

American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)

e-ISSN :2378-703X

Volume-5, Issue-2, pp-564-569

[www.ajhssr.com](http://www.ajhssr.com)

Research Paper

Open Access

## FROM DEVELOPMENT ECONOMY TO KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY: A QUALITATIVE LEAP?

Roger MONDOUE<sup>1</sup>, RomualdDEZO MOUAFO<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Department of Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, Professor-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

<sup>2</sup>(Department of Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology, PhD Student-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

**ABSTRACT:** Facing the dynamics of the development economy, which refers to a survival situation of the states in permanent risk of failure, and facing the fashion of the knowledge economy, that expresses the placement of knowledge and innovation at the heart of the process of wealth creation, African countries should make a choice. In comparison with that one, which subjects the so-called underdeveloped countries to the psychological complex of Stockholm, it seems a qualitative leap as it engages them in the wake of competitive productivism. We think beyond the guarantees made to the African appropriation of this "new paradigm" that it seems a qualitative leap, under the condition of a revival of this forgotten discipline in the globalized economy that is the political economy.

**Keywords:** Development, Development economy, Knowledge economy, Political economy.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The development economy conceived as this motor science of these avatars of "colonial knowledge" which are "development sciences", is that of a proposal/imposition of "economic laws" supposed to engage so-called "underdeveloped" countries in the direction of development. As an economic analysis "applied" to the development process and the study of "quasi-nation states", according to Oswaldo de Rivero [DE RIVERO; 2003], this perspective is, on the whole, that of the survival of the "Third World States", confronted with the permanent risk of failure. However, lived as a *sui generis* paradigm, because it places the concept of knowledge, coupled with the need for innovation, as a "new engine of growth", the "knowledge economy" perspective is more in line with competitive productivism. In coherence with the project of emergence, we notice a proliferation of conceptual, militant and practical approaches. Some authors, such as Paul Kamogne Fokam support African appropriation of this "new paradigm", even though others, like Jean-Marc Éla, sees in it a risk of imbalances in the whole science development in Africa [ELA; 2006]. However, we say, a paradigm is only as good as its application contexts allow. Hence the question of de facto and de jure compatibility of the development economics? and the knowledge economy. Ahead of these two perspectives, our hypothesis is that Africans must choose. Compared to the development economy which, according to Jacques Chatué's analysis, participates in at least one "psychology crime", the knowledge economy appears to be a qualitative leap. But how to consider this "new paradigm" in a context where the "development" of the so-called "underdeveloped" countries are conditioned by their entry into the famous totally free "world casino", this famous globalization that takes the shape of a "universal gravitational law", "to which no person, company or nation can escape" [DE RIVERO; 2003: p. 18]? Approached from this angle, the knowledge economy appears as a qualitative leap under condition: the revival of this forgotten discipline of political economy, as it links economic gains to the priority needs of a 'nation' designed as "home", "same house".

### II. THE BIOPOLITICAL INSCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT ECONOMY

Beyond the effectiveness of a certain unity manifested in its "sub-continent", the Third World is characterized above all by its diversity; diversity which, according to some observations of Jacques Brasseur, makes any attempt to analyze its global "economic problems" if not impossible at least extremely difficult. Yet, he notes, this growing diversity is paradoxically the result of a "common phenomenon": the "economic development". The economic development of each countries has a proper rhythm. He asserted on this subject: "some, especially in Africa, have experienced low growth while others, in Asia and Latin America, have changed rapidly. so the Third World which in 1950 was to seem much more homogeneous, it appears today as an expanding universe where the most advanced of their starting point are those who travel the fastest, while

those who are close to the origin of just crawl, while those in the middle of move at a new speed” [Brasseul;1989:5].

In *Introduction à l'économie du développement*, Brasseul, from a global approach justified by this “common phenomenon” is interested on the one hand in the study of economic development and on the other side to a presentation of the “instruments” and the “concepts” of the economy development defined as economic analysis applied to the development process and to the study of developing countries [Brasseul; 1989:5]. The United States appear in the fifties, as the favourite place where the most progress is made in a “relative optimism about the growth opportunities of poor countries” [ Brasseul; 1989:25], the “development analysis”. The pioneers of this study share both the idea of a necessary interventionism, focused on the determining role of an investment in technical capital and in linear conception of the phases of development.

Only the failures of real development in the sixties and seventies, the “difficulties of many countries”, the stagnation of some has led to a generalized pessimistic era hence the occurrence of the Third Worldist movement guided by the idea of a catch-up made impossible due to its perception of “underdevelopment” as a simple consequence of the domination of so-called “developed countries” over “developing countries”. In reverse, the eighties will see the birth of a counter-revolution against the Third World, attested by the revival, in economy development, of liberal thought. For the proponents of this counter-revolution firmly opposed to the theories of domination, the causes of underdevelopment are internal. From the point of view of Brasseul, they defend the market economy, liberalization, privatization, openness to the outside world and free exchange”, anything promoted, inter alia, by the GATT agreements, as they bear little or no bearing on the dynamics of globalisation. We see the economy of development is therefore crossed by a succession of phases that separates the economists from the development hence this assertion of Brasseul: “currently we find these three successive phases in the main currents that separate development economists: the structuralist current, the liberal or neoclassical current and the neo-Marxist current. As Chenery remarks, the last two try to adapt the older thought systems to the case of the developing countries, while the first, more original, seeks to develop an analysis specific to developing economies, (called differentiated analysis by Hirschman as opposed to mono-economism of the last two currents which the same analysis must adapt everywhere)” [Brasseul; 1989:26].

As it generally appeals to history, geography, sociology, economy development has a “multidisciplinary aspect”; as its “object”, it appears most often as an instrument of decision support, as a means of advising the “prince” on the “policy to be pursued”, it has a normative aspect. But the implementation of these policies requires an understanding of the phenomenon of “underdevelopment” that they will try to explain either by economic causes, with reference to Ragnar Nurkse and its theory of vicious circles of poverty, either by non-economic causes its theory of vicious circles of poverty for example, either by non-economic causes for example. Concerning the theory of vicious circles of poverty, as we have no doubt guessed, it is admitted that poverty is self-sustaining, for poor countries cannot by themselves emerge from the series of vicious circles in which they are caught. Without repeating the schemes proposed by Brasseul, here is the economy of the so-called theory, a situation of poverty can only lead to low incomes poverty leads to low incomes; low savings, low investment, low capital, low productivity leading to low incomes. Similarly, low income leads to inadequate nutrition, low productivity, which leads to low incomes. We have come to the same conclusion: the self-maintenance of poverty. If we have low incomes, market demand is low, narrow markets, there is lack of opportunities low investment, low productivity etc. From this point of view, we see, any occurrence within the circles is impossible. Therefore, one escapes only by injection, better by intervention. To break the vicious circles, Nurkse thinks, it requires an external contribution, aimed at increasing the stock of “technical capital” and the productivity, that is, the increase in income and demand, and hence internal investment, thus setting countries on the road to economic development” [ Brasseul; 1989:27]. In relation to non-economic explanations of the causes of “underdevelopment” particularly the cultural hypothesis explained among other by Axelle Kabou [Kabou:1991], it is above all a question of a defence of the thesis of the “autoflagellation” thus, the commonly alleged idea is that of mentalities, value systems religions or philosophical doctrines, as contrasting with the phenomenon of economic development in the “third world countries”. Such a contrast is explained for example by the fact that while industrial development requires a trading economy, ever-increasing needs and the structuring of large-scale production, some Third World populations have rather limited needs, hence the pregnancy of both small producers and crafts. As reported by Brasseul, they are not oriented towards exchange towards trade, and have no desire to accumulate, no desire to invest, no need to increase their size. Within these populations, he continues, all production is basically only production of the population it is organized only as a production of a restricted community, and the exchange takes the form of a barter between neighbours. The consequence of such an organization on economic development is the social pressure exerted by these populations and in this case, those who would like to make changes. Which helps to reinforce the thesis that people’s behaviour and mentality would be at the origin of their “underdevelopment” in view of their incompatibility with “the introduction of modern production techniques and methods” [Brasseul ; 1989:37]. But

whatever its explanations, we simply explain, the need for an understanding of the “phenomenon of underdevelopment” as a prerequisite for the choice of a model or a theory of development.

Demonstrate the mechanics of growth and explain how an economy develops, this is the objective of development models. When does this growth mechanism start? From the appearance of the production chain, of a surplus, that is to say an oversupply of consumption by production allocated to increase production capacity. Let's consider to exploit it, this very simple example given by Brasseur: in a fishing village if the catch, that is to say the production exceeds the needs, that is to say the consumption, then the inhabitants of that village, they will be able to live on reserves for a period of time, so they will be able to devote themselves to tasks other than fishing, such as construction of larger canoes, where the production of nets. This represents an investment that stimulates the joint increase of the technical capital stock and the “capacity of production”. This means that there will be a doubly increase in the product of the fishery and a diversity of activities. However, this is only the role of “productive goods” as a source of growth. From the idea, widespread after 1945, of economic growth as planned and promotable, that is to say, all in all, Eastern governments have developed various growth strategies, that it is the classic model, illustrated among others by Adam Smith through his “famous invisible hand”, of the neoclassical model, illustrated for example by the “production potential curve”, where again the neo-Keynesian model, placing savings and capital at its heart role that will be taken up and emphasized in the model of Paul Kamogne Fokam [Fokam;2016].

Now, let us hammer it, since the “intention of development” through Harry Truman's point IV, this small “catalogue of good intentions”, received as a “masterpiece” as a synthesis of ideas and conceptual innovation, has established a relation *sui generis* between development and “underdevelopment”. Contrary to its classical western conception, which approached it as an intransitive phenomenon, that is, as a simple phenomenon, the appearance and use of the underdevelopment noun admits at the same time that the idea of a procession, “of a possible change in direction of a final state” [Rist; 2007: 134]. The priority of a possibility/necessity of provocation, of almost magical innovation of such a change. Beyond the simple observation of the effectiveness of things that “develop”, the “development” takes on a transitive meaning and normally” an action by one agent on another [RIST; 2007:135]. This meaning is, basically, the establishment of a correspondence between “development” is, in reality, an illusion of what exists natively, without apparent cause. It is in this perspective that we consider the idea of a biopolitical inscription of the economy of development, perceived by Chatué as the driving science of the “development sciences” [Chatué; 2014]. This idea translate the volonte, which is still in the process of developing an external impetus to the political and economic dynamics of African societies. It expresses the constant desire to act on African societies from the outside, organizing them at least politically and economically. This project starts from a certain subsidiary. To annihilate the potentialized conflict in the colonizing/colonized opposition then, we imagined a new “developed”/“underdeveloped” separation, conforming to Rist's analysis to “the new universal declaration of human rights and the progressive globalization of the state system” [Rist; 2007: 135]. This familial link introduced by the “new binomial” is the substantial order, in the sense that there is only a relative difference between the two. an “underdeveloped” stage far from being the opposite of an “developed” stage is only a delayed stage, that is, to use this biological metaphor, its embryonic stage. According to this analogy, the “underdeveloped” can, by concocting recipes terminals, otherwise manage to catch up with the “developed”, at least or at least narrow their gap. An idea against which many African thinkers, will rise including the Senegalese Felwine Sarr for whom the “Africa has no one to catch up” [Sarr; 2016] or the Cameroonian Chatué for whom as they are pressed by the urgency of catching up, the development science only consider the present in Africa to annihilate their future [Chatué;2014].

In sum, the humanitarian perspective of development economy which is to address African economic problems in the wake of the struggle for survival, makes it possible to consider the far more decisive perspective of the struggle for production, for competitive productivism, as envisaged for example by this “new” paradigm: the knowledge economy?

### III. THE LATE APPROPRIATION OF KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY IN AFRICA

Beyond the effectiveness of its “relatively fuzzy” and “protein” character, and above its appearance difficult to grasp and control the concept of “knowledge”, according to the statement of Jean-Pierre Bouchez, “suddenly assumed (especially in its commercial dimension) the capital and determining importance in our society qualified as post-industrial and largely immaterial to be a new engine of growth, combined with the unavoidable imperative of innovation” [Bouchez; 2012:9]. This is why the “knowledge economy” was that of neoliberal essence, in reference to the knowledge economy, where academic essence, in reference to cognitive capitalism arises primarily as being the analysis of a particular stage of capitalism, as it is based on the idea of knowledge as an economic good. In its managerial side, that of knowledge management, it is a question of answering the question know how to convert useful knowledge into value and profit or, in other words, intellectual capital in economic capital through its incorporation and deployment in products and services

within a hypercompetitive market universe [Bouchez ;2012:157]. This is why knowledge economy is globally It is seen as a sui generis stage of the accumulation system, since it is less on machinery and the division of labour as on knowledge and capacity for innovation. to illustrate this new regulation, Bouchez cited Christian Azaïs accumulation, that is to say the dynamics of economic and social transformation of the society is based on the systematic exploitation of new knowledge and information it is therefore an era of the hegemony of knowledge, a prevalence of the driving role of knowledge production through knowledge. As we announced, the knowledge economy articulates “knowledge” and “innovation”. For Maryann Feldman, the concept of innovation that Joseph Aloïs Schumpeter already placed at the heart of economic dynamics, is the “ability to melt or combine different types of knowledge into something new, original, innovative which has an economic value oriented towards the market” [Bouchez; 2012:43]. For Schumpeter, as Julien Pénin shows in “Joseph Aloïs Schumpeter: the father of the modern economy?”, in addition to being the main factor in economic development, innovation is the “central variable through which the economic actors compete with each other” [Pénin; 16-36:4]. It clearly distinguishes the intention, which it perceives as a new solution to a eventually problem possibly technical or not.

According to the terms of Pénin, the innovation for Schumpeter consists in the introduction of the creation of economic circle/circuit; that is to say give it an economic value. For example, innovation will be referred to as an invention that has spread in the sense of successful marketing [BOUCHEZ; 2012: 42]. According to Bouchez, indeed, its articulation with knowledge is based on meetings of actors with diverse knowledge and experience. In any event, Black Africa seems to be falling behind in this “new” paradigm, even if Jean-Marc Éla identifies the risk of an imbalance in the overall development of science in Africa [ELA; 2006: 292].

Because the knowledge economy insists on the need for education reform and directly-based research on knowledge, we want to show Africa’s positioning in relation to the “whole” initiative of Paul Fokam, both conceptual, activist and practical. *Et sil’Afrique se reveillait?* of Fokam is a project to wake up Africa from a near comatose sleep. It starts from the diagnosis and identification of a triple factor which, according to him, constitutes the seeds of poverty in Africa a school that does not allow Africans to project into the future; a conception of work that is unsuited to the environment endogenous challenges; subjection to the burdens of the colonial past...” [FOKAM; 2016: 7] Because the fight against poverty in Africa is poorly committed, reduced to the “quantitative bias”, the author initiates his project on the basis of a redefinition of poverty, that is to say of its extension to the intellectual and moral aspects. Because, as he asserts, peremptory, “by conceiving poverty in a single dimension, we have distorted the diagnosis” FOKAM; 2016: 8]. But one cannot simply perceive reasons for “victimity”. As much as international institutions are wrong about the ways out of poverty, as well as local political actors remain powerless in the face of the evils that plunge the continent into a kind of lethargy, science does not manage to enter the university to make society fruitful. Research is trial and error and rarely leads to innovative inventions. Public morals are worked by resignation, inertia and recklessness. Socio-political, economic and cultural decisions are not based on a strong vision. Political regimes succeed each other without satisfying the thirst for sustained and sustainable prosperity” [FOKAM ; 2016 : 8]. His aforementioned work therefore presents itself clearly as an arsenal, as it delivers us weapons, to address a set of critical challenges that would allow Africa to “catch up”. One of these weapons, if not the most important, is the “management revolution”, that is to say, that is, basically, the “knowledge revolution”.

Fokam says of “knowledge” that it is “the main inexhaustible resource of the wealth of the world, the wealth of the subsoil being, on the other hand limited FOKAM; 2016: 20]. Drawing lessons from major powers, such as Germany and Japan, he is convinced that to lay the foundations of its development, Africa must use this “inexhaustible resource of wealth” for exclusively economic purposes. Knowledge should be used only for the benefit of the economy. To catch up with the train in motion and, therefore, find a place in the future world which will have “knowledge” as its main resource, Africa must reform, that is, “to transform itself to be in tune with the new possibilities of the economy” [FOKAM; 2016: 20]. As we can see, his project is thus ultimately that of a reorientation of Africa according to an economic requirement, as discussed above, the “knowledge economy” means an entry of “research” co-piloting with the business world, according to the Silicon Valley model. It presupposes both the existence of a university, as a place of research and discovery, the existence of innovation clusters, as a place for transforming discoveries into potentially saleable products, and the existence of enterprises as the place of production of these products.

To place Africa in this perspective, Fokam believes that, at the very least, a reinvention of the Third Millennium “school” and a battle for a challenging “business” in Africa. This “school” will be the one that transmits “knowledge”, but above all, “know-how”. With this in mind, says the author, training must have as its primary objective innovation because, without it, every society withers and dies. To innovate, we must free ourselves from fear, admit that error is formative that fear moves away from innovation” [FOKAM; 2016: 45]. Because today’s main wealth is intangible, there is a need for substantial investment in research. This “business” is the one, where he believes, “four groups of people will come together for a goal which will be to maximise

the creation of wealth for the well-being of everyone: shareholders; workers; the state; customers” [FOKAM; 2016: 134].

#### IV. FOR A CRITIC OF KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY IN THE LIGHT OF THE REVIVAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

To properly establish the interest if not to return totally at least to nuance the outraged criticisms of political economy, as it potentialized a certain economism, the economist Jean-Marie Harribeyre approaches his reading of both political economy and his critic of the interpretation proposed by Karl Polanyi of “la Grande transformation”. He explicits it in Karl Marx's terms: “this transformation is a process of commercialization that sees the power of labour forcing it self to be sold, nature used as material base of capitalist accumulation and currency metamorphosed into silver, into capital that is to say in value in perpetual self-growth” [HARRIBEY; 2008: 101-116:105]. Therefore, HARRIBEY will test the update of these categories at the basis of the political economy critic that is to say, those of “labour”, “value” and “capital”. In fact, the author asks the question of if the latter are not obsolete as long as the “the process of valuing capital is relatively less dependent on work of its classic industrial form and more to knowledge as a decisive factor in the creation of value?HARRIBEY; 2008; 108-109].As far as we are concerned, we hear, in the face of the “geoeconomics”, the effectiveness of the “conflicts of globalization”, at economic and political dominance [DEFRAGES; 1997], articulate the interest of a critic of knowledge economy in the light of a recovery of a forgotten discipline in the globalized economy: “political economy”. How do we figure it?

The problem of the definition of economy was raised among others by Jacques Généreux, notably/especially in *Introduction à l'économie*. On the basis of the evidence that we cannot today, define the purpose of the economic analysis by reference to a topic or a list of concrete topicsbut by reference to its way of conducting its study, the author proposes this simple definition of the economy “Economics studies how individuals or societies use scarce resources to best satisfy their needs” [GÉNÉREUX ; 2001 : 9]. Thus, Généreux explains that, the economy refers above all to a particular mode of consideration of human behaviour, “individuals or groups of individuals act because they have needs to meet/ satisfy and that this is not self-evident in a universe where the means available are limited” [GÉNÉREUX ; 2001 : 9]. In this way, it demonstrates the ubiquitous economic point of view,that any human behaviour can be analysed from an economic angle, meaning is “as the reasoned implementation of means by individuals who seek to achieve their goals” [GÉNÉREUX; 2001: 9]. Beyond the controversies it could provoke, this definition calls us in that it allows little or nothing to exclude any idea of autonomy of the economy. Thus, by reviving the political economy, we mean linking economic issues with political research as the latter are concerned with the “entire destiny of peoples”.

Despite the opposition distinction made by Jean-Paul Betbeze between “industrialized globalization”, around the figure of the United States, and «globalization of emerging countries», around the figure of China [BETBEZE; 2016],we think, with Chatué, that the vast movement of the globalization of economic relations[ CHATUÉ et DJUIDJE CHATUÉ, 2019; pp. 171-184: 180], enjoin to put in priority the economic gains with the needs of the nation, approached as our home, our same home. Maybe we know too much, made up of *oikos* and *nomos* that mean respectively “house” and “Managing, Administering”, economics refers etymologically to the art of well managing a home to manage the property of a person and, by extension, the property of a country.Now, precisely, as Chatué asserts in *Les stratégies du cogitamus*, a country presupposes a territory, which must not only be considered in its relationship with the State,but also, and perhaps most importantly, in its relationship with the nation,heard, far from Johann Gottfried Herder and Ernest Renan, as “political inscription of the culture”[Chatué; 2012]. For this author, in fact, living together requires a “common living territorialized”, which can be promoted through a declaration of the “wealth of the territory” as “common wealth”. On such a basis, the “territory” can and should be experienced not only as “done”, but also as “value” as “emotional value”, “moral value”, “patriotic value” and, all things considered, “war issue”.By living in the “territory” as one lives in a “house”, one feels the need,in the context of a globalized economy, to produce wealth to feed the “home”, first of all.

And *Et sil'Afrique se réveillait?* certainly treats of the economic Africa. Only, is it really the promotion of economic prosperity in Africa or the economic prosperity of Africa. Can Africa not emerge for the benefit of others? As shown by the author of *Épistémologie et transculturalité*, the dynamics of globalization, “which draws inspiration from the GATT agreements”, “to the symbolic of the historical downfall of Berlin's wall, at least as much as at the advent of the digital age”, highlights the interests of the “ultrarich” hidden behind the multinationals. As Oswaldo de Rivero asserted in *Le mythe du développement*, the new international aristocracy made up of multinationals and transnationales,pierce national sovereignties with their goods, services, capitals, technology, telecommunications, credit card, habits of consumption [DE Rivero; 2003: p.56]. In this perspective, its oriented all the production, meaning the production in its objectives, in its mode,and in its actors. That's why we think the knowledge-based economy as a new knowledge-based wealth-generating regime must be criticised in the light of the revival of the political economy, conceived as a correlation of the enrichment

process and type of society nationally and internationally. The term “knowledge economy” could not feed chrematistic. In this way, compared to economy development, that submits to the psychological complex of Stockholm this “new paradigm” appears a qualitative leap under condition: its connection with the endogenous political economy, in the coherence of the spirit of Bandoeng and Lagos, that to say, *in fine*, the idea that Africa must position itself as a strategic entity and consequently, the idea that Africans can develop themselves.

## V. CONCLUSION

The perspectives of development economy and the knowledge economy refer respectively to a volonté of helping the so-called underdeveloped countries, supposedly confronted to the permanent risk of failure, and to a “new paradigm” marked by the re-centering of “knowledge” that is to say by its placement, with the imperative of innovation, at the heart of the production of economic wealth. The development economy, in its mode of reattachment to colonial knowledge, submits the African countries to the psychological complex of Stockholm, because subjugated by science, they feel the need to line up behind those who, deep down, keep them in a logic of dependence. While knowledge economy writes those countries in the wake of competitive productivism because as we know it translates the co-piloting with the world of the company, especially according to the model of the Silicon valley. On this basis, compared to that one, this one seems as a qualitative leap, but under condition of the recovery of political economy, beyond the threat of the guest entering the “global casino” as a development requisite. Because the economic prosperity in Africa does not necessarily imply the economic prosperity of Africa, we think that knowledge economy, wealth production perspective, must be considered in connection with the political economy, perspective of enrichment of the nation, first of all.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Guichaoua, et Y. Goussault, *Sciences sociales et développement*, (Paris, Armand Colin, 1993).
- [2] A. Kabou, *Et si l’Afrique refusait le développement*, (Paris, L’Harmattan, 1993).
- [3] F. Sarr, *Afrotopia*, (Paris, Philippe Rey, 2016).
- [4] G. Rist, *Le développement. Histoire d’une croyance occidentale*, (Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 3<sup>e</sup> édition, 2007).
- [5] J. Brasseul, J., *Introduction à l’économie du développement*, (Paris, Armand Colin, 1989).
- [6] J. Chatué, *Épistémologie et sciences de développement*, (Yaoundé, CLÉ, 2014). - *L’Afrique noire et le biais épistémologique*, (Yaoundé, CLÉ, 2012).
- [7] J. Chatué, et B. Djuidje Chatué, Réflexions philosophico-juridiques sur les alternatives de l’appropriation africaine du droit, *Revue Africaniste Inter-Disciplinaire (RAID)*, 7, 2019, 171-184.
- [8] J. Généreux, *Introduction à l’économie*, (Paris, PUF, 2001).
- [9] J.-M. Éla, *L’Afrique à l’ère du savoir : science, société et pouvoir*, (Paris, L’Harmattan, 2006).
- [10] J.-M. Harribey, Valeur travail, transformations du capitalisme et primat de l’économie : controverses, malentendus et contresens, in I. Sainsaulieu (Ed.), *Par-delà l’économisme. La querelle du primat en sciences sociales*, (Paris, L’Harmattan, 2008) 101-366.
- [11] J.-P. Betbeze, *La guerre des mondialisations*, (Paris, Economica, 2016).
- [12] J.-P. Bouchez, *L’économie du savoir : construction, enjeux et perspectives*, (Bruxelles, De Boeck, 2012).
- [13] O. De Rivero, *Le mythe du développement. Les économies non viables du XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, (Tunis, Cérès Éditions, 2003).
- [14] P. Fokam, *Et si l’Afrique se réveillait ?*, (Yaoundé, Afrédit, 3<sup>ème</sup> Ed., 2016).
- [15] P. M. Defruges, *La mondialisation*, (Paris, PUF, 1997).