What is global development?

Document Version
Final published version

Citation for published version (APA):
Horner, R. (2017). *What is global development?* (pp. 1-24). (Global Development Institute Working Paper Series; Vol. 2017, No. 20). https://www.gdi.manchester.ac.uk/research/publications/gdi-working-papers/2017-020/

OPEN ACCESS

What is global development?

Rory Horner[1]

[1] Lecturer, ESRC Future Research Leader and Hallsworth Research Fellow, Global Development Institute, The University of Manchester, United Kingdom.

Email: rory.horner@manchester.ac.uk

Cite this paper as:

Horner, Rory (2017). What is global development? GDI Working Paper 2017-020. Manchester: The University of Manchester.

Abstract

Global development is a term that is increasingly referred to, yet is often conflated with international development and is used with different implicit meanings. This paper outlines reasons for moving beyond international development, before distinguishing between global development as 'vertical' scale and as 'horizontal' scope. As a strand of development focusing on common issues, the former co-exists in parallel with sovereign (national development) and foreign (international development) issues. The latter involves an overarching paradigm, taking in interconnected as well as shared issues anywhere. It is a successor to international development and goes beyond a focus only on the Global South to encompass development issues anywhere. Global development as scope thus explicitly goes beyond the North-South binary and is argued to represent a greater fit with contemporary development opportunities and challenges.

1.   Introduction

Often associated with a North-South binary, the term 'international development' seems increasingly inappropriate in terms of its ability to capture the various actors, processes and major challenges which our world faces in the early 21st century. The era, if it ever truly existed, is long past where inter-state actions under big 'D' development intervention, through aid from Northern countries to the South, were most crucial in shaping development outcomes. Little 'd' processes of ongoing economic transformation, often involving civil society and firms, as well as states, have long been argued to be especially crucial (Hart 2001). Across a number of different spheres, whether it be in terms of income (UNDP 2013), wealth (OECD 2010), a global middle class (Sumner 2016), poverty (Kanbur and Sumner 2012), inequality (Bourguignon 2015; Milanovic 2016) or development cooperation (Mawdsley 2015), new geographies of development can be identified over the last decade (Horner and Hulme 2017). Indeed, the boundaries between 'developed' and 'developing' countries are blurring, one indicator being the World Bank's April 2016 announcement that it will no longer distinguish between the two groups in its annual World Development Indicators. The universality of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Climate Agreement highlight more prominently than ever the limitations of the North-South divide of international development.

In light of such arguments, the term global development would seem to be intuitively more appropriate now, than the rather outdated international development. An emerging 'global development paradigm' (Gore 2015) has been proposed. The Guardian Global Development series is a popular website and blog. The popular hashtag for much 'development' related material on Twitter is #globaldev. Since 2010, the OECD has published a series of reports called Perspectives on Global Development. Increasingly various research centers/institutes (eg Aberdeen, Brandeis, Boston University, Manchester, Notre Dame, Reading, Tufts, UCLA), degree programmes/specialisations (eg Aberystwyth, Bath Spa, Carleton, East London, Georgia Tech, Queen's University, Sheffield, Sussex) and think-tanks/organisations (eg Center for Global Development, Global Development Network, Initiative for Global Development) use the two words 'global development' in their name. Yet the term global development is often conflated with 'international development'[1], is sometimes used with different implicit understandings, and has not been systematically unpacked. So, what does global development refer to and how might it be distinct from earlier approaches, such as international development?

Following a short review of arguments for moving beyond North-South international development (section 2), this article seeks to unpack different implicit understandings of "global development". By drawing on lessons from debates over the meaning of

---

[1] In a limited, but perhaps illustrative, example, the Wikipedia definition conflates the two: "International development or global development is a wide concept concerning level of development on an international scale" (Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_development, last checked 29th September 2017).

global health (section 3), a key distinction is made between global development as 'vertical' scale (eg Currie-Alder 2016) and as 'horizontal' scope (eg Gore 2015) (section 4). The former focuses on common issues and co-exists with sovereign (national development) and foreign (international development) issues. The latter involves global development as an overarching paradigm, taking in interconnected as well as shared issues anywhere. The key differences between the two understandings of global development are outlined in terms of their geographic focus (Global South vs whole world), the range of issues involved (global public goods only vs also shared issues in North and South), their origins (1980/90s globalisation vs 21st century blurring North-South divide and post-2015 SDGs), and their relationship with international development (in parallel to vs as successor to). Some opportunities and challenges (section 5) for global development as scope, which considers development in relation to the whole world, are then examined. The article concludes (section 6) that a global development paradigm is particularly fitted to contemporary, 21st century development challenges.

2. Beyond North-South international development

'International development' is often loosely used as an umbrella term for development research and practice, combining two words which do not necessarily fully reflect all that is associated with their domain. The origins of the term 'international' are dated to Jeremy Bentham, who coined the word in the late 18th century in relation to the law governing the relations between states (Suganami 2009: 231). 'International' gained popularity in a 19th century context of rising nation-states and cross-border transactions between them. Meanwhile, the term 'development' can be variously used to refer to an idea, objective and/or activity, often interrelated, and often with considerable ambiguity or looseness (Kothari and Minogue 2001; Cornwall 2007). Nevertheless, an important distinction can be made between imminent development as intentional practice or willed action, or big 'D', and immanent development as underlying processes of capitalist development, or little 'd' (Cowen and Shenton 1996; Hart 2001).

Although it is not the purpose here to provide a detailed review of international development (eg Sumner and Tribe 2008), the term is often associated with actions designed for poor countries, including foreign aid (Currie-Alder 2016: 7). While development is often linked with the imminent processes of active intervention, immanent processes of development have been widely argued to be particularly significant in shaping outcomes and to warrant much more attention within development studies (Hart 2001; Mohan and Wilson 2005). Although many key development actors, such as those from the United Nations system, major development banks or official development assistance, are products of the inter-state system, the term international can arguably suggest an over focus on exchanges between country units (Scholte 2002), and thus also imminent or big 'D' development. Various non-state networks that cross multiple countries, as well as spaces and

communities within countries (Perkins 2013: 1003), which are part of a wider immanent development, can then be overlooked.

While the conceptual and policy approaches have varied (from modernisation and dependency to human and sustainable development), the geographic focus for international development – in study, research and practice – has remained relatively consistently on the Global South (or in earlier terminology the Third World, or geographically Asia, Africa and Latin America). Inequalities between 'developed' and 'developing' countries have been prioritised, in accordance with a macro-scale geography of a world divided into two (in relation to which the former Soviet bloc – as the Second World - has always sat awkwardly positioned). The Millennium Development Goals, for example, are a clear manifestation of this, being overarchingly designed by developed countries who set targets for developing countries (Hulme 2009).

Yet much of the empirical challenge for 21st century development, in its research and practice, and especially in relation to immanent or little 'd' processes, does not fall within the boundaries of a narrowly-conceived international development focus on big 'D' development – designed by the North, and oriented around transfers (aid, institutions, policies, technologies) to the South. Four major reasons why an international development focus solely on the Global South is no longer tenable are now outlined: first, the North-South axis has always been problematic, ignoring development challenges in the North; second, global interconnectedness; third, the global challenge of sustainable development; and fourth, the accelerated blurring of the North-South boundary in the 21st century.

2.1. Long-lasting frustration with the North-South binary

The consistent association of development, both in study and practice, just with the Global South, has long been questioned. Whereas Seers (1963) was among many who pointed to distinctive developing country conditions and therefore a need for an associated distinctive body of research, Maxwell (1998) among others argued that these perspectives were no longer relevant and there was much to be learnt from poverty and social exclusion across both Global North and South (also Gaventa 1998). Indeed, with the extent of unemployment and people living under the poverty line in the OECD countries of the North, inequality and poverty were recognised two decades ago as being issues which "are global in character and affect all countries" (UN 1995; also de Haan and Maxwell 1998; Therien 1999). In a statement that is even more prescient now, a host of common challenges were identified:

> "If 'development studies', by induction, is what students of development do, then many current themes are relevant to both North and South: restructuring the state; poverty reduction and livelihood; political development and governance; gender inequality; social capital; agency and participation ... the list goes on - and of course includes social exclusion" (Maxwell 1998, 25-26).

Almost two decades ago and also pointing to the comparative lessons and experiences that could be shared, Jones (2000) likewise questioned why it is alright to do development 'over there', but not over 'here'. Potter argued that those "interested in development must endeavour to encompass issues and policies of development wherever they occur" (2001: 425). Similarly, Willis (2005: 16) critiqued the idea that 'development' was something that was only relevant to the Global South:

> "This distinction fails to recognise the dynamism of all societies and the continued desire by populations for improvements (not necessarily in material goods). It also fails to consider the experiences of social exclusion that are found within supposedly 'developed' countries or regions (p. 16)".

Many have continued to point to how the concepts for the study of change in 'poorer countries' are also relevant in other countries too (Sumner and Tribe 2008: 1).

As well as overlooking challenges faced within the Global North and comparative lessons, the North-South, 'developed'/'developing' binary has also been critiqued for facilitating explanations of poverty in the South as a residual problem or lack of 'something' (eg markets, technology, globalisation). Thus, the causes of underdevelopment were located in a ghettoised Third World or Global South (Saith 2006), rather than viewed as a relational problem in accordance with incorporation into global economic and social relations (Therien 1999, Kaplinsky 2005). Even where the North-South binary was deployed in a relational approach such as structural world-systems analysis (Wallerstein 1979), its Northern core and Southern periphery approach was also susceptible to somewhat crude simplification.

Post-colonial approaches have also long questioned the North-South (or Western/non-Western) binary, exploring in detail the construction of difference involved and their implications (Said 1979). For example, representations of a 'developed' West and 'developing' rest were often invoked to justify intervening to help others (Kothari 2005). Moreover, such scholarship has also pointed to the contingency of North-South relations, and the utility of development to both North and South (Radcliffe 2005).

2.2. Global interconnectedness

Global interconnectedness, including through globalisation and global public goods, questions understandings of development as an endogenous process within the Global South, and thus also questions the exclusive focus on the Global South. Various earlier periods of economic globalisation, especially the late 19th century period of relatively 'free trade' (O'Rourke and Williamson 2002), have been highlighted. Facilitated by economic liberalisation and information and communication technologies, the 1990s in particular brought increased international integration, and thus attention to economic, political, cultural, and informational globalisation (James and Steger 2014). Scholars of economic globalisation have highlighted the influence of flows of capital, goods, services, people and labour, as well as ideas and knowledge (Castells 1996). While world-systems theorists had long argued for conceptualising development within a

single world system, accelerated global interconnectedness from the 1990s onwards has heightened the need to take the whole world as the unit of analysis. The analysis of the implications of globalisation for development also increasingly requires moving beyond a North-South approach, centred on how Northern actors shape development in the Global South. A more multipolar globalisation (The World Bank 2011) has emerged, with considerable growth of South-South trade (Horner 2016) as well as broader South-South cooperation (Mawdsley 2017).

The issue of global public goods also questions approaches which see development as solely shaped by actors in, or a challenge just for, the Global South. Public goods are those that are "fully or partially non-rival and non-excludable" in terms of their consumption (Kaul 2017: 143). For global public goods, the publicness can also comprise the spatial dimension (across several regions or even of worldwide span), impact (beyond national jurisdictions) and temporality (long term effects) (Kaul 2017: 143). Thus, these are public issues which transcend the ability of individual states to effectively address. Global public goods are very significant collective challenges for the whole world, not just the Global South (eg Sumner and Tiwari 2010; Sachs 2012; Leach 2015; Kanbur 2017). Moreover, successfully addressing the issue of global public goods is an important benefit for all countries, not just for those in the Global South. Recently, Kaul has argued the need for a notion of global development that comprises attention to "the health of the planetary system as a whole", and which must include attention to "development in and of GPGs [global public goods]" (2017: 142).

A variety of issues attract attention as global public goods, including health (against infectious diseases), environment, and global financial stability (Alonso 2012). Health is a field where interdependencies have been longer recognised and thus there has been a move from 'international health', focused on developing countries, to 'global health' (Brown 2006; Bozorgmehr 2010). The environment as a global commons has also attracted considerable attention as a hugely significant global challenge, which warrants discussion in its own right.

2.3. Sustainability challenge

Sustainable development is clearly a major challenge for the whole world, with the presence of planetary boundaries providing biophysical limits for "a 'safe operating space' for global societal development" (Steffen et al 2015). The shift towards development having a universal frame of reference is most dramatically expressed in the SDGs, agreed in 2015. The SDGs' universal frame of reference to the whole world marks a sharp contrast from the earlier MDG era when the key goals, largely set by developed countries, were almost exclusively for developing countries. The 17 Global Goals of the SDGs are about what *all* countries can do, in contrast to the MDGs which were almost exclusively (save for Goal 8) about 'developing' countries.

The framing of development as sustainable development has arguably been a crucial, although not sufficient, step to moving beyond the classic North-South spatial orientation of international development to think about development globally. A break

from the earlier spatial framing was not automatic for the SDGs. *Our Common Future* (the Brundtland Report) of 1987 had pointed to the sustainable development challenges of developing countries and was framed in the binary of developed and developing world (Perkins 2013: 1005). More recently, however, increasing reference has been made to "the growing urgency of sustainable development for the entire world" (Sachs 2012: 206). The SDGs have further evolved out of discussion of what would replace the MDGs and also as part of the process leading up to and following the Rio+20 conference on sustainable development in 2012. The G77 (an informal collective of the UN's 130 "developing countries"), and Brazil in particular, were especially active in their formation (Hulme 2015; Bhattacharya and Ordóñez Llanos 2016), with the post-2015 agenda being set in a context of "rapid blurring of boundaries between the developed and developing contexts in terms of rising inequities and poverty" (Tiwari 2015: 314).

A significant spatial shift is thus embedded not just in the formation, but also the target, of the SDGs. According to one recent commentary by Death and Gabay, the goals have radical potential in challenging one of the main tenets of much development policy and research, "that development is something for, and occurs in, the 'developing world'" (2015: 598), with the result that they "might do more to challenge the labels of 'developed' and 'developing' than decades of academic critique" (2015: 600). Major development challenges for high-income countries are highlighted in relation to climate change (SDG 13), ecosystem conservation (SDG 14 and 15) and sustainable consumption and production (SDG 12) (Sachs et al 2016).

Specifically in relation to climate, the Kyoto Protocol of 1997, following the Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) principle agreed as part of the United Nations Framework of Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC) at the Rio Summit in 1992, had placed responsibilities for reducing carbon emissions on higher-income (Annex I) countries. Yet, the Paris Agreement on climate change (agreed in December 2015) has removed the binary of Annex I and non-Annex countries, albeit retaining the CBDR principle, and requires some commitments by all countries.

2.4. 'Blurring' North-South divide

Another argument in favour of a universal focus relates to shifting patterns of global inequalities. Following two centuries when the gap was widening, especially between those in the Global North and in the Global South (Pritchett 1997), the last two decades have involved some fall in income inequalities between countries (Bourguignon 2015; Milanovic 2016). The absolute numbers living in extreme poverty have fallen while many countries previously classified by the World Bank as low-income have 'graduated' to middle-income status (Sumner 2016). Moreover, gaps in mortality rates, life expectancy, educational enrolment and carbon emissions between the Global North and South have been reduced. At the same time, within many (but not all) countries in both the Global North and South, many measures of economic, human and environmental inequality have grown (Alvaredo et al 2018). Such patterns of

"converging divergence" – involving some convergence between countries (especially between North and South) and divergence within countries – now more clearly than ever raise issues about a division of the world into a rich North and a poor South. Although inequalities between countries are still vast across many indicators, these trends unequivocally question any exclusive focus of development on the Global South (Horner and Hulme 2017).

Calls to move beyond macro-scale, North-South spatial categorisations of development are no longer just the domain of critical development scholars arguing that the old North-South vision of an "international curtain of poverty" is outdated (Therien 1999) and pointing to "Souths" in the "North" and "Norths in the South" (Sheppard and Nagar 2004). Such calls are now echoed by others with very different backgrounds. Justin Lin, when World Bank Chief Economist, argued in 2008 that: "Development is no longer about the old paradigm of aid dependency or charity, or about the North teaching the South. It is about an investment in a stable and inclusive future". Robert Zoellick, when President of the World Bank, argued that the term Third World was no longer relevant in the context of a more multipolar world economy (World Bank 2010). The World Bank's announcement in April 2016 of its removal of the classification of developed and developing countries in the World Development Indicators is one response to this blurring boundary. Widespread agreement appears to exist that new "maps of development" are emerging, raising questions about the demarcation of whole world regions on the basis of their levels of development, and calling for more "nuanced maps" (Sidaway 2012).

Within development cooperation, Mawdsley (2017: 108) has observed "an unprecedented rupture in the North-South axis that has dominated post-1945 international development norms and structures". Such a change has been further driven by the growth of South-South development cooperation, as well as the response of the traditional donors to a changing global context. The 2011 Busan Declaration is an example of a shift in development cooperation, seeking to replace the donor-recipient relationships with an approach emphasising multi-stakeholder global partnership (Eyben and Savage 2013). With greater wealth and income in parts of the Global South, the number of countries who are highly dependent on aid has fallen significantly. A new prospect of multidirectional cooperation now beckons (Janus et al 2015). The idea of development cooperation as overwhelmingly a Western, postcolonial project, characterised by a moral geography of charity clearly does not fit.

In sum, long-standing arguments for considering 'development' in the North, global interconnectedness in the form of globalisation and global public goods, the planetary challenge of sustainability, and greater blurring of the North-South boundary augment the need for a universal frame of reference in relation to development. What the new global development is may be subject to some debate, however. The following section seeks to explore what the global is and to extrapolate lessons from other fields, particularly health, about a switch from the international to the global.

3. Outlining the 'global': scale vs scope and lessons from global health

This section first outlines understandings of the global, before examining debates over the meaning of 'global health', where parallels may be found in the attempt to elaborate on 'global development'. This ultimately leads to a distinction between 'global development' as 'scale' and 'global development' as 'scope'.

'Global' is a word with various meanings and associations. 'Globe', from which it is derived, dates from the 15th century and is itself derived from the Latin 'globus' and has been used to represent the earth spherically. In the late 17th century, 'global' became used to refer to 'world scale', in addition to 'spherical'. 'Globalise' and 'globalism' only emerged in the 1940s, while 'globalisation' first entered an English-language dictionary in 1961 (in the Merriam-Webster Third New International Dictionary) (James and Steger 2014: 419).

Usage of the term the 'global' scale can refer to different things. Indeed, scale has often been associated with verticality (Marston et al 2005; Jones et al 2007), and used in terms of a hierarchical ladder, from local to global or vice-versa (Herod 2008: 226). Howitt has observed that "in many social science settings, careless use of notions of scale as level, often leaves the spatial extent of an issue invisible" (2002: 305). Building on Howitt's observation, Marston et al (2005: 420) also noted confusion between the meaning of scale as a vertical, hierarchical ordering, and a meaning of horizontal 'scope' or 'extensiveness'. Hereafter, the former 'vertical' approach is referred to as global *scale* (eg global scale, as distinct from national scale, local scale), with the latter, horizontal approach referred to as *scope*. For an issue or perspective to be global in scope, its extent or framing relates not just to a local area, a nation state, the Global South or Global North, but to the whole world.

Conflation of these two different interpretations of 'global' has manifested itself in the field of health, where there have been lively debates around a shift from international to global health, and over what global health entails (eg Brown 2006; Koplan et al 2009; Bozorgmehr 2010; Jenkins et al 2016). Koplan et al have suggested that when compared with global health:

> "International health has a more straightforward history. For decades, it was the term used for health work abroad, with a geographic focus on developing countries and often with a content of infectious and tropical diseases, water and sanitation, malnutrition, and maternal and child health" (2009: 1993).

The term international health has been used from the late 19th century onwards, referring to control of epidemics across national boundaries, and with a colonial, biomedical angle (Brown et al 2006). Indeed, a related association continues, as "global health is still often perceived as international aid, technologies, and interventions flowing from the wealthier countries of the global north to the poorer countries of the global south" (Fried et al, 2010: 535). Such an understanding overlooks a more contemporary perspective centring around inter-dependency and the contributions of various nations (Fried et al 2010), as well as on greater consideration

of the social determinants of health, inter-dependency and a global focus (Rowson et al 2012). The World Health Organization (WHO), for example, shifted its focus towards global health in the 1990s (Brown et al 2006). Nevertheless, considerable confusion has been reported over the actual meaning of global health. A survey of 29 health leaders in the US about a new paradigm of global health found a split in respondents. Approximately half thought 'global health' was meaningless jargon, while the other half saw clear differences related to something transnational (yet they were unable to clearly indicate what that shift was (Bunyavanich and Walkup 1999)).

While various understandings and metaphors of 'global' have been identified in relation to global health (Bozorgmehr 2010), two key approaches have emerged - 'scale' or 'scope'. Using global health in terms of 'scope', Brown et al, for example, argue that global health "implies consideration of the health needs of the people of the whole planet above the concerns of particular nations" (2006: 62). With such a definition, 'global health' is not mutually exclusive from international health. Thus, international health focused on control of epidemics across boundaries, for example, would form a part of global health, which would also encompass consideration of a range of non-state actors, and comparative, in addition to the necessarily interconnected, challenges. Koplan et al adopt a similar definition: "global health is an area for study, research, and practice that places a priority on improving health and achieving equity in health for all people worldwide" (2009: 1995). Explicitly stating that "global in global health refers to the scope of problems" (Koplan et al 2009: 1994), such an articulation also facilitates inclusion of domestic health, as well as cross-border, disparities. This would appear to be the meaning adopted by the journal "Global Public Health", which focuses on "key public health issues that have come to the fore in the global environment"[2]. A second perspective on global health relates to a meaning of global as vertical 'scale'. Bozorgmehr (2010) has criticised the Koplan et al (2009) articulation for being indistinguishable from public health, sharing conceptions of health focused on well-being (physical, mental and social), population and individual approaches, and seeing a variety of causes for ill-health. Suggesting that the worldwide (scope) approach is misleading and overlaps with public and international health, Bozorgmehr instead proposed that Scholte's (2002) notion of "global-as-supraterritorial" provides a distinct focus for 'global health' as study, research and practice.

Arguably similarities may be found between 'health' and 'development' in this discussion of a transition from the international to global. Indeed, global health is often poorly defined, has roots in, and still often relates to, an international health associated with the colonial era and problems of developing countries. A related debate has been over whether global justice supersedes international justice (Brown 2008; Harris 2010). International justice is associated with international law and privileges the nation state, whereas global justice takes as its reference object humanity as a whole, whose interests may not be taken for granted by inter-state relations (Brown 2008). In relation

---

[2] According to the journal's aims and scope, available at:
http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=rgph20
(Last accessed: 25th September 2017)

to climate change, Harris (2010) has suggested that global conceptions of justice, focused on the rights, responsibilities and obligations of people everywhere, and drawing on cosmopolitan rather than communitarian (fellow citizens only) accounts of justice, are much more appropriate than international conceptions of justice centred on states. Global social justice has also been argued to provide a key focal point for development studies (Copestake 2015). The following section now explicitly considers different perspectives on global development[3].

4. Global development: scale vs scope

Echoing some similarities with the field of global health, an important distinction can be made between global development related to '*scale*' or to '*scope*'. Based on the former, "global development" is a strand in development studies, alongside sovereign (national) and foreign (international) issues (following Currie-Alder 2016). The other understanding involves "global development" as scope, and can be seen as a "global development paradigm" (eg Gore 2016), which will be expanded upon in greater detail as a fitting approach to move beyond international development. Key differences emerge between the two understandings of global development in terms of their geographic focus, the ranges of issues involved, their origins, and their relationship with international development. These differences are outlined briefly in Table 1 below and will be elaborated further in the subsequent discussion. Ultimately, it is proposed that "global development as paradigm" may be more fitting for the 21st century.

Table 1: Global development as 'scale' and 'scope'

ISSUE	Global development as 'scale': strand within development studies	Global Development as 'scope': overarching paradigm
Geographic focus	Place-specific: Global South synonymous "poor countries" and "poor people"	Universal: (sustainable) development issues anywhere in the world
Key issues	Development in the Global South	Interconnected (eg global public goods) and shared issues in both Global North and South
Origins	1990s globalisation	Post-2015 SDGs, patterns of "converging divergence" (falling inequalities between countries, growing within)
Relationship with international development	Operating in parallel	Successor

Source: Author's construction.

---

[3] Some other adjectives placed before 'development' also involve different meanings. For example, the moniker 'social' when added to 'development' has been adopted with two different meanings– one (often in economics) posing 'the social' (human dimensions of development) in relation to and distinct from the economic (material dimensions of development), while another (often in sociology) poses the 'social' (or collective dimension of human existence) in relation to and distinct from the individual (Kabeer 2015).

4.1. Global development as scale - a strand within development studies

A perspective that sees global development as a (rising) strand within development studies, operating in parallel with other streams of international development (foreign hotspots) and national development (sovereign decisions over improving the human condition at home), has been elaborated by Currie-Alder (2016). The national development strand relates to the domestic context, including sovereign problems such as the use of national wealth, education, health, social protection and thus providing for citizens. The international development strand focuses on foreign hotspots, and particularly relates to development practice focused on poor places abroad. The global development tradition is focused on "creating a common future, recognising the interdependence of different countries in producing public goods and confronting public ills" (Currie-Alder 2016: 8). Engaging with issues such as climate change, diseases, migration, trade etc, it particularly relates to problems beyond the sole control of individual nation states. The understanding of 'global' is thus as at a global 'vertical' scale.

These different strands have been noted to attract varying degrees of attention at different stages. While national development has a long-standing tradition dating to the 19th century at least, the international development strand grew in relation to many countries in the Global South post-independence. Indeed, it is most often associated with the rise of what Hart (2001) refers to as big 'D' development intervention. More debatably given the continued relevance of international development in the 1990s, such as in the formation of the MDGs, Currie-Alder (2016) suggests the 'global development' strand also flourished then, intermingling with international relations and foreign policy in relation to problems beyond the control of nation-states. Now he sees donor agencies and NGOs as having shrunk and the audience of and for international development declining, as "national and global development traditions are thriving" (2016: 17). As well as the pressing relevance of the global strand, he notes the importance of national development with the biggest gains in poverty reduction, for example, coming through sovereign efforts in large countries, as well as the pressing relevance of the global strand.

Outlining these different strands is a very useful distinction to make within development studies, yet it does not sufficiently address the question of pushing beyond the Global South. The importance of issues which go beyond big 'D' international development intervention, with which it is often still associated, are clearly recognised, such as the relevance of the national and global development strands. In Currie-Alder's outline, 'global development' relates closely to what is covered by the field of global studies, which is associated with globalisation and understanding the global (Scholte 2004; Pieterse 2013). Global studies has been framed as seeking to "provide kaleidoscopic and panoramic perspectives on global conditions and cognitions" (Pieterse 2013: 511). Parnell (2016), for example, examined global urban policy in terms of how the urban

has become central to policymaking at the global scale (eg with SDG11 as well as Habitat III). Global development then becomes a parallel interest to, say, research on international or national issues, or even to research on local development (eg Pike et al 2014). Clearly this global strand is of great significance, yet such a framing of global development could involve a focus only on actors, such as major organisations, and on processes which are associated with the 'global' scale. It does not engage with the issue of moving the spatial extent beyond the Global South. Instead, another usage is now outlined which encompasses a wider geographic remit – 'global development' as scope.

4.2. Global development as scope – a paradigm for development studies

Taking 'global development' as scope may be viewed as an overarching focus that considers development in relation to the whole world as part of a 'global development paradigm' (Gore 2015, Longhurst 2017, Scholte and Söderbaum 2017). Most notably it includes a departure from the dominant orientation of 20th century international development towards just being about 'poor countries' and 'poor people'. We live in a world where many of the causes of development outcomes are inter-connected and shared, rather than being segmented along North-South or national boundaries. A "one-world" approach has previously been advocated (Singer 2002; Mehta et al 2006; Sumner 2011), but without in-depth elaboration in relation to development studies.

A global development paradigm may encompass *collective* challenges of global public goods, *shared* (sustainable) development challenges that countries and regions anywhere in the world face as well as *severe challenges or 'hotspots'*. This approach can be more inclusive of research in, and relating to, the Global North, and may also involve greater comparative research across Global North and South.

Global public goods (eg Sumner and Tiwari 2010; Sachs 2012; Leach 2015) have huge relevance as a *collective challenge*, which can affect all parts of the world. Issues that have been identified across the three domains of economic, human and environment include financial stability and arguably taxation cooperation, treatments for serious global diseases, and mitigation of carbon emissions and adaptation to climate change (Alonso 2012; Leach 2015). As recognised most recently and prominently in the Paris Agreement of 2015, for example, climate change is an enormous development challenge, and one with significant consequences for all countries.

Places and people in both the Global North and South face many *shared (sustainable) development challenges*. Issues of relative poverty and inequality have, for a considerable while, been recognised as relevant to both Global North and South (de Haan and Maxwell 1998). As well as receiving continued attention more recently (Chen and Ravallion 2013), across a variety of different sub-fields, other themes attracting such attention have included urban issues (Robinson 2011; Parnell 2016), precarious work (Siegmann and Schiphorst 2016), local and regional development, and socio-spatial inequality (Pike et al 2014). A host of common challenges facing the third sector (ie non-profits/non-governmental organisations) in North and South have also been

identified, such as accountability, resource mobilisation, legitimacy, effectiveness etc (Lewis 2015). Examples of Northern approaches to social justice that have learnt from the Global South have been suggested to include participatory approaches to grassroots action and microfinance, and social protection through conditional cash transfers (Lewis 2017).

Most prominently of all, the SDGs identify 17 goals which have global relevance. Initial attempts to create indexes of progress towards the SDGs show that, although the extent and nature varies, all countries face significant challenges. As well as climate change, ecosystem conservation and sustainable consumption, other indicators where OECD countries are found to fall short include those on agricultural systems, malnutrition (related to obesity), development cooperation (SDG 17), jobs and unemployment, and gender equality. Of course, the SDG Index and Dashboards also show huge basic needs challenges for low-income countries – in relation to poverty, hunger, health care, education, water and sanitation, jobs and infrastructure (Sachs et al 2016).

Severe challenges continue to require special attention. Inequalities between countries are still vast with considerable citizenship premiums (Milanovic 2015), despite some blurring of the North-South divide this century. The Global South still arguably warrants a key focus. What Collier (2007) called the planet's bottom billion – or by now 800 million if measured according to extreme income poverty – exclusively live in the Global South in the most severe deprivation and are an obvious starting point. In terms of assessing the severity of challenges, it is also necessary to avoid a problem of somewhat arbitrary lines of division in classifications, as a result of which people who have escaped from income/consumption poverty are overlooked, despite being seriously vulnerable. A graduated approach calibrated to degrees of severity may be necessary. Many (but not all) of the highest carbon emitters are found in the Global North, serving as an example of how the challenge of climate change and environment puts considerable emphasis on the Global North and elite populations as those with some of the biggest development challenges to tackle. If the Paris Agreement on climate change is to get close to meeting its targets, it will need significant commitment by those who might be considered relatively developed in a North-South international development context, but who nevertheless appear considerably underdeveloped in a global sustainable development context.

Some of the changes arising from a move from international development to global development (as scope) are captured in Table 2 below. While this primarily involves a shift in geographic focus, it also involves shifts in spatial nomenclature (questioning more than ever macro-scale generalisations such as North/South, developed/developing), in the prominent meaning of development (from being like the Global North, to sustainability) and in the nature and orientation of development intervention (from Northern aid to a more diffuse and varied development cooperation).

Table 2: From International Development to Global Development as paradigm

ISSUE	International Development	Global Development
Geographic focus	Place-specific: synonymous "poor countries", "poor people" and Global South	Universal: Sustainable development issues wherever they exist - Interconnected issues and shared issues across North and South
Spatial nomenclature	First-Second-Third Worlds; Developed/Developing; Global North-South	Layering: Global convergence, national and sub-national divergence (enclaves, peripherality, connectivity/exclusion)
Prominent meaning of development	Modernisation and growth: Southern countries becoming like the Global North	SDG agenda: Transformation, true "global development"; sustainability; social justice
Big 'D' development morality and actors	Charity and development aid by Northern states, NGOs	Development cooperation by traditional and new donors; multiple domestic and international sources of public and private development finance

Source: Horner and Hulme (2017: 26).

5. Challenges for a global development paradigm

The approach of framing global development as scope (ie in relation to the whole world) has potential on a number of fronts - addressing the long-standing frustration of overlooking development issues in the North, moving away from the problematic North-South binary, being more suited to the challenges of sustainable development, and being more fitted to the contemporary pattern of shifting global inequalities. As an approach, it also moves beyond an association of 'development' with international aid. Nevertheless, considerable challenges must be addressed if the potential of global development is to be delivered.

Some argue that the whole idea and terminology of 'development' should be abandoned. For example, Rist has suggested that if "development is at the root of the problems besetting the world, then we should give it up – and certainly not replace it with a new development programme claiming universal validity" (2008: 58). Moore (2015) has proposed moving away from development as an organising framework towards "global prosperity". Sumner and Tribe (2008) note that a possible response to framing 'development' as global, ie in relation to the entire planet, is to regard it as another way to impose the values of industrialised countries on developing countries. However, they recognise that would be a very narrow view of development (2008: 20), associating 'development' largely with the imminent form, and overlooking many aspects of transformation that continue to take place regardless. Nevertheless, this

perspective serves as a valuable warning that a progressive approach to global development is not automatic.

A focus on 'global development' may have unintended consequences. For example, it may inadvertently lead to a withdrawal inward, particularly a reluctance to engage with addressing the most severe deprivation, such as the extreme poverty which is still almost exclusively found in parts of the Global South. As 'development' is a challenge for everyone everywhere, actions can be taken to promote development 'at home' with disregard for their implications elsewhere. Yet, although the China trade "shock" in the US is a clear example (Autor et al 2016), it cannot be assumed that there is a zero-sum relationship between within-country inequalities and between-country inequalities. Addressing one aspect of global inequality (eg within- or between-country) does not necessarily aggravate the other (Rodrik 2017). The opportunity of global development is to draw comparative lessons across both Global North and South about addressing either or, ideally, both within-country and between-country inequalities across a variety of domains of development.

A danger with 'global' approaches is that they do not adequately incorporate research and knowledge related to the whole world. Indeed, sometimes global perspectives have been considered to conceal, being a camouflage for Western visions which are characterised by historical and geopolitical amnesia (Slater 1995: 367). Neoliberalism's prescription of a particular market logic everywhere has been criticised for its universal set of prescriptions for developed and developed countries alike (Cammack 2001). Urban theory has been criticised for presenting itself as 'global' but inadequately addressing the realities of Southern cities (Schindler 2017). The task is thus to seek to move beyond the "production of parochial universalisms" (Robinson 2003). Rather than necessarily producing 'universal laws', a key task of global development can be to question claims to universality which are often made on the basis of unduly narrow theorisation and evidence bases, such as only in relation to certain parts of the world.

Rather than a group of experts from one place telling a subordinate group from another what to do, a charge often raised within and against international development, a global development perspective augments the need for greater mutual learning, and associated collaborative action, across and within the Global North and South (McFarlane 2006; Mehta et al 2006; Sumner 2011; Leach 2015; Longhurst 2017). For example, Mehta et al (2006) have argued that development research should focus on both rich and poor countries, forging new relationships including between northern and southern researchers. More recently, Leach points to the potential of mutual learning in relation to sustainability "across and between low-income countries, emerging economies and richer, declining economies on a world stage—about how such transformational alliances can be forged and operate" (2015: 830). With particular institutions and individuals in the Global North often still dominant, the challenge for mutual learning across North and South and thus a "planetary development studies" is clearly in the enactment (McFarlane 2006). The opportunity now is to move beyond those North-South boundaries which cut off certain forms of learning, towards thinking

about, for example comparisons, convergences, and connections (Maxwell 1998), and also translation (McFarlane 2006) in order to more effectively learn lessons in tune with our contemporary world.

6. Conclusion

Development studies in the 21st century clearly finds itself situated in a very different context from much of the 20th century. Four key reasons suggest a need to move beyond a North-South orientation of international development – long-standing critiques of the North-South binary, global interconnectedness, the universal relevance of sustainability, and the contemporary blurring of the North-South boundary. A global development framing appears more suited to the contemporary geography of development challenges, yet it has not been systematically unpacked. The term is increasingly used, yet with different implicit understandings of its meaning. Similarities can be noted to the field of global health which has a more interdependent global focus, but has also struggled with issues of clarity of definition of the concept and associations with just a developing country focus.

Two perspectives on "what is global development?" are highlighted here. One sees global development as focusing on the ('vertical') global 'scale', alongside strands focused on the national (domestic) and international (foreign issues). The other sees global as 'scope' foreshadowing a paradigm shift towards global development which would encompass interconnected issues, shared issues and development challenges graduated towards the most severe, wherever they may be found. Building on Gore (2015), it is suggested here that the global as 'scope' approach is the most appropriate for the 21st century, moving clearly beyond the North-South divide to consider development as a challenge relate to, and involving, the whole world.

An exciting and timely agenda emerges from a global development as scope approach. Major societal challenges facing the world approaching 2020 include significant interdependent issues related to climate change and finance. Drawing comparative lessons from across the Global North and Global South opens up new learning opportunities, and is preferable to the separation of the study of North-South inequalities from domestic inequalities. Institutional retrenchment along North-South lines is going to be needed in international organisations (eg Kanbur 2017), non-governmental organisations (eg Lewis 2015) and, of course, university and development research institutes. Although clearly not without challenges, the possibilities appear exciting, and timely, for global development in terms of creating a more progressive analytical approach befitting the 21st century.

References

Alvaredo, F., L. Chancel, T. Piketty, E. Saez and G. Zucman (eds.) (2018). *World inequality report 2018*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Autor, D., D. Dorn and G. Hanson (2016) The China shock: Learning from labor-market adjustment to large changes in trade, Annual Review of Economics, 8, 205-240.

Baldwin, R. (2016) The great convergence: information technology and globalization, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Bhattacharya, D. and A. Ordóñez Llanos (2016). Southern perspectives on the post-2015 international development agenda. London: Routledge.

Bourguignon, F. (2015). The globalization of inequality. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bozorgmehr, K. (2010) Rethinking the 'global' in global health: a dialectic approach. Globalization and Health, 6, 19 DOI: 10.1186/1744-8603-6-19

Bunyavanich, S. and R.B. Walkup (2001) US public health leaders shift toward a new paradigm of global health, *American Journal of Public Health*, 91 (10), 1556-1558.

Brown, T. M., M. Cueto and E. Fee (2006) The World Health Organization and the transition from "international" to "global" public health, *American Journal of Public Health*, 96 (1), 62-72.

Cammack, P. (2001) Neoliberalism, the World Bank and the new politics of development, pp. 157-178 in U. Kothari and M. Minogue (eds.), *Development theory and practice: critical perspectives*, London: Palgrave.

Castells, Manuel (1996). *The rise of the network society, the information age: economy, society and culture, Vol. I*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Collier, P. (2007) *The bottom billion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Copestake, J. (2015) Whither development studies? Reflections on its relationship with social policy, *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 31 (2), 100-113.

Cornwall, A. (2007) Buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse, *Development in Practice*, 17 (4-5), 471-484.

Cowen, M. and Shenton, R. (1996) *Doctrines of development*. London: Routledge.

Currie-Alder, B. (2016) The state of development studies: origins, evolution and prospects, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 37 (1), 5-26.

de Haan, A. and S. Maxwell (1998) Editorial: Poverty and social exclusion in North and South, *IDS Bulletin*, 29 (1), 1-9.

Death, C. and C. Gabay (2015) Doing biopolitics differently? Radical potential in the post-2015 MDG and SDG debates, *Globalizations*, 12 (4), 597-612.

Eyben, R. and L. Savage (2013) Emerging and submerging powers: Imagined geographies in the new development partnership at the Busan high fourth level forum, *The Journal of Development Studies*,49 (4), 457–469.

Gaventa, J. (1998) Poverty, participation and social exclusion in North and South, *IDS Bulletin*, 29 (1), 50-57.

Gore, C. (2015) The post-2015 moment: towards sustainable development goals and a new global development paradigm, *Journal of International Development*, 27 (6), 717-732.

Harris, P. (2010). *World ethics and climate change: From international to global justice*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Hart, G. (2001) Development critiques in the 1990s: culs de sac and promising paths, *Progress in Human Geography*, 25 (4), 649-658.

Herod, A. (2008). Scale: the local and the global. Chapter 12 in N. Clifford, S. Holloway, S.P. Rice and G. Valentine, *Key Concepts in Geography*, London: Sage. Pp. 217-235.

Howitt, R. (2002) Scale and the other: Levinas and geography, *Geoforum*, 33 (3), 299-313.

Horner, R. (2016) A new economic geography of trade and development? Governing South-South trade, value chains and production networks, *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 4 (4), 400-420.

Horner, R. and D. Hulme (2017) From international to global development: new geographies of 21st century development, *Development and Change*, DOI: 10.1111/dech.12379.

Hulme, D. (2015) *Global poverty: global governance and poor people in the post-2015 era*. London: Routledge, 2nd edition.

James, P. and M. Steger (2014) A genealogy of 'globalization': The career of a concept, *Globalizations*, 11 (4), 417-434.

Janus, H., S. Klingebiel and S. Paulo (2015) Beyond aid: A conceptual perspective on the transformation of development cooperation, *Journal of International Development*, 27 (2), 155-169.

Jenkins, C., M. Lomazzi, H. Yeatman and B. Borisch (2016) Global public health: A review and discussion of the concepts, principles and roles of global Public Health in Today's Society, *Global Policy*, 7 (3), 332-339.

Jones, J. P., K. Woodward and S. Marston (2007) Situating flatness, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(2): 264-276.

Kabeer, N. (2015) Evolving meanings of "the social" in the international development agenda, *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 31 (2), 114-131.

Kaplinsky, R. (2005). *Globalization, poverty and inequality*. Cambridge: Polity.

Kanbur, R. (2017) What is the World Bank good for? Global public goods and global institutions. CEPR Discussion Paper, Cornell University.

Kanbur, R. and A. Sumner (2012) Poor countries or poor people? Development assistance and the new geography of global poverty, *Journal of International Development*, 24 (6), 686-695

Kaul, I. (2017) Making the case for a new global development research agenda, *Forum for Development Studies*, 44 (1), 141-148.

Koplan, J. P., C. Bond, M. Merson, K.S. Srinath, M.H. Rodriguez, N.K. Sewankambo, and J.N. Wasserheit (2009) Towards a common definition of global health, *The Lancet*, 373 (9679), 1993-1995.

Kothari, U. and M. Minogue (2001) *Development theory and practice: critical perspectives*, London: Palgrave.

Kothari, U. (2005) *A radical history of development studies: Individuals, institutions and ideologies.* London: Zed Books.

Leach, M. (2015) The ebola crisis and post-2015 development, *Journal of International Development*, 27 (6), 816-834.

Lewis, D. (2015) Contesting parallel worlds: Time to abandon the distinction between the 'International' and 'domestic' contexts of third sector scholarship? *Voluntas*, 26 (5), 2084-2103.

Lewis, D. (2017) Should we pay more attention to South-North learning? *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 31 (4), 327-331.

Longhurst, R. (2017) Universal development - research and practice, *IDS Bulletin*, 48 (1A): 1-24.

Marston, S. A., J.P. Jones, K. Woodward (2005) Human geography without scale, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30 (4), 416-432.

Mawdsley, E. (2017) Development geography 1: Cooperation, competition and convergence between 'North' and 'South', *Progress in Human Geography*, 41 (1), 108-117.

Maxwell, S. (1998) Comparisons, convergence and connections: Development studies in North and South, *IDS Bulletin*, 29 (1), 20-31.

McFarlane, C. (2006) Crossing borders: development, learning and the North – South divide, *Third World Quarterly*, 27 (8), 1413-1437.

Mehta, L., R. Haug and L. Haddad (2006) Reinventing development research, *Forum for Development Studies*, 33 (1), 143-148.

Milanovic, B. (2016) *Global inequality: a new approach for the age of globalization*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mohan, G. and G. Wilson (2005) The antagonistic relevance of development studies, *Progress in Development Studies*, 5 (4), 261-278.

Moore, H. (2015) Global prosperity and Sustainable Development Goals, *Journal of International Development*, 27 (6), 801-815.

Oldekop, J. et al. (2016) 100 key research questions for the post-2015 development agenda, *Development Policy Review*, 34 (1), 55-82.

O'Rourke, K. and J. Williamson (2002) When did globalisation begin? *European Review of Economic History*, 6 (1), 23-50.

Parnell, S. (2016) Defining a global urban development agenda, *World Development*, 78, 529-540.

Perkins, R. (2013) Sustainable development and the making and unmaking of a developing world, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31 (6), 1003-1022.

Pike, A., A. Rodríguez-Pose and J. Tomaney (2014) Local and regional development in the global North and South, *Progress in Development Studies*, 14 (1), 21-30.

Pollard, J., C. McEwan, N. Laurie, and A. Stenning (2009) Economic geography under postcolonial scrutiny, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34 (2), 137-142.

Potter, R. (2001) Geography and development: 'core and periphery'? *Area*, 33 (4), 422-439.

Pritchett, L. (1997) Divergence, big time, *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11 (3), pp. 3-17.

Pritchett, L. (2013) *The rebirth of education: Schooling ain't learning*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Global Development.

Radcliffe, S. (2005) Development and geography: towards a postcolonial development geography? *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 (3), 291-298.

Rist, G. (2008) *The history of development: from Western origins to global faith*. London: Zed Books.

Robinson, J. (2003) Political geography in a postcolonial context, *Political Geography*, 22 (6), 647-651.

Robinson, J. (2011) Cities in a world of cities: The comparative gesture, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35 (1), 1-23.

Rodrik (2017) 'Is global equality the enemy of national equality?', Harvard Kennedy School Working Paper No. RWP17-003, Harvard University, Cambridge, M.A. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2910603

Rowson, M., C. Willott, R. Hughes, A. Maini, S. Martin, J. Miranda, V. Pollit, A. Smith, R. Wake, J. Yudkin (2012) Conceptualising global health: theoretical issues and their relevance for teaching, *Globalization and Health*, 8: 36-36.

Sachs, J. D. (2012) From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals, *The Lancet*, 379 (9832), 2206-2211.

Sachs, J., G. Schmidt-Traub, C. Kroll, D. Durand-Delacre and K. Teksoz. (2016). *SDG index and dashboards - global report*. New York: Bertelsmann Stiftung and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN).

Said E (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Saith, A. (2006) From universal values to Millennium Development Goals: Lost in translation, *Development and Change*, 37 (6), 1167-1199.

Schindler, S. (2017) Towards a paradigm of Southern urbanism, *City*, 21 (1), 47-64.

Scholte, J.A. (2002) What Is Globalization? The Definitional Issue - Again. 2002. Coventry, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation (CSGR). Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick; CSGR Working Paper 109/02.

Scholte, J.A. (2014) Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalizations*, 11 (4), 503-513.

Scholte, J.A. and F. Söderbaum (2017) A changing global development agenda? *Forum for Development Studies*, 44 (1), 1-12.

Seers, D. (1963) The limitations of the special case, *Bulletin of the Oxford Institute of Economics and Statistics*, 25 (2), 77-98.

Sheppard, E. (2004) From east–west to north–south, *Antipode*, 36 (4), 557-563.

Sidaway, J. (2012) Geographies of development: New maps, new visions? *Professional Geographer*, 64 (1), 49-62.

Siegmann, K. A. and F. Schiphorst (2016) Understanding the globalizing precariat: From informal sector to precarious work, *Progress in Development Studies*, 16 (2), 111-123.

Slater, D. (1995) Challenging western visions of the global: The geopolitics of theory and north-south relations, *The European Journal of Development Research*, 7 (2), 366-388.

Steffen, W., et al. (2015) Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet, *Science*, 347 (6223), 736-746.

Suganami, H. (2009) A note on the origin of the word 'International', *British Journal of International Studies*, 4 (3), 226-232.

Sumner, A. (2016). *The world's two new middles: Growth, precarity, structural change, and the limitations of the special case*, UNU-Wider.

Sumner, A. and M. Tribe (2008). *International development studies: theories and methods in research and practice*. London: Sage.

Sumner, A. and M. Tiwari (2010) Global poverty reduction to 2015 and beyond: What has been the impact of the MDGs and what are the options for a post-2015 global framework? *IDS Working Papers*, 348, 01-31.

The World Bank (2011) *Global development horizons 2011 – multipolarity: The new global economy*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.

Therien, J. P. (1999) Beyond the North-South divide: The two tales of world poverty, *Third World Quarterly*, 20 (4), 723-742.

Tiwari, M. (2015) Looking back to move forward: The MDGS and the road to post-2015: Introduction to Journal of International Development special issue on reflections on the post-2015 debate, *Journal of International Development*, 27 (3), 313-319.

UNDP (2013) *Human development report: The rise of the South – Human progress in a diverse world*. New York: UNDP.

Wallerstein I. (1979) *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, K. (2005). *Theories and practices of development*. London: Routledge.

World Bank (2010) Old concept of "Third World" outdated, Zoellick says, Available from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2010/04/14/old-concept-of-third-world-outdated-zoellick-says