and women to empower the later by enhancing their collective capacity towards self-reliance.

Endnotes

¹In this paper, terms such as theory, paradigm, and perspective, discourse are used in a very loose sense and often interchangeably.

²The modernization paradigm has been based on the early sociological speculations related to the concept of mechanical and organic solidarity (Durkheim), “tradition and modernity” (Weber), etc. Talcott Parsons, another sociologist, took a lead in formulating the concept of modernization more elaborately.

³Rostow formulated five-stage growth model of societal transformation. These five stages are the society of traditional stage, the pre-take off stage, the take off, drive to maturity, and the society of high mass-consumption (Rostow, 1960).

⁴These challenges are a kind of reflection of modernization project that is responsible for environment deterioration, socio-political violence, erosion of political participation and inappropriate and harmful technology (see Banuri, 1990:75-76).

⁵According to Arturo Escobar, Western science has failed to provide the kind of knowledge necessary for building and maintaining culture and community in the Third World. It has actually been an instrument of cultural violence on the Third World because of its reductionist nature (see Escobar, 1992:420).

⁶For an elaborate discussion on how are dichotomies gendered and how do they glamorize masculinity at the expense of femininity in specific areas such as war, military, sports, colonialism, foreign policies, and popular media, see Hooper (1999:pp. 479-485).

⁷Although none of the modernization theorists speaks anything about gender (or, even about women precisely), Talcott Parsons is one of the few ones who has anything to say regarding women. According to Jaquette (1982, cf. Chowdhry, 1995, fn. 6), Parsons called the Third World women as “tradition-conservationists” which logically refers that they are obstacles to modernization.

⁸Banuri defines the “impersonality postulate” as the assumption of modernization discourse that “impersonal relations are inherently superior to personal relations” (1990:83).

⁹Although differences between instrumental and relational cosmologies are obvious, Banuri provides a very simple and helpful analogy. He suggests thinking on the difference between a house and a home, between an animal and a pet, between the person in the street and a friend (Banuri, 1990, fn. 8).

¹⁰The concept of cosmology - the theories of universe - is designed to harbor the substratum of deeper assumption of culture about reality (Galtung, 1990). The dominant cosmology, according to Banuri (1990), almost always represented the impersonal (the “instrumental” and the “masculine”) perception at the expense of the relational one.

¹¹For Galtung, it is one of the basic tasks that modernization does to propagate the Western cosmology, which leads towards a situation of epistemicide of other cosmologies.

¹²*Zenana*, a term used in Urdu, refers to the inner core of Muslim house which is exclusively a women's space (such as harem?).

¹³See for example Mohanty 1988, fn. 9.

¹⁴Here, violence is defined as avoidable insults to basic human needs and more generally to life (Galtung, 1990).

¹⁵In a sense, modernization is just an extension of liberal philosophy that sees the whole world in terms of self-other dualism.

¹⁶Empowerment has been defined variously. One simple definition is that empowerment is a "process by which an individual or group conveys to others the authority to work" (Sanders, 1995:1). It comprises of the norms, principles, and ethos ascribed to individuals and groups engaged in the task of liberating others by empowering them to act.

¹⁷In the context of black liberation theology, for example, seven separate approaches to empowerment have been developed. They include, according to Saunders (1995), testimony, protest, uplift, cooperation, achievement, re-moralization, and "ministry."

¹⁸Chowdhry (1995) argues that groups like Gabriela in the Philippines, the Self-employed Women's Association (SEWA) in India, and the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh are examples of the success of empowerment through grassroots organization.

References

- Banuri, Tariq (1990). Modernization and its discontents: A cultural perspective on the theories of development. In Frederique Apfel Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin (eds.) *Dominating knowledge: Development, culture and resistance*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 73-101.
- Chowdhry, Geeta (1995). Engendering development? Women in development (WID) in international development regimes. In M. Marchand and J. Parport (eds.) *Feminism/postmodernism/development*, London: Routledge, pp. 26-41.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. (1966). *Modernization: Protest and Change*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Escobar, Arturo (1992). Reflection on 'development': Grassroots approaches and alternative politics in the Third World. *Futures*, vol. 24(5), pp. 411-436.
- Galtung, Johan (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 27(3), pp. 291-305.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982). *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Hooper, C. (1999). Masculinities, IR and the gender variable: A cost-

- benefit analysis for (sympathic) gender sceptics. *Review of International Studies*, No. 25, pp. 475-491.
- Mohanty, C. (1988). Under the western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse. *Feminist Review*, No. 30, pp. 61-88.
- Nandy, Ashis (1987). Towards a third world utopia. In *Transitions, tyrannies, and utopias: Essays in the politics in awareness*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, Talcott (1951). *The social system*, London: Rutledge.
- Rajavi, Shafrashoub and Carol Miller (1995). From WID to GAD: Conceptual shifts in the women and development discourse. *Occasional Paper 1*, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).
- Rostow, W.W. (1960). *Stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge at the University Press.
- Sanders, Cheryl J. (1995). *Empowerment ethics for a liberated people: A path to african american social transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Webster, Andrew (1984). *Introduction to the sociology of development*. London: Macmillan.