



ETHICS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: THE DEVELOPMENT ETHICS PARADIGM

Nikos Astroulakis*
University of Crete, Greece

ABSTRACT: The author argues that development ethics, and its subject matter which is international development, may be accurately interpreted within a political economy context in relation with the ethical theory's reflections to international development. Development ethics came at the stage in the middle of 20th century by Louis Joseph Lebret and became widely known by his student Denis Goulet. In contrary to economic positivism, for development ethicists the issue of international development is viewed not as growth in a narrow sense of material expansion of wellbeing, but as the qualitative enrichment of human beings in all relevant aspects of human life.

KEYWORDS: Development ethics, Louis Joseph Lebret, Denis Goulet, International development, Political economy, Ethical theory

JEL Classification: B00, B29, B49, B59

* This research has been co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund – ESF) and Greek national funds through the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) - Research Funding Program: Heracleitus II. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund.

Introduction

The discussion on ethics and international development got an important position during 20th century and this interesting dialogue holds until now. Development ethics is the field of studying ethics and development issues. For development ethicists (Goulet, 1975 and 2006; Dower, 1988; Gasper, 2006; Crocker, 2008), development ethics perceived as both the ethical reflection on the means and on the ends of local, national and international development. This ethical reflection not only takes the form of a philosophical discourse, but also offers “a space of analysis, evaluation and action regarding the trajectory of societies, with special reference to suffering, injustice and exclusion within societies and between societies at a global scale” (Gasper and Truong, 2005: 373-74). To this concern, development is accepted both as an end state and as an action. However, development ethics’ foundation, as all other intellectual fields of study, appears areas of consensus and controversies (Crocker, 1998 and 2008; Clark, 2002) as well as contradictions and constitutional gaps. Further, searching the literature on development ethics, one can easily understand that there appears a “black box” according to the development ethics methodological synthesis. To me, development ethics cannot be thought out in a methodological vacuum as it is apparent in the existing literature.

The present study contributes to this side. The paper seeks to encapsulate to development ethics all these attributes that makes it an intellectual paradigm within the pluralistic boundaries of the political economy. In this study, political economy and ethics are perceived as a unified field of study. Development in its global dimension or otherwise international development is accepted as a field of study for social scientists, humanists and philosophers if not only. Ethics and international development is also a theme for the aforementioned branches. In particular, the paper answer to methodological issues of what is the subject matter of the development ethics paradigm and why this ethical paradigm to international development should be theoretically tested under a political economy frame in conjunction with ethical theory. At least, development ethics is a novel social science and philosophical approach that to my scholarly sense needs further investigation and gives the opportunity for even advanced knowledge contribution to the ethical study of development both for social scientists and philosophers.

Regarding to the structure of this paper, after the illustration of development ethics as an intellectual field of study through its founder scholars views, development ethics is interpreted under a comprehensive frame; that of political economy and ethical theory. In this context, the development ethics paradigm includes the

political, societal and economic aspects and their interplay to the investigation of ethical inquires to international development. A typology of the ethical basis of development ethics paradigm according to meta-ethical, normative and applied ethical foundations is followed. In this typology, the ethical questions of the development enterprise are posed according to development ethics underpinnings. The analysis concludes with the remarks of the study.

The conceptual rise of Development Ethics: Louis Joseph Lebret and Denis Goulet

This part investigates the rise of development ethics as an intellectual field of study in its more contemporary mode, through the work of the prominent development ethicists, Louis Joseph Lebret and Denis Goulet. For both, Lebret and Goulet development is perceived “as the basic question of values and the creation of a new civilization” [Lebret cited in (Goulet, 1995: 6)]. There are many others prominent scholars, e.g. David Crocker, Das Gasper, David Clark, Nigel Dower and Jay Drydyk to name some of them, that search development ethics in its contemporary form. There is also a well organized foundational umbrella the *International Development Ethics Association*¹ where younger and older social scientist, philosophers, humanists, ecologists, technocrats and practitioners with different origins and different status from all over the world discuss, discover and act on crucial development issues. However, this section concentrates in the works of Lebret and Goulet. They have been chosen for two main reasons. First, their work is noteworthy and well recognized, even with some antinomies and critique, from the whole development ethicist community. Second, they answer directly to the questions, “what is the subject matter of development ethics?” and “how is development ethics formulated until now?” that this section wants to address.

Lebret and the *Economy and Humanism*

The direct precursor of development ethics in its contemporary outline can be found in the life tribute of Louis-Joseph Lebret [1897-1966] and the philosophic and economic center of the *Economy and Humanism*, that Lebret was one of the main founders. Lebret was a social scientist and philosopher. He was a marine officer and since 1923 a Dominican priest. I would not stay at his rich biography

¹ International Development Ethics Association (IDEA) is a unique international, cross-cultural, and interdisciplinary group of philosophers, development and environmental theorists, and practitioners. It was initiated in Costa Rica in 1984. IDEA. "History of IDEA." Retrieved 2009, from <http://www.development-ethics.org/history>.

but merely to the fundamentals of his work as determinants of the conceptual rise of development ethics.

In 1941, Lebreton established in Marseille an interdisciplinary research center known as *Economy and Humanism*. Essentially, *Economy and Humanism* constituted a philosophical movement. Some of the *Economy and Humanism* aims was to elaborate issues affecting human development such as “institutions and systems, the myriad form of social change, ideologies, competing pedagogies, economic sector, the dynamism whereby a populace may play a role in decisions affecting its own conditions” (Goulet, 2006: 51). *Economy and Humanism* main challenge was to critically investigate the development problem in its multiple dimensions. In precise, “Its goal was to examine critically the theoretical and political bases of competing economic systems, to create instruments for linking the analysis of small units with an understanding of national of words units, to discover how social change could be planed in cooperation with a populace and in harmony with its values and objectives, and to discover guidelines for intelligent action at all levels” (Goulet, 2006: 52). In 1942, a Manifesto was published by *Economy and Humanism*. In the clime of the pre cold war era the Manifesto claims both against to neo-liberalism and neo-socialism. “Authority and a distributive economy do not necessarily mean static economy at national level. Nor do market and free economy necessarily mean an omnipresent market and the tyranny of price” (Goulet, 2006: 52-53). The proposals of the Manifesto were to the direction of an economy based on the need and service of a human rather a profit economy. However, Lebreton never doubted that an economic structure based of market and profit was incapable of attaching human needs. This contradiction is explained by his position against competitive capitalism and centralized socialism. For the capitalism, Lebreton argued that the market system leads to the hyper consumption for a segment of the society, and gives the ability of producers to manipulate the desires of possible consumers. There is not any critical mechanism in the base of real human needs for all individuals and societies. Centralised socialistic systems on the others, in their effort of competing capitalism, demotes “the importance of noneconomic values which do not collectivize existence, to the detriment of spiritual, artistic, and personal growth” (Goulet, 2006: 58).

Lebreton was influenced by Christian humanism. To understand that, Lebreton’s views of achieving ethical development are quoted as they have been codified by Goulet (2006: 56):

“•Development is, above all, a task of forging new values and new civilizations in settings where most existing institutions contradict human aspirations.

- The only valid path is to seek optimum growth in terms of a population's values and in terms of resource limitations.
- Planning is futile unless it is a permanent association between decision makers at the summit and communities at the grassroots.
- Equity in the distribution of wealth and the achievement of dignity for all are priority targets of development efforts.
- Conflicts of interest can be solved only by eliminating privilege and launching a general pedagogy of austerity."

Based on the aforementioned principles, the main contribution of Lebret's ethical study of development is concentrated to the problem of the unequal distributions of goods within societies. Lebret systematically investigates the human and societal needs and the role of development in accessing these needs in order to address the problem of the inequality and to what it incurs to the social and human development. As Goulet (2006: 57) underlines, "[Lebret] argued that satisfying an abundance of false needs at the expense of keeping multitudes in misery can never be authentic development" while "underdevelopment is a byproduct of the distorted achievements of those societies which incorrectly label themselves developed". For Lebret, authentic development ought to correspond to the spiritual and cultural origins of the society. Needs should assist societal solidarity, resource sustainability, and the integral human necessity of all individuals and societies to a decent existence. According to Goulet (2006: 57), Lebret codified three categories of needs:

- "Essential subsistence needs (food, clothing, housing, health care, and the like).
- Needs related to comfort and the facilities which render life easier (transportation, leisure, labor saving-devices, pleasant surroundings, and so on).
- Needs related to human fulfillment or transcendence, whose satisfaction confers heightened value on human lives (cultural improvement, deeper spiritual life, enriching friendships, loving relationships, rewarding social intercourse, and so on). These may also be called 'enhancement goods'; they enhance human societies qualitatively and find their expression in cultural or spiritual achievement."

In brief, for Lebret ethical development should subordinate the attainment of the aforesaid needs to all and for all, individuals and societies. The policy implications that one finds in the Lebret applied ethical and development suggestions are

harmonized to his presumptions of accepting these needs. For Lebret, development's ultimate goal can only be achieved when "all human beings in every society are entitled to enjoy the structural and institutional conditions which foster universal human ascent" (Goulet, 2006: 58). The meaning of his conceptual involvement to the ethical development can be summarized to the distinct that individuals and societies should not only be reduced to their economic dimension. Development refers to the whole person and every person, and that development does not result from an accumulation of projects, but from how these projects incorporates with a local, regional and global image of a human development. In the after, Lebret's life and contribution has evidently influenced the rise of development ethics such as. Lebret's concepts and policies in the development are accurately met almost to all development ethics thinkers but this one who is directly influenced by Lebret is, as it obvious, his student Denis Goulet.

Denis Goulet

Denis Goulet [1931-2006] was a social scientist and activist. He was a student, as it has been mentioned, of Lebret. Goulet has been powerfully influenced by his mentor's life and ideas on the ethical view of the development problem. As it is evidently, Goulet made well-known Lebret's ethical concepts in development but the most important is that he extended Lebret notions to a more distinctive field, that of development ethics. Therefore, even Goulet's study on development ethics is largely affected from his teacher, his work can be characterized as enriched to that of Lebret and absolutely novel to the formulation of the field of development ethics. Thus, if Lebret could be considered as a direct precursor, Goulet can be labelled as the father of development ethics as a self conscious intellectual field.

Goulet has placed an open frame and begins a discussion on how development ethics can be formulated. Goulet (1975 [first edition 1971]) in his most influential work, *The Cruel Choice: A new Concept in the Theory of Development*, poses the bedrocks of the development ethics. The meaning of his work can be summarized to the effort of trusting "debates over economic and social development into the arena of ethical values" (preface vii). The central ethical question that Goulet's development ethics investigate is "what are the requirements of the good life and of the good society in the modern world?" Responding to this question, Goulet's ethical analysis sets development on two basic concepts that of "existence rationality" and that of "vulnerability". Both concepts overlap his study on development ethics. It can be perceived as a theoretical ethical umbrella that involves his development ethics conceptual navigation.

In his own words, existence rationality is defined as “the process by which a society devises a conscious strategy for obtaining its goals, given its ability to process information and the constraints weighing upon it” (Goulet, 1975: 188). Interpreting Goulet’s words, based on a political economy view, existence rationality is considered to be the system of meanings (customs, norms, beliefs, social attributes ect.) within the economic, social and political structure that exists in any society and determines the course of action undertaken to serve societal aims. More specifically, the system of meanings refers to how societies evaluate, employ and apply particular strategies in order to assist to what Goulet (1975) sets as universal goals of development, those of *life sustenance*, *esteem* and *freedom*. In general, Goulet accepts the taxonomy of the societies to traditional, transitional and modern. Each of them has built an alternative system of meanings under a historical and social process. Development should not be perceived as an alien body to the existed system of meaning of any societal type. If development is to be addressed, three conditions ought to be followed: “(a) new capacities for handling information must be generated; (b) vital resources hitherto not available must become exploitable; and (c) the alien rationality implicit in modernization must be re-interpreted in terms of traditional existence rationalities” Goulet calls this progress as “expanded existence” (Goulet, 1975: 189). The core value of existence rationality is to be concerned of the provision of those ingredients that ensure what any society defines as the good life. Thus, any change should be integrated in the principle of “existence rationality” or differently the system of meanings determined by each society.

The second key attention to Goulet’s study of an ethical founded development is that of “Vulnerability”. It is mainly analyzed within a debate between developed and developing in terms of growth and industrialization nations. “Vulnerability is exposure to forces one cannot control” (Goulet, 1975: vii) for that, it constitutes a near to existence rationality concept. For Goulet, vulnerability refers directly to underdeveloped and indirectly to advanced developed conditions. It is better explainable if we can perceive it as an initial state. In developing societies vulnerability implies to the situation of the barriers to meet their development goals. The dualism of the global economic system explains to a large extent the vulnerability of developing nations. Or as economic history has shown that “the Industrial Revolution of Western capitalist economies not only accentuated the spread and aggravated the lag, but actually propelled industrial economies, on the one hand, and non-industrialized economies on the into diverse paths” [Freyssinet cited in Goulet (1975: 39)]. More precisely, industrialization in developed world has in many cases been associated with exploitation of resources, economic involvement and political patron to non-industrialized nations. Intervention from advanced to developing nations at the economic, social and political environment

makes developing countries vulnerable to discover and meet their development goals. Further, vulnerability is a matter of power as well an ethical matter. It is a matter of power for the reason that less vulnerable societies has a better advantage of asserting their own development aims while ethical because less vulnerable societies can better affect the meaning of the good life based on their historical and societal needs.

Turning now to the epistemological foundation, a general premise is that the study of development ethics can be forceful only if it takes place to the field of social science; applied policies and their ethical reflection (Goulet, 1995, 1997 and 2006). Almost whole development ethicists' community agrees with this premise. Goulet conceives the conceptual foundation of development ethics by answering to the question "What is development ethics?". In his words, "The discipline of development ethics is the conceptual cement that binds together multiple diagnoses of the problem with their policy implications through an explicit phenomenology study of values which lays bare the value cost of alternatives courses of action" (Goulet, 1995: 27). Further, development ethics is formulated as "disciplined eclecticism" which means eclectic in its selection of subject matters and disciplined in its mode of studying them (Goulet, 1997: 1168). Accordingly, development ethics receives from the work of other intellectual areas such as social sciences and humanities, religious studies and ecology. The elaborations of all these concerns and inceptions take place under a wide ethical view on the discussion over development *means* and *goals*, the quality of life, and the respect to cultural diversity. Almost all Goulet's ethical thought is permeated from the insight that development ethics ought to investigate development in light of fundamental philosophical ancient queries on the meaning of the good life, the foundation of justice in society and the human stance towards nature (Goulet, 1997: 1161). The study of development ethics attempts to discuss and codify the aforementioned philosophical quires borrowing scientific instruments from economists, political and religious studies, anthropologists, environmental scientists and others. Important is that for Goulet, development ethics authorization cannot only be described normatively but also practically. In his words, "to ethicists it is axiomatic that how development is pursued is just as important as what benefits are gained" (Goulet, 1997: 1168).

Methodological Considerations and the Development Ethics Paradigm

The preview section is about the core elements of the conceptual formation of development ethics based on the pioneer work of development ethicists Lebrét and Goulet. However, searching the literature on development ethics, one can easily understand that there appears a "black box" according to the development ethics

methodological framework. Development ethics cannot be thought out in a methodological vacuum as it is apparent in the existing literature. What this section wants to indicate is that development ethics needs a methodological specialization.

Beyond a general premise that development ethics belongs to social science by evaluating applied policies in reflection with ethical matters, one cannot find in the literature a comprehensive framework of studying and applying development ethics issues. Goulet himself suggests that development ethics as any other intellectual field ought to be investigated in a four-dimensional aspect. The study of development ethics should be *systematic, cumulative, communicable* and *testable*. Goulet seems to emphasize to these attributes by writing that “Development ethics aspires to be faithful to these canons” (Goulet, 2006: xxxii). However, a critique to Goulet methodological synthesis can be that he has never analyzed these four attributes in a precise manner. Searching the literature on development ethics through its illustrious and less illustrious scholars as well as participating in *International Development Ethics Association* I did not found a concrete and historical tested intellectual methodological frame that development ethics can be evaluated by a systematic, cumulative, communicable and testable manner as Goulet has suggested. Further, in the definitional level, development ethics appears disagreements. Does it concern a new discipline as Goulet (1997) states or an interdisciplinary meeting place as Gasper (2006) addresses? Criticism of development ethics notes a confused and a complex frame, an unclear and an arbitrary way of analysis. For instance, Gill (1973: 116), reviewing Goulet’s book *The Cruel Choice*, underlines, “The problem with Goulet’s analysis is not so much that it is wrong as that it is arbitrary”. To me, in order to make development ethics less arbitrary it needs to insert development ethics to a comprehensive methodological framework.

Methodology refers to the technique and process that things can be illustrated or otherwise the “modus operanti” of a study. The “modus operanti” of this paper is to offer the framework of examining international development via development economics in the political economy tradition and throughout its ethical orientations. To my concern, development ethics can be better explained and gives even better interpretations to international development within a political economy context in conjunction with ethical theory.

I argue on a development ethics paradigm that in order to conjunct ethics and development two scientific fields are fundamental, that of ethical theory and that of political economy. Following my argument of combining the two fields, ethical theory and political economy to address to aforementioned question, ethical theory provides us with the “problem” through discussion in a philosophical dialectic

polarity of “what is good and bad” and its value-dimensions, while political economy gives us a framework in which we must move to solve it, without compromising critical factors such as “economy”, “policy”, “ideology” and “power”. To use a development ethicist statement, Crocker (1991: 467) points out that “the science [the political economy in our case] describes and explains what is, was, and can be. To discern what *ought to be* is the task of ethics”. To be more precise, ethical theory attempts to answer the question of how one should live while political economy investigates the laws of the political, economic and social life and the conjunctions between them within and among societies.

The objective of the development ethics paradigm is ambiguously international development. It deals with the challenges of the international economic and social development. Specifically, ethical development can refer to the problem of international financial crisis, world poverty, environmental destruction, the imbalance of resources and the dualism of the world economy. To this concern, the development ethics paradigm responds to the following ethical questions: (i) What is the nature of development in an international context? (ii) Which should be the means of the development process to international development as it has aforementioned been defined? (iii) What form of applied ethics, in a sense of global ethics, could be the most appropriate to applied policy implications? The critical investigation of international development to aforementioned ethical issues in the course of political economy tradition and its different school of thought guides to this novel development ethics paradigm. The proposed development ethics paradigm comprises ethical theory and political economy. Otherwise, the development ethics paradigm, in a political economy context, discovers and typifies international development in its ethical aspects.

By moving in a political economy context it means that development ethics strongly accepts the nature of economics as an interdisciplinary field that bridges the social sciences and the humanities, taking under consideration the economic, political, cultural, institutional, ideological and ethical aspects of the society and the individuals. In the political economy context ethical issues can be found at any of the schools of thought that one investigates. The pluralistic political economy tradition involves recognition that, as well as “the open market” structure of the global economy, other elements such as ideology, power, policy, culture, values and ethics constitute the image of international development.

However things are not always easy. Economics in its very positive form has refused to investigate ethical issues within the concept of development. During 20th century, economics, in lines of mainstream methodology, took a shape, to a large extent, of positive science. Just recalling mainstream Chicago School economists

and Nobel laureates George Stigler, Milton Freedman and Cary Becker both founders and prominent representatives of economic positivism. Alvey (1999), among others, examines the decline of economics from its ethical dimension during 20th century. To more recent references, Milonakis and Fine (2009), and Fine and Milonakis (2009) explore the transformation of political economy to mainstream economics or better how political economy has transformed to a positive science under a historical and ideological process. They also discuss for an economics imperialism of economics science, in its positive shape, on the other social sciences perspectives. For positive economics, during 20th century, development has been supposed as a synonymous of growth, a material expansion in terms of a westernized development. Qualitative indicators and models have again and again measured the development problem but they do not seem to solve it. Development was perceived as an absolutely measurable matter, as a synonymous of economic growth- the variation of GDP for instance. Ethical inquiries on the concept of development were viewed mostly as an affair for philosophers and humanists than economists. Regarding the debate within ethics and economics, Robbins (1945: 148) asserts that “[u]nfortunately it does not seem logically possible to associate the two studies in any form but mere juxtaposition. Economics deal with ascertainable facts; ethics with valuations and obligations. The two fields of enquiry are not on the same plane of discourse”. Robbins is involved among them that express the vein in economic study of perceiving economics as a science which takes place after the elucidation of moral and ethical propositions. For positive economics there has not been space for ethical dialogue on the development problem or more precisely positive economic thinking has argued on a strict economic rationalism.

Hopefully, within the political economy tradition, ethical and institutional enquiries have never quitted to hold a significant position to development discussion. Searching this relation of ethics and institutions to society and development, Marangos and Astroulakis (2009: 385) have shown that, “development ethicists, as well as institutionalists, do not hesitate to make explicit normative-ethical judgments, in contrast to the dominant neoclassical economic doctrine, which explicitly uses positivism to avoid value judgments. Institutionalists and development ethicists commonly adopt a critical stand over consolidated values, norms and institutions that exist in the society.” Furthermore, in any of the political economy school of thoughts, politics, the society and the economy were treated as unified entire in a historical background. For classical and founders political economists, such as Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Gunnar Myrdal, Joseph Schumpeter, Karl Marx, Max Weber, Thorstein Veblen, Maynard Keynes, Ludwig von Mises and Frederic Hayek to name some of the greatest ones that characterize the different school of thoughts within the political economy

tradition, the discussion on the economy and development is determined to large extent from the ethical, the ideological and the institutional parameter.

Focusing to the discussion on ethics and development, ethical issues can be found at any of the school of thoughts that ones investigates within political economy. However, different school of thought, as it is fated, appears to have huge antinomies not only in the results but also to the definitional and methodological approach to development. As Hodgson (2001: xiii) points out “Differences between different systems could be so important that the theories and concepts used to analyze them must also be substantially different, even if they share some common precepts. A fundamentally different reality may require a different theory”. To be more specific, I am placing an argument near to the topic of this study. Among the political economy schools of thought alternative meaning of word “development” are offered. The term “development” for instance has a completely different explanatory meaning between neoclassical political economists and their Marxist opponents. For the firsts, “development” is more or less a synonymous of growth, while for Marxists the term “development” describes the development process of capitalism. However, no matter what school of thought within political economy tradition someone accepts, it treats political economy as the social science that covers a unified field of thought that include politics, the society and the economy and their interplay.

In recent times, even neoclassical political economists ensure the usefulness of the ethical study to the economy and development. Among them, Hausman and McPherson (1993: 672-78) codify the reasons why economists should be interested in moral questions. Accordingly, i) the morality of agents affects their behaviour and as a consequence the economic upshots, ii) welfare economics lies on morals presumptions, iii) public policies are driven by moral commitments which should be linked with economic results, and finally iv) positive and normative economics are often intertwined, so that even positive concerns contain moral presuppositions. The authors argue that, “economists who refuse to ‘dirty their hands’ with ethical matters will not know what technical problem to investigate” (p. 672). Hence, development ethics, and its subject matter which is international development, may be accurately interpreted within the political economy context.

The development ethics paradigm maintains that development is a societal and individualistic self-oriented procedure in a global economic, social and geographic reality or more briefly “a globalized world”. However, international development does not equally deliver its benefits to all nations and individuals in the world. Within this globalized environment there are significance contradictions and inequalities among societies and between individuals within them. Thus, for a

better investigation of the ethical development in its globalized form, it is needed first to codify the types of the societies and then the economic, social and political formation in each of them. Beyond that, my claim is evidently based to the conception that within any school of thought in the political economy traditions value judgments and ethical considerations assists and is assisted by the economic, social and political foundation of each society. Thus in order to better explore international development and its ethical reflection the fundamental elements of economic thought of any school within the political economy tradition should be underpinned.

The Ethical Basis of the Development Ethics Paradigm

As it was mentioned earlier, the economic, social and political foundation of any developmental endeavor and their ethical reflections to societies and individuals comprise the development ethics paradigm. In order to examine, define and affect international development a comprehensive conceptual framework on development and its ethical issues should be constructed. This section provides the conceptual design regarding ethical theory and its conjunctions with international development. Particularly, it suggests a specific typology that constitutes the ethical underpinning of the development ethics paradigm.

Thinking international development in terms of ethical theory, the preliminary ethical question that arises is “what is the nature of development?” or in more words, “how does development and its final state ‘a good society’ and ‘a good life’ is defined”. The next step can be the normative foundation of development or differently what societies and individuals should do in order to accomplish development, as it has been defined. This refers to the desired changes that lead to a good society and a good way of living. And finally, which form of economic, political and social matters in their ethical context is applied to any of the specific fields of the development enterprise. I call this three dimensional approach to development as the ethical basis of the development ethics paradigm which is based on the ethical theory and its typical sub-categories which are: Meta-ethics, Normative ethics and Applied ethics. A brief description of each is followed:

Meta-ethics can be defined as the branch of ethical theory that explores, from a higher order, the nature of ethical views, assumptions, and commitments. It is an inquiry about ethical theories. Meta-ethical questions concern the meaning of ethical claims, as well as the structure and method of ethical theories. In this framework, one can raise epistemological questions, such as “what counts as the ethical truth?”, or methodological questions pertaining to the justification of ethical commitments. In short, meta-ethical inquiry is concerned with the question “what

is the nature of the ethical arguments?”.

Normative ethics can be described as an attempt to determine “principles” that can be used to articulate and justify ethical views, assumptions, and commitments within a broader framework of a meta-ethical theory. Normative issues usually respond to the question “how things should or ought to be?” Whereas, meta-ethical questions are of higher-order, normative issues are considered to be first-order – or substantive – questions.

Applied ethics is the branch of ethical theory that investigates ethical issues in private and public life with an applied manner. Applied ethics aspires to solve world problems in the principles of Normative Ethics. Some examples are bio-ethics, business-ethics, environmental ethics and global ethics.

It is obvious that no one of the aforementioned sub-categories of the ethical theory can be characterized as independent. They constitute a continuum rather a sharp line. In the level of normative ethics, meta-ethical presumptions and justifications, of what is right or wrong for instance, determines the normative nature of the adopted ethical principles. While in the level of applied-ethics, normative endorsements influence the ethical content of applied policies. Hence, ethical views, statements and actions cannot be interpreted under a specific of three fields but merely as ethical interconnections among the ethical theory sub-categories.

The development ethics paradigm directly responds to the aforementioned ethical discourse:

To the meta-ethical question of “what is the subject matter of development;”, development ethics answers with a threefold dimension. First, development is attained by achieving “a good life” for all persons and the whole person. At the minimum, all people need all these goods that lead to cover biological needs, and additionally to free part of human energy in order for it to be allocated to a wider range of life aspects beyond covering first order needs. The “good life” is perceived as the case to “being more” in challenge to “having more”. The development model based mainly on economic growth has distorted the way that the “good life” is perceived: “having more” (material goods, wealth ect.) leads to the notion of “being more” (successful, attractive, valuable) (Fromm, 1999 and 2005). Against this perception, development ethics talks for a “good life” in all aspects of human life, otherwise what is called by development ethicists as “human ascent”. Second, development ethics advocates global justice in the form of a non elite, nation or people, participation to social planning and outcomes. The element of “power”, in terms of nation and inside the societies is distinctive in this

discussion. And third, ethical development evidently supports sustainability with natural resources. Sustainability for development ethicists comprises an ethical and technical matter. Technological advanced gives the means of attaining sustainability the decision to attain sustainable development is a matter of ethics.

According to normative ethical question of “what an intellectual field should determine of addressing international development”, development ethics determines a normative set of ethical targets and strategies of attaining them. Marangos and Astroulakis (2009: 382-384) arrange and examine ethical targets and strategies to international development from the viewpoint of development ethics. Ethical targets are codified in three words that of i) life-sustenance, ii) esteem, and iii) freedom that societies and individuals ought to investigate within a value based context of the “good life”. Life-sustenance refers to the nurture of life thus it maintains a fundamental element. Esteem is a universally accepted value due to the fact that all human beings in all societies feel the necessity for respect, dignity, honor and recognition. Freedom is valued as a component of the “good life” in a sense that development ought to free humans from all servitudes (to others, to nature, to ignorance, to institutions, to beliefs) in order to govern themselves and determine their destiny. Ethical strategies on the other are normative judgments which provide both the notional and practical framework under within which ethical targets should be discussed and policy recommendations over those targets ought to be formulated. Ethical strategies are underlined under the terms, i) abundance of goods, ii) universal solidarity, and iii) participation. Abundance of goods means that people need to have “enough” goods so as to have a “good life”. And “enough” should be, at the minimum, all goods that lead to the satisfaction of biological needs, in addition to freeing part of human energy toward a wider range of life aspects beyond satisfying first order needs. Universal solidarity can be perceived as a philosophical issue, a need of all people for unity to their common fate. As Goulet (1995: 64) underlines “[a]ll philosophies and systems of thought postulate, at least implicitly, a common destiny for humans: the fate of one is the fate of all”. Last but not least, for development ethicists participation of ordinary people and local societies to decision making is perhaps one of the main points of attaching international development. Both normative ethical target and strategies are unswervingly derived from the meta-ethical orientation of development ethics.

In the level of applied-ethics, development ethics is aware of the investigation of international development applied policies in a macro level while taking into consideration the micro traits of each society. In different words, development ethics, in a practical level, takes the form of global ethics (Crocker, 2008). Inevitably, the discussion on global ethics is long and the modelling of them could be even more elongated. I will stay, in this point, at statement of Crocker (2008: 1)

that “it [Global development ethics] justifies, applies, and extends ethical reflection on development goals, policies, projects, and institutions from the local to the global level”. To more recent empirical studies on the field of applied ethical policies, Enderle (2010) evaluating the wealth creation from the angle of development ethics in one of the global leading economies that of China evidently shows that wealth creation is far beyond to growth rates. As he states “‘Making money’ can be destroying wealth while creating wealth can be losing money.” (p. 2). What Enderle proves is that development or in his words wealth creation cannot mean simply “making money” or “maximizing profit” or “adding value” in a rather vague sense. It has spiritual and material aspects by processing production and distribution and contending physical, financial, human and social capital. Furthermore, to my sense, the concepts of the “authentic development”, as posed by Goulet (1996), can also elucidate how development ethics perceive the applied ethics to international development. Authentic development refers to the means and ends of human action, or in other words, to the vision of a better life and the way that this life can be accessed. As it is previously mentioned, development ought to respond to normative ethical inquiries concerning the meaning of the good life, the foundation of justice in society and within societies, and the stance of human individual and societies towards nature. “Providing satisfactory conceptual and institutional answers to these three questions is what constitutes authentic development” (Goulet, 1996: 197). Applied ethics, in each field of life, should correspond to the aforesaid precision.

Under the prism of the ethical theory a specific typology² of the ethical questions on international development and its development ethics responses is presented in Table 1.

Constructing parallels between the sub-categories of ethical theory and the ethical questions that arise in each of them for the international development constitutes the ethical basis of the development ethics paradigm. The question that arose can be posed such as “is there a unique way of addressing these ethical issues to the development enterprise?” My answer is that the economic, social and political reality determines the whole ethical discourse. On the other, ethical responses reflect to the agents of development and determine economic, social and political reality.

² For classification methods see Barley (1994) and Marradi (1990).

Table 1. The Ethical basis of the development ethics paradigm.

Ethical theory sub-categories	Ethical questions to international development	Development ethics
Meta-ethics	What is the subject-matter of Development?	Good life, justice, and sustainability with nature.
Normative ethics	What should an intellectual field determine of addressing international development? (as it has been defined by meta-ethics)	Ethical targets and Ethical Strategies
Applied ethics	Which are the applied policy implications	Global Development Ethics

Conclusion

In this study, a methodological framework of development ethics within the boundaries of the political economy is suggested. The development ethics paradigm within the political economy context takes cognizance of its fruitful heritage and integrates the basic development ethics issues to political economy analysis. As it is mentioned, the objective of the development ethics is international development. After the illustration of the development ethics basic views through out its founder scholars, the study indicates that development ethics, and its subject matter which is international development, may be accurately interpreted within the political economy methodological context. In specific, the paper based on the chief argument that differences in economic, political, social and eventually ethical foundation of individuals and societies lead to differences to the manner that international development is perceived. The analysis within the political economy context and the different school of thoughts could impress the dissimilarities to the economic, social and political formation of each type of society. Eventually, these alternatives views on the economy, society and politics reflect different patterns to ethical development. The idea of approaching development ethics from the perspective of political economy and its ethical theory’s insight stems from the fact that the nature of economic and social development presents strong value-ethical

dimensions. As any social science field, development ethics cannot be appeared as valued and ideological neutral. In contrary, it is valued and ideological determined. Thus, the development ethics needs to be examined under different school of thoughts, or otherwise different ideological and ethical patterns within the political economy tradition. What the study determines as the development ethics paradigm to international development is exactly the reflection of economic, social and political formation of each society to meta-ethical, normative and applied ethical aspects of international development. Thus the study offered a novel typology among the meta-ethical, normative and applied ethical questions to international development. In applied policy implications, the research aims to provide a new paradigm of human development that could be served as a tool for implementing ethical policies on international development, based on the actual needs of the subject (man) in harmony with the object (humanity). As Clark (2002, p. 830) recommends “The cultivation of development ethics has the potential to produce a coherent account of human well-being for guiding development policy and thinking”. In finishing, a methodology of understanding international development under the prism of ethical theory and the concerns of political economy is indicated in this paper.

References

- Alvey, E. James, 1999, A short history of economics as a moral science”, *Journal of Markets & Morality* 2(1): 53-73.
- Bailey, Kenneth, 1994, *Typologies and taxonomies: An introduction to classification techniques*, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, London.
- Ben, F., and Milonakis, D, 2009, *From economics imperialism to freakonomics: the shifting boundaries between economics and other social sciences economics as social theory*, Routledge: London and New York.
- Clark, A. D., 2002, Development ethics: A research agenda, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 29(11): 830-848.
- Crocker, D., 1991, Towards development ethics, *World Development*, 19(5): 457-483.
- Crocker, D., 1998, Development ethics, in Craig, E., (ed.), *Encyclopedia of philosophy*, vol. 3, London, Routledge: 39-44.
- Crocker, D., 2008, *Ethics of global development*, Cambridge University Press.
- Dower, Nigel, 1988, What is development? - A philosopher's answer, Centre for Development Studies Occasional Paper Series, 3, Glasgow: University of Glasgow.
- Enderle, Georges, 2010, Wealth creation in China and some lessons for development ethics, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96:1-15.
- Fromm, Erich, 1999, *Man for himself*, Routledge: London and New York.

- Fromm, Erich, 2005, *To have or to be*, Continuum International Publishing Group, London.
- Gaspar, Des and Truong, Thanh-Dam, 2005, Deepening development ethics: From economism to human development to human security, *The European Journal of Development Research*, 17(3): 372–384.
- Gaspar, Des, 2006, Introduction: Working in development ethics – a tribute to Denis Goulet, *Éthique et économique/Ethics and Economics* 4(2): 1-24.
- Gill, R., 1973, Reviewed work(s): The cruel choice: A new concept in the theory of development, by Denis Goulet, *Political Science Quarterly* 88(1): 116-117.
- Goulet, Denis, ed., 2006, *Development ethics at work: Explorations 1960-2002*, Routledge: London and New York.
- Goulet, Denis, 1975 [1971], *The cruel choice: A new concept in the theory of development*, New York, Atheneum.
- Goulet, Denis, 1995, *Development ethics: A guide to theory and practice*, New York: The Apex Press and, London: Zed.
- Goulet, Denis, 1996, Authentic development: Is it sustainable?, in D. C. Pirages, ed., *Building sustainable societies*, New York, M.E. Sharpe: 189-205.
- Goulet, Denis, 1997, Development ethics: a new discipline, *International Journal of Social Economics* 24(11): 1160-1171.
- Hausman, M. D. and McPherson S, M., 1993, Taking ethics seriously: Economics and contemporary moral philosophy, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 31(2): 671-731.
- Hodgson, Geoffrey, 2001, *How economics forgot history: The problem of historical specificity in social science economics as social theory*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Marangos, John and Astroulakis, Nikos, 2009, The institutional foundation of development ethics”, *Journal of Economic Issues* XLIII(2): 381-388.
- Marradi, Albetto, 1990, Classification, typology, taxonomy, *Quality and Quantity* 24: 129-157.
- Milonakis, Dimitris and Fine, Ben, 2009, *From political economy to economics: Method, the social and the historical in the evolution of economic theory*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Robbins, Lionel, 1945 [1932], *An essay on the nature and significance of economic science*, Macmillan and Co.