

1-1-2014

A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons

David H. Lempert
Independent Scholar

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp>

Recommended Citation

Lempert, David H. (2014) "A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons," *Journal of Economic and Social Policy*: Vol. 16 : Iss. 2 , Article 3.
Available at: <http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp/vol16/iss2/3>

ePublications@SCU is an electronic repository administered by Southern Cross University Library. Its goal is to capture and preserve the intellectual output of Southern Cross University authors and researchers, and to increase visibility and impact through open access to researchers around the world. For further information please contact epubs@scu.edu.au.

A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons

Abstract

In furthering the process of codifying international agreements into a body of international development law and established principles, this article creates an indicator for social scientists, practitioners and the public to use in measuring whether international organisations and governments meet the criteria for *development* that have been established by various international treaties and that are recognised by experts in the field. Though the concept of human and social development presented in international treaties actually reflects diverse dimensions of humanity offered by psychologists (human development potential), anthropologists (cultural adaptation and diversity along non-linear paths), artists and others (expression, co-existence with nature, ideas of beauty, and intellectual discovery), few, if any, today in the development field appear to pay any attention to these broader views. *International development* as defined both by its proponents (mostly economists and technicians) and by its critics (often political interest groups in urban societies) is now largely a linear measure along a ladder, applying a single dimensional measure of productivity and the physical (animal) benefits it can provide. This article re-establishes the international community's comprehensive human vision that has been co-opted.

Keywords

Development, Progress, Colonialism, Globalisation, Humanism

Cover Page Footnote

Thanks to Professor Paul Kingston, head of the Critical Development Studies Department at the University of Toronto, for challenging the author to create a positive and critical definition of development that the field could use to define its goals and shape its curricula.

Introduction

Nearly a decade ago, I worked on a project with the United Nations Development Programme in Vietnam, to restructure one of the country's major ministries, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, with clear missions and functions to which employees could be held accountable. In starting with the basics, I was astonished by the way the ministry had defined rural development. In fact, the rural areas were scheduled for elimination through forced removal of peoples on lands slated for urban industrialisation or agricultural industrialisation in ways that often uprooted entire communities. This is the government's strategy for a modern industrialised society that the World Bank has described as a "development success story" (World Bank, 2013, introduction). It has proceeded rapidly, with the country moving from 20 percent rural in 1990 to 36.5 percent in 2010 and a goal of more than 50 percent urban by 2040 in a plan patterned on other countries (World Bank, 2011). Indeed, this process in Vietnam is little different from the loss of lands and communities that now appear to be underway almost everywhere (United Nations, 2013; Pearce, 2013; Liberti, 2013). Moreover, this approach appears to be wildly heralded by almost every major international donor and development organisation, with their focus on short-term incomes rather than on other measures. Instead of *developing* rural areas to protect and enrich their cultural attributes, environmental harmony, and traditional assets, the approach was to urbanise and eliminate them. *Development* of rural areas and of the peoples and their traditions appeared to have come to mean their elimination or destruction.

Several months later, in contract work subject (rightly or wrongly) to a confidentiality agreement of non-disclosure of publicly funded work for a major European development agency that I can describe as of one of the smallest and richest countries in the world in terms of per capita income, I was tasked to design some development investments for one of Vietnam's provinces. Rather than being *under-developed*, an economic analysis of the province's finances prepared confidentially for the government revealed that the province was actually going bankrupt, having reached declining returns to scale on its nearly-depleted resource base. This comes as no surprise to resource economists who measure assets and rates of productivity where assets are fixed and where technological growth, spurred by technology transfers, quickly reaches its limits (Daly, 2011; Nguyen, 2008; Brown, 2011). The peoples of the province were actually living a standard of life comparable to Europeans before World War II but had used up their natural and infrastructural endowments. The investments I suggested were largely parallel to those the European donor had made in its own communities decades before, with social policy changes to try to make the communities sustainable.

Among the development investments I proposed, along with population and consumption planning, were those to promote individual intellectual activities in the schools in the form of libraries, laboratories, experimental gardens and workshops, as well as cultural parks and historical parks to build tourism, protection and pride. I also sought to address cultural problems of smoking, alcoholism and militarism by dealing with the underlying causes. The donor rejected all of these suggestions and chose, instead, a path that would likely accelerate the country's bankruptcy. The spending they chose to call *development* was to build more roads, schools in the form of warehouses for children but without any actual development of their potential, along with irrigation projects that might temporarily feed the symptoms of poverty but that a standard investment analysis revealed would more quickly sink the community into bankruptcy. None of these was an investment that would address the issues of bankruptcy and each was likely to make things worse. The donor neither addressed the readily available data on how the higher birthrate was leading Vietnamese to migrate across the borders nor recognised that major private investors in the country were using the country's capital to invest in the lands of neighbouring countries while displacing the peoples there, instead of in the areas where bankruptcy was occurring. The *development* path the donor chose was one that would not allow Vietnamese children to compete with their own children and that would not correct any cultural legacies of colonialism and violence nor deal with any of the other issues. That view of *development* was certainly not one that they would apply to their own human children or in their own communities and was clearly not the one that had been taken in their own country in the past.

These are not isolated experiences or limited to Vietnam but represent an approach to *development* that quickly raised the question of what was really meant by the term. Indeed, Vietnam is a country now described by the donor community as a lower middle income country and a development success story on the basis of its per capita annual incomes, despite both its slowly going bankrupt by depleting its assets and its rush to colonise the resources of its smaller neighbours (World Bank, 2013).

These examples, above, are simply among the most emblematic of the ideology that guided the donor community, the international development banks, and the government authorities who worked with them. The view of *development* there and in most of the 30 countries where I have worked in a 30-year career, with some slight differences in Eastern European countries that are being annexed into Europe but with a secondary status, was to view human beings in the developing world as little different than farm animals whose basic needs were to be met and who were set to be domesticated. Indeed, one study of how Vietnam was applying

the international Convention on the Rights of the Child concluded that the approach was simply one that protected children as productive assets in ways that were essentially no different from the vaccination and feeding of livestock (UNICEF, 2003, p. 9). The measures of domestication were relabelled as development.

In the *developed* world today, the kinds of investments made by governments (in prisons, police, military, mass media controls, commercial infrastructure, and human capital developments of workers) also increasingly reflect this narrower view of what constitutes human and what is important to civilisation, humanity and progress.

This is paradoxical, as if the very meaning of the word *development* has somehow come to mean its very opposite. Certainly, the (European) vision of humanity since the 16th Century – the Renaissance and the Enlightenment – includes a much broader and fuller perspective of what constitutes human development as well as of being human rather than any other kind of animal. Moreover, this is a view that has been incorporated in some international rights treaties as well as in a number of the social sciences (including psychology, anthropology, sociology, as well as human biology and ecology) and arts.

The purpose of this article is to reassert the broader view of *human development* and *human* that seems to have disappeared from the development field in both theory and practice, even though that view is easy to find in international treaties and in a liberal arts education in the developed world.

This article, in combining economics and social policy, applies an established methodology from the policy and juridical sciences for regulating human activities and promoting long-term human goals. That method is to codify principles on the basis of their elements using laws as the data of public consensus. The approach is then to use these codifications to examine and promote compliance with the law. In the area of development there is now an emerging body of international laws and treaties that reflect a universal consensus on certain basic human aspirations, but they have yet to be codified in ways that can be used to screen activities for compliance. Like other basic legal principles that underline economic activities in a social context, such as contract laws, laws on development can also be codified.

Previously, this author has offered several indicators to measure whether international donors are meeting their obligations in international law and to professional standards in several of the most basic areas of development like

sustainability, sovereignty/ freedom from dependency, democracy, gender equity, poverty alleviation, and evaluations, as part of an effort to establish accountability where little or none exists. This article starts with something even more basic in the core of international aid itself; the very definition of development that is at the heart of international agreements and the basic concept of civilisation.

The piece begins with different definitions and tensions in the definitions on *development* and shows how there is already a consensus to resolve them that the international community has offered in rights treaties, backed by work in various disciplines. In codifying the consensus in the international legal agreements, this article offers an indicator for screening activities that are defined as development where no such indicator currently exists. In applying this indicator to existing activities, it becomes clear that the meaning of *development* has been politically and ideologically twisted and the international standard has become co-opted by short-term agendas. The piece then offers some thoughts on returning to the international standard.

Tension between two competing approaches in definitions and concepts of development that can be resolved by the clear principles and consensus of international treaties

In the popular usage of the word *development*, current definitions are either vague or contradictory and differ from the much clearer view that the international community has established in its treaties.

Development in Popular Usage:

What seems to have happened with the term *development* is that different disciplines define it in different ways according to how change occurs within their subject of study. This has led to competing approaches: one that is linear (uni-directional), (largely in science and technology), and one that is pluralistic and varied with infinite permutations (largely in social sciences and humanities). While the one that should apply to human societies and individuals should be the one coming out of social sciences and humanities, through international (legal) agreements, there do not seem to have been attempts to resolve the confusion and to assure that the appropriate definition is applied.

A standard definition for *development* contains reference to *growing* and *progress* that are also left vague, such as in this one, that is also self-referential, from Harper Collins (2009):

Development: the act or process of growing, progressing or developing.

Unless there is also an agreement on *progress* and on an appropriate process of growing, there is no way to know what this word really means. By this definition, even industrial countries should be classified as *developing* if they are pursuing *progress* and investing in *economic growth*, while agrarian or hunting societies might be those called *developed* since they had already reached a steady state.

Some authors have tried to deconstruct the term (Rist, 2002) and have added other attributes such as the concept of unfolding through different stages, seemingly using a biological view of embryology and maturation. But that view is also open to contradiction. Individual organisms reach maturity on a set path but species evolve only on random paths. So is *development* linear (uni-directional) or pluralistic and adaptive?

Though many critical development scholars argue that *development* does nothing more than to hide agendas of hegemony or dependency (Gunder Frank, 1972; Wallerstein, 1979) that they sometimes blame on what they call *capitalism* (Baran and Sweezy, 1968) rather than just *empire* of multiple forms, there are legitimate disagreements between academic disciplines over the term *development*. These disagreements can extend into social planning.

In the natural sciences, *progress* is largely a linear (uni-directional) process of discovery and revealing of natural laws that can then be applied in technologies. Though technological *progress* does not have to be linear, different advanced technologies do require previous technologies.

By contrast human creative expression, cultural adaptation and evolution are NOT linear processes (Sahlins, 1960). They follow rules but evoke multiple rich and diverse patterns.

One can reinvent the wheel because technological development is largely linear (uni-directional) in revealing and applying natural laws but one can't reinvent Beethoven or the Beatles because the *development* of music doesn't follow the same linear path. One can promote the conditions that *developed* Beethoven or the Beatles and music and that *develops* scientific inquiry as part of the unfolding of the human potential for intellect and creativity.

This conflict is what underlies some of the confusion today as to what constitutes *development*. There is also a legitimate reason for this. On the one hand, long-term human survival does require the achievement of more advanced science and technology. Life in our solar system has a finite existence. Prolonging human life and other life from earth ultimately requires technologies for leaving earth. At the same time, our current existence on earth and its richness is not entirely dependent on technologies and is often threatened by new technologies. Our ability to survive has been based, like that of other organisms, on the ability to adapt in multiple forms. So, we have a tension between the need to advance technologies while also assuring pluralist diversity and adaptation. It means we need to have a definition of *development* that assures both.

Doing that means we need to assure that some societies, that value scientific advance and technological change, promote the individual diversity and accessibility of resources and scientific tools to advance science. At the same time, we also need to assure that other societies are fully protected in their ability to maintain their diverse adaptations and to maintain themselves as communities integrated to their environments.

In fact, the international community has addressed this tension. It has incorporated it into international treaties that were designed to maintain this long-term human vision and to prevent humanity from moving towards either extreme – the destruction of diversity of cultures and their right to independent existence without entering a single global system with a single standard of values, on the one hand; versus the destruction (including the self-destruction) or repression of industrial societies and their ability to promote individual human diversity and opportunity so as to advance scientific and technological experimentation for long term exploration and humanistic goals rather than to impose conformity and inequality, on the other.

Treaties sought to encapsulate the understandings and lessons from the failures of industrial societies in World War II-era Europe and Depression-era Europe, along with understandings of limitations of the planet's environment and the value of diversity of all of its forms.

The international treaty consensus on development

There is no single international declaration defining development, probably because the definition consists of several different elements that have been the

focus of specific agreements. However, it is possible to construct such a definition using the basic international agreements:

- the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* written at the founding of the United Nations in 1948 and that has been the basis of several other agreements, along with
- treaties that seek to define the aspirations for development of the individual (the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC) that is almost universally adopted and builds on previous agreements (1989)) and
- treaties that define aspirations for development of cultures/communities and that are based on the *Genocide Convention* that was also signed in 1948, as one of the basics of international law. Though still relatively recent and not universally accepted in today's political climate, the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP) (2007) is an elaboration of the Genocide Convention in ways that suggest what it means to fully develop communities/cultures. Though the UNDRIP is written to protect *Indigenous peoples* it embodies the principles of cultural and community vitality for all human groups.

Among many other international treaties and agreements, these three reflect the core principles of the international system. All three use the word *development* in ways that apply it to individuals and to groups. Other treaties, including the basic rights treaties – the international covenants on civil and economic rights (1966), and on economic, social and cultural rights (1966) – as well as the Rio Declaration (the Conference on Environment and Development) (1992), reiterate and flesh out what is mentioned in these basic documents.

The beauty of looking at these treaties together is that they offer a general view of development by contrasting it with what it is not, as well as enumerate several elements that constitute development. After reviewing the general definition, we can then list and organise the different elements to present what is the international vision for development in a way that *codifies* it.

This methodology for extracting the basic principles from the body of treaties is one regularly used by lawyers and judges when trying to find the precepts underlying laws and is referred to as *statutory analysis*. Though bodies drafting laws do not always fully define the theories and principles that they use when they reach a consensus and draft a law or a group of laws, legal scholars and judges routinely use laws to reconstruct the underlying principles (Cross, 1995; Beninion, 2009; Sutherland, 2010). In fact, it is similar to what social scientists also do in *deconstructing* texts to find the guiding logic underlying them. The

empirical *data* used to explore human behavior and draw conclusions comes from the written texts, themselves. That method can be applied here.

General View: In general, what we find constantly reiterated in treaties, and in direct opposition to contemporary uses of development, even by most international agencies (including the United Nations agencies) is that *development is about all of these other human aspirations and characteristics that are specifically human*. At the heart of the international treaties is the view is that *development is not about meeting basic human/animal needs*. It is about the full realisation of the human potential. It is about unleashing the full potential of human beings and humanity; something at completely the other end of the spectrum of thinking from the basics of security, food, clothing, shelter, basic health, nutrition and simple functional education or skills. It is not about what has been termed *basic needs* (Streeten, 1981) and, if anything, requires sustainability (and security) as its pre-requisites, meaning that *sustainable development is also not development unless it satisfies long-term cultural/community sustainability, first, and then adds development*.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights notes this set of higher human aspirations before linking them to the term *development*. It aims at “a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set form in [the] Declaration can be fully realised” (Article 28, 1948) as “a common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations”. The international community recognises “the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people” (Preamble).

The first mention of *development* of this Declaration is in Article 22 and the wording is interesting. It is used in connection with *personality* (individuality) linked with these rights and freedoms. It is entirely distinct from economic satisfactions, which is simply a prerequisite to development:

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realisation, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organisation and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and *the free development of his personality* (italics added).

This is reiterated again in Article 26 when *development* is mentioned a second time and again in terms of the “full development of the human personality” (in ways enumerated below).

The Convention on the Rights of the Child reinforces the use of the term: development some four decades later, making it clear that there was no mistake on the intent. The Preamble begins again with the focus on *development* in connection with *personality* and not just basic needs, noting that each child for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality, should grow up in a family environment, in an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding.

Article 6 notes that the Convention obliges State parties to “ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival *and* development of the child” (italics added). Survival (basic needs) is clearly differentiated from development. Article 18 makes it clear again that the basics of “upbringing” (i.e., food, clothing, shelter, security, health care, nutrition) are also not development, noting that parents and legal guardians have the primary responsibility for two different tasks; “the upbringing *and* the development of the child” (italics added).

The CRC, Article 27, starts to enumerate the attributes of *development* (in five separate categories) and again notes that basic needs are only as a pre-requisite for such development but NOT development, in themselves.

1. States Parties recognise the right of every child to a standard of living adequate for the child's *physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development*. (italics added)

Also, Article 23 of the CRC adds a sixth category of development that opens the link to the Genocide Convention and other treaties for cultural and community protection. It adds the category of “cultural development” as essential for a child’s “individual development”. This idea of cultural protection is also stressed in the CRC preamble, noting the need for “due account of the importance of the traditions and cultural values of each people for the protection and harmonious development of the child.”

While individual *personality* and creative diversity is stressed in the CRC, including science and creativity, the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples stresses the importance of parallel advancement at the level of cultures/communities. As with individual *personality*, the UNDRIP sees cultures as having their own individuality that *develops* in a diversity of forms rather than

along a linear path of production, consumption or technology. The Preamble affirms that:

all doctrines, policies and practices based on or advocating superiority of peoples or individuals on the basis of national origin or racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust, [and establishing] their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests.

The idea of *cultural development* is not only one of the attributes of individual personality development but a parallel category of *development* that is also recognised by the international community, dating back to the Genocide Convention. The UNDRIP Preamble notes clearly that individual cultures have “the right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests”. Moreover, “all peoples contribute to the diversity and richness of civilisations and cultures, which constitute the common heritage of humankind”. The Declaration of the Rights of the Person also notes that “Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits” (Article 27). These rights are recognised in the UNDRIP as “collective rights which are indispensable for their existence, well-being and integral development as peoples” (Preamble).

The UNDRIP Preamble describes cultures/communities as *developing* along three dimensions, noting that they have the right to “freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development,” as part of a right to “self-determination of all peoples”. The *economic development* choice assumes free choice of science, technology and consumption patterns. Moreover, economic productivity is distinguished in the Preamble from the “sustainable and equitable development” that are part of indigenous knowledge, cultures, and traditional practices.

The Specific Areas of “Human” Attributes to be Developed: As noted above, these international agreements not only offer a guiding philosophy of what *development* is and isn’t, but they also note and elaborate different areas that constitute both individual development and culture/community development, within the contexts of society and at the global level. Though there is no perfect way to specify an exact list of areas or levels that constitute development, we can use these treaties to construct a rough list as well as to note that there is no such thing as a hierarchy or sequence of the categories. They are all to be taken together as part of an integrated concept of development that requires attention to all of them at once.

What we have, overall, are four different categories or levels of *development* with a total of 13 concerns.

- At the level of the *individual (personality)*, the treaties refer to five *development* objectives plus *culture* (that links these to the level of culture/community);
- At the level of *society*, the treaties are clear on how societies themselves must develop in order to meet the needs for full individual/personal development. These are understandings and rights that promote individual *development*, which can probably be placed in three categories of equity, political rights, and peace/tolerance.
- At the level of *cultures/communities*, there is one fundamental prerequisite; sustainability.
- At the *global* level, three areas of political, economic and social development probably overlap with the ideas of individual development but can also be seen as essential to the development of cultures/communities. Development of social equity, political rights and peace/tolerance, are essential at the global level for assuring development among and between cultures.

Note, again, that the international community recognises *development* by focusing on human beings and the levels of human organisation. *Productivity* development or *economic development* do not fit into the fundamental development principles of the international community because they would at best only be a means to an ends but are not the ends, themselves. Within the principles of the international community, *economic development* or *productivity development* might be oxymoronic. If proven to be a means to achieving development objectives, productivity or economics *might* be relevant to development but nothing in the fundamental precepts of development suggests that it is.

Individual/Personal Development Objectives: The CRC identifies five areas of *personality development* that it mentions together -- *physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development* (in Article 27) – and a sixth – *cultural development* (Article 23). One can see these as one’s body, one’s mind, the physical world, relation to individuals, relation to the community, and relation to one’s culture as all specific parts of being human. Other articles help flesh out what these are (Articles 18, 29, 31 and others) as follows:

1. *Physical (body) development:* Recreation and leisure are mentioned and the idea here is likely that of developing one’s physical abilities as part of health, confidence and awareness as well as one’s cultural expressions and

economic and social activities that rely on body expression. There is also attention to helping the disabled achieve their full potential.

2. *Mental development*: Both intellectual/mental abilities and also mental health are mentioned using terms and clauses like *psychological treatment*, *responsible life in a free society*, and *rest, leisure and recreational activities*. Added separately, though certainly part of mental attributes, is science. The CRC stresses “facilitating access to scientific and technical knowledge and modern teaching methods” (Article 28). “Talents are listed separately in Article 29” and may include things like scientific ability or creative arts, that really are also “mental” abilities. Note that mental development is very different from basic education or just job training. It is an expression of unique abilities of each individual.
3. *Spiritual (appreciation of natural world) development*: The only specific types of spiritual development that are mentioned are “respect for the natural environment” (biophilia and stewardship of biodiversity of ecosystems), religious freedom and the value of peace and tolerance, that could be said to be spiritual. The UNDRIP notes that “Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard”. (Article 25) which also suggests that spirituality is a love of nature and appreciation of non-human attributes of the world. This appreciation is different than just protecting or living with the environment. It implies respect, responsibility and understanding.
4. *Moral (appreciation of others as individuals) development*: of respect for rights and fundamental freedoms”; “respect for civilisations other than his own”/”understanding, peace, tolerance”. This is different from obedience to laws or rules. It implies empathy and responsibility as well as long-term responsibility to future generations and the unborn and to humanity.
5. *Social (appreciation of community) development*: In this category, the CRC mentions “respect for parents, cultural identity, language and values”. Here, again, the word “respect” implies understanding and appreciation of how social institutions were formed and chosen, how they are shaped and by what standards they are valued. They are neither to be obeyed nor replaced at the subject of any authority (governmental or international agent or outside influence). Moreover, there is no mention here of respect for the State or political hierarchy or power, or to material wealth or consumption. Identity and values are above these.
6. *Cultural (appreciation of one’s identity) development*: Cultural development can be seen as an extension of “social development” beyond

family and social institutions and to include all attributes of culture and pride in one's culture. The CRC sees development here as the ability to "participate fully in cultural and artistic life" (Article 31). The UNDRIP expands on this to include "the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature" (Article 11) as well as economic and political practices and skills that are beyond "social" and artistic or religious. Pride and understanding should include the ability to enrich culture and to promote its strengths and ability to be sustainable, without wishing to discard, abandon, neglect, debase or replace it.

Societal Level *Development Objectives*: While it is difficult to separate out the specific means to achieving individual personality development to their fullest, the different treaties stress several prerequisites that can be grouped into three areas: *social equity/equal opportunity*, *political equity*, and *peace/tolerance* that promote individual freedoms and expressions. These are both in the basic treaties and also elaborated in specific international rights conventions. While they are means to attaining the above, they can also be considered development objectives in themselves at the societal level.

1. *Social equity/ "Social progress"/Equal opportunity*: The Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights calls for "social progress" and equity is mentioned elsewhere as a goal. It is an essential to the promotion of individual human development to the fullest. Creating it requires not just finding short term income generation strategies for *the poor* or *empowering* them but also convincing *the haves* of their long-term interests in solidarity with others as part of a common advancing humanitarian future.
2. *Political equity/ "Equal rights"*: The CRC Preamble stresses that "the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world". The idea here is that political equality is also an essential to full access to resources for the highest attainment of individual potential. The CRC articles stress different political rights such as free expression of views (Articles 12 and 13) and "freedom of thought, conscience and religion" (Article 14) while the Declaration of the Rights of the Person underlines the importance of "freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear" (Preamble) as the basic building block of development of the post-war future, along with attention to human "dignity" (Article 22). Like social equity, creating it requires changing the mindset of those with

power and building institutions that protect and advance an understanding that diversity and empathy are part of linked survival concerns for societies and humanity.

3. *Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarisation*: Though ridiculed today, the CRC states very clearly that the prerequisite for human development is “an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding” (Preamble). The UNDRIP phrases it more practically in terms of “demilitarisation of the lands and territories of indigenous peoples” as the key “to peace, economic and social progress” (Preamble). In describing how personal development was to occur, the Declaration of the Rights of the Person notes that “Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace” (Article 26, 2)). Certainly, “de-colonialisation” of hegemonic structures in formal colonial regimes and elimination of pressures by superpowers on smaller countries is envisioned as the key to this goal everywhere, not merely in education of the weakest to accept the reality of their subordination and inferior position. The goal here is not to simply reduce conflicts, through homogenisation or acceptance of inferiority, but to create mechanisms that protect diversity and negotiation of that diversity with recognition of the importance of such diversity to human survival. Countries now increasingly do link “security” with development and most international *development* activities of nation states are now linked with their foreign affairs departments, so the linkages with de-militarisation and peace are not that far afield.

Cultural/Community Development Objective: There is no further explanation of what cultures require to develop, but the overall right of cultural development is recognised as based on a fundamental principle: *sustainability of cultures* in their environments.

Sustainability/(sovereignty): Before a culture or community can consider *developing*, it must be assured that its basic existence as a sovereign culture is guaranteed. Though the international system does not yet recognise the specific sovereignty of cultures that are not nation states, the Genocide Convention and the Rio Declaration (1992) do recognise the prerequisites of sustainability.

Global Development Objectives: There are certain prerequisites for cultural development that are also parallel to and in addition to those of individual personality development, but at the global level rather than the societal level. These are: *social equity of cultures*, *political equity of cultures*, and the requirement of *peace/tolerance* to protect diversity, integrity and freedom of cultures to develop. As with means/objectives for individual *development*, achievement of these objectives also requires understanding and change in powerful cultures as part of a recognition of what is required for long-term human progress and survival, and not simply signing of declarations or attendance at workshops as signs of pretended *goodwill*. These are measured by actions and results in stemming cultural endangerment and disappearance, not by intent (Lempert, 2010; Lempert and Nguyen, 2011).

1. *Social equity/ Social progress/Equal opportunity:* The international recognition of social equity when applied to cultures is not a call for equal consumption and production patterns in a homogeneous world system since that would contradict the treaties. It is the recognition of equal opportunity of peoples to live and function comfortably and sustainably within their environments without pressures from others that would take away those economic bases and resource basis of their equal opportunity to survive as cultures.
2. *Political equity/ Equal rights:* If political rights are essential at the individual level for personality development, they are also essential at the level of cultures in order to protect their right to development. The UNDRIP begins to recognise these rights as already implied by other treaties even though they are not specifically recognised by the nation states that effectively control the international system.
3. *Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarisation:* The UNDRIP makes it clear that cultures also require demilitarisation and an end to hegemonic pressures if they are truly to be free to *develop*. Recent studies also demonstrate the importance of this linkage (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011). By not recognising it, governments now conducting *development* activities through their foreign ministries may be acting at cross purposes.

Note, once again, that this list of 13 development attributes is not hierarchical. UNICEF claims that all of the parts of human development are holistic and must all be taken together.

How the international consensus on *development* is backed by different social science theories

While there are critiques of the international view of *development* as coming out of European enlightenment or colonial thought in the way that the world system of nation-states is also a European construct, the definitions of *development* found in international documents are reflected in some core social science that is probably less subject to cultural or political ideology.

Certainly, the ideals of individual personality development that are found in international rights treaties can also be found in texts of the European *Enlightenment* such as Voltaire's ideal of progress, science and reason (Voltaire, 1901 [1760s]) and Rousseau's *Treatise on Education* (1762). In Ancient Greece and Rome, there was already an ideal of a *liberal arts* education that included the development of the body, science and practical skills and crafts, appreciation of nature, arts (music, literature, philosophy), civics and ethics, that parallel the list found in the CRC (Foucault, 1986).

Social science studies of human processes of learning and maturation in psychology and education have confirmed the natural processes of human *development* when offered various opportunities. The basis of early psychology was the development of the *personality*; establishing its components and the fundamentals to promote it (Jung, 1970; von Humbolt, 1854). Abraham Maslow originally postulated a *hierarchy* of needs starting with basic, physiological needs and safety and then rising to include love/belonging, esteem and self-actualisation (morality, spirituality, problem solving/mental abilities) (1943) but more recent scholars have found that development is holistic and not several areas need to be promoted in an integrated way. More recent work, like that of Gardner on *multiple intelligences* has defined bodily kinesthetic (physical), linguistic and mathematical logic (mental), intrapersonal and interpersonal (moral), and musical abilities that can be analogised to multiple areas of *development* (1993).

Anthropology and other social sciences have provided the basis for understanding cultural development and for the relation between certain kinds of rights and opportunity for individual and cultural development. Much of this also comes out of the basis of political philosophy in examining systems of governance and principles of symmetry/equality (Locke, 1629; Rousseau, 1762; Brutus, 1787).

Despite the relationship of these disciplines to the international standards, if you search for a social scientific definition of *international development* that links social science to the international standards, you are likely to come up empty

handed. On the internet, searches almost immediately lead instead to *economic development* as if these other fields have abandoned (or lost) their role and economics, which includes little or no study of cultural sustainability or human expression beyond consumption, has usurped the role.

Only recently have economists, like Amartya Sen, begun to look again for a bridge to these other disciplines, in establishing the goal of *development* not as productive growth but as encompassing a concept of *freedom* in multiple dimensions (Sen, 2001).

Indicators in the field and the lack of an indicator to screen *development* interventions

Given that one can find a relatively clear list of the elements that constitute *development*, as noted above, one would think that there would also be specific indicators that incorporate these into measures of compliance and success of *development* interventions with international standards. Yet, not only do such indicators not exist, but the *human development indicator* that the United Nations system itself uses, disregards the treaties!

The major measure of development that is now used internationally is the Human Development Index (HDI) developed by Amartya Sen and Mahbubul Haq in 1990 (UNDP, Belize website and World Bank website). UNDP describes it as based on factors of sustainability, security, equity, political empowerment and cooperation, which would all fit the elements of *development*, along with a sixth factor, productivity, which doesn't. The authors describe their approach as that of *people centered policies*. But if you look at the index itself, the actual measures are really those of productivity without cultural or individual diversity or development at all. They are: life expectancy, formal State schooling/literacy and average per capita incomes. Moreover, the index ranks countries, in violation of the basic principles of non-discrimination and support for diverse consumption choices that are established in international treaties. This index is NOT a development index according to the international agreements. Instead, it would be more correctly termed, the *Human Domestication (Achievement) Index* because it is measuring the levels reached by cultures that domesticate human beings rather than *develop* them.

In fact, there does not appear to be any organisation or scholarly work holding *development* organisations to the international standards. There isn't yet any *donor monitor* beyond certain groups like the Bank Information Center in the U.S.

and Bank Watch in Central and Eastern Europe or Government Accountability Project (Lempert, 2008). Nor is there any binding or professionally certified or endorsed ethics code that would shame professionals working in such organisations from making claims about what they do that have no relation to international agreements or standards (Lempert, 1998).

Several previous articles by this author presented indicators to measure compliance of development actors with international law and treaties and documented these basic principles and the links to development where none existed, in related areas that are prerequisites and means/objectives of development such as sustainability (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008), sovereignty/self-determination of cultures/communities (Lempert, 2009), and principles of individual and cultural rights that are endorsed by the international community and also supposed to be followed in *development* interventions (Lempert, 2011). No one else appears to be doing such screening.

Here, this author adds *development*, itself, as an internationally-agreed category for which there is no existing screening indicator or device and for which one is invented here for the first time and presented, below.

The indicator of *development* that can measure adherence to recognised professional standards of the field

To make it easier for organisations and contributors to tell the difference between *development* and other approaches in the name of development, it is easy to transform the elements of development into an indicator with three categories and the full list of 13 elements that the international community has determined comprise development. Even non-experts can quickly use this tool as a litmus test of development.

By simply asking whether a *development* organisation or initiative meets the test of satisfying the international community's list of elements for *development* using *Yes or No* questions and then counting up the results, one can determine the relative compliance with development objectives by the following scale:

Scale:

ALL 13 points	True Human Development in line with the essential International Conventions that are the aspirations for humanity
6.5 – 12.5 points	Strong, progressive attempt to meet the aspirations

3-6 points	of humanity Partial Solution that may endanger individuals or cultures
0 - 3 points	Something other than development under the name of development

Note that this indicator is not designed to distinguish the category of *relief* organisations (that legitimately offer assistance to restore a system that has suffered a disaster, with support for basic needs and, if done correctly, support to re-establish a previous system) from others that do not do *development*. However, many forms of *development* assistance that are little more than *charity* with no attempt to rebalance or improve a system to become sustainable or to reach its own chosen sustainable potential can be unmasked by this test.

At the same time, certain interventions or inputs not necessarily defined today as *development* may meet the test of *development* more effectively than those using this label.

Measures/ Sub-Factors: The scoring is the same for each element and one can refer back to the descriptions of the elements above, for reference. Most of the questions are clear cut Yes (1 point) or No (0 points), but in cases where there is a judgment call, you can opt for a “Debatable” (0.5 points). Use the following for each element.

Scoring for each area:

- Yes, there is an intervention to promote this aspect or it was considered and no intervention is needed now to reach full potential – 1
- Debated (or partial, for different groups) - 0.5
- No - 0

I. Individual/Personal Development Objectives: Is there a focus, in an holistic approach, that goes beyond “basic needs” and beyond the assured sustainability of the cultures/communities in which individuals are members, to achieving the following for individual “personality” development (6 objectives),?

Question/Element 1. *Physical (body) development*

Question/Element 2. *Mental development*

Question/Element 3. *Spiritual (appreciation of natural world) development*

Question/Element 4. *Moral (appreciation of others as individuals) development*

Question/Element 5. *Social (appreciation of community) development*

Question/Element 6. *Cultural (appreciation of one’s identity) development*

II. Societal Development Objectives: Does the society offer the three prerequisites to assure individual “personality” development in ways that will be sustained and institutionalised over the long-term, for the flourishing of individualism, diversity and creativity and the celebration of what is distinctly human (3 objectives)?

Question/Element 7. *Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity for individuals*

Question/Element 8. *Political equity/ Equal rights for individuals*

Question/Element 9. *Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarisation for individuals*

III. Cultural/ Community Development Objective: Is there a focus on promoting cultural sustainability and sovereignty (1 objective)?

Question/Element 10. *Sustainability/ (sovereignty) of cultures*

IV. Global Development Objectives: Is there a focus, in an holistic approach at the global level, to achieving individual community/cultural development in ways that will be sustained and institutionalised over the long-term, for the flourishing of cultural diversity, adaptability, choice, and creativity and the celebration of what is distinctly human (3 objectives)?

Question/Element 11. *Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity of cultures*

Question/Element 12. *Political equity/ Equal rights for cultures*

Question/Element 13. *Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarisation for protection of cultures*

How Some Organisations Do

After understanding how the test works, it is easy to apply to every new case in just a few minutes and with close agreement among anyone using it. From the results, it is also easy to see that few, if any, organisations that claim they are doing international *development*, including the United Nations itself (!) score more than zero points! There are organisations that do *development* but they are

mostly foundations in industrialised countries that are working to build communities in the so-called *developed* world (a world that is actually still being developed) or organisations that do not have the word *development* in their missions. ***In the international context, every development agency, every development bank, and even the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) appear to have discarded internationally-agreed standards and replaced them with something more akin to animal rearing and basic needs that will never achieve development.*** It is easy to see this simply by analysing the MDGs, which have become the common agenda of most international donor organisations as well as international development banks.

One can look directly at the current agenda of the United Nations in the Millennium Development Goals and see how the U.N., itself, refuses even to comply with its mandate on promoting the full spectrum of *development* as established in its core treaties.

- **The United Nations' Millennium *Development* Goals (MDGs) [Italics added], Creating a Global Approach that Undermines the United Nations' Standards**

While we can score the U.N. system's MDGs using the 13 questions of the indicator, we can also use the indicator in reverse; listing the specific activities/goals that are now part of the consensus of the global powers in their interventions in weaker cultures and communities, and ask whether any of them fit with the 13 objectives outlined in international basic treaties. Table 1, below lists the MDGs on the left hand column and then analyses each of them to see whether any of the goals meets the international definition of *development* (UN Millennium Declaration, 2000). The analysis suggests that none of them does. The MDGs have essentially hijacked the U.N. system's *development* agenda.

Table 1: Analysis of Whether the Millennium Development Goals Meet the International Definition of Development

<i>Millennium Development Goal and Measures</i>	<i>Does it Meet the Definition of Development in its Universal Application?</i>
1. End Poverty and Hunger, including increasing the share of the lowest 25 percent	No. In industrial economies, the answer is yes for the equity goal, but in universal application it is more often used to change production and consumption patterns of traditional cultures or to treat poverty symptoms rather than to assure cultural sustainability.
2. Offer Universal Education (at the primary school level)	No. This level of education is not aimed at increasing individual or community potential or protecting cultural/traditional education. It is to promote State education and socialisation and too often to erase local culture and pride.
3. Gender Equality	No. In industrial economies, the answer is yes, but in universal application it is more often to disrupt local cultures and prepare females for factory and office labour rather than to achieve real equality through demilitarisation.
4. Child Health (reduce infant mortality)	No. Health intervention is a basic need that could just as well be applied to protect livestock.
5. Maternal Health	No. Health intervention is a basic need that could just as well be applied to protect livestock.
6. Combat HIV/AIDS	No. Disease prevention is a basic need that could just as well be applied to protect livestock.
7. Environmental Sustainability: species protection, lowering of ozone and CO ₂ levels.	No. By transforming the environment into just another item on a checklist rather than part of the overall sustainable development equation for every country and culture (balancing consumption with production in an environment), the approach is to manage harm not to <i>develop</i> the relationship between humans and nature.
8. Global Partnership: rule-based trade and finance, sustainable debts	No. This is just harmonisation of the global system.
Total	0. The first and third goals do promote development in industrial countries but that is not the target for these interventions.

If we deconstruct, decode, and demystify what the UN now calls *development* we find that it is really a basic needs approach. It likely “postpones” poverty by treating symptoms rather than repairing systems that are unsustainable and that continue to generate poverty. It seems that the focus on symptoms is an indicator that the real intention is to maintain poverty in the places where interventions

occur, with the donors co-dependent on maintaining such poverty. The MDGs would more correctly be termed, the *Millennium Poverty Postponement Goals* or *Millennium Short-Term Basic Needs Goals*. Since there is no use here of the sustainable development formula (Lempert, Nguyen, 2008), these are also not *Sustainable Development Goals*.

The idea that *development* needs to focus first on the most basic needs of the poorest of the poor whose survival is threatened, and that after addressing this priority one can move towards other kinds of support may sound sympathetic and logical. But that is in fact a sham, long exposed by the international community itself. It is in direct violation of the international agreements on *development* and for good reason. Treating symptoms does not address the root causes of poverty and does not move peoples up towards the next level. Nor does it relieve them of their difficulties such that they are then free to concentrate on their individual and cultural development. In fact, it does the opposite and a *deep structure* analysis of the benefits and costs in the global system suggests that it may be designed to do so, either deliberately or subconsciously. Treating basic needs works to postpone and continue poverty at higher levels in future generations because it does not provide a sustainable solution to stabilise populations and consumption. Moreover, the solutions that are offered for meeting basic needs are exactly those that undermine cultural diversity and individual diversity because they work to homogenise populations. Although the U.N. system declares that it promotes *sustainable human development* as defined by *increased choices*, the reality is that it works to diminish cultural diversity and individual diversity within countries in its application of the MDGs and current policies (Lempert, 2009, 2010, 2011; Lempert and Nguyen, 2011). The increased *choices* it seems to focus on are product choices as well as the choice to abandon their cultures and become part of the global system. This is in violation of the U.N.'s own treaty agreements and core principles for the long-term protection of humanity. As growing populations and urbanisation undermine cultures and the environment, there is no way to suddenly recreate the cultural diversity and adaptability that was lost, to recreate the environments that have been compromised, or to offer healthy environments for personality development and freedoms. The integrated approach to development, with 13 elements had a rational logic to it that the MDG approach destroys.

- **The failed *development* approach of the U.N.'s MDGs seems to be reflected throughout the development community**

Several other studies have offered the data to confirm these results and the missions of most *development* organisations confirm that what goes on in the

name of *development* today fails to follow the international agreements. International organisations do not even comply with their own treaties for defining development.

In defining *official development assistance* (ODA) which is the guiding measure used by the international community, the OECD clearly defines *development* only in its economic dimension. Its standard of what constitutes ODA is the “promotion of the economic development and welfare” of “developing countries” (OECD, 2008, page 1).

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), for example, was founded in 1968 with the mission “to help people living in poverty”; a mission quite different from the international treaty consensus on *development*. Its Development for Results, 2010-11 (CIDA, 2010) agenda is simply “increasing food security, stimulating sustainable economic growth, and basic education for youth” to meet animal needs. It notes the “key development challenge” as “the Millennium Development Goals including lack of access to nutritious food, safe drinking water, adequate health care, and basic education” which are all basic animal needs. The G8 development considerations that it promotes are: “international assistance, economic development, health, food security and peace and security” with peace and security not defined in terms of demilitarising the countries that are the major threats to actual development (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011).

One finds the very same agenda in the so-called *development* banks. Their missions, simply, are not *development* as defined by the international treaty standard.

- The agenda of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development is to “foster transition to market economies” not fulfillment of any of the principles of *development* (EBRD, 2014).
- The Inter-American Development Bank’s agenda is “to reduce poverty and inequality” but its definition of inequality does not meet those contained in treaties for protection of cultures and their choices or for real political equality and economic opportunity (IADB, 2014).
- The Asian Development Bank cites its mission as “an Asia and Pacific free from poverty” with only “essential goods, services, assets and opportunities” (ADB, 2014).
- The World Bank, similarly, defines its *development* mission as to “help reduce poverty” (World Bank, 2014).

These organisations are not doing *development* in ways that meet the international definition. They are doing production engineering and as many argue, (neo-colonial) investing in ways that undermine cultural and individual diversity in the places where they work.

Indeed, in the area of cultural protections, UNESCO itself recognises that the international community is not meeting its obligation to protect cultures. If languages are a good proxy for culture, then about 90 percent of the world's cultures will have disappeared by the end of the 21st century as 97 percent of the world's people converge to about 4 percent of the world's languages and their cultures. The current number of cultures, using language as the measure of distinct cultures, is now down to 6,000 from some 15,000 (Krauss, 1992). In fact, the situation for culture is probably more alarming than for languages. Many cultures are retaining their languages but globalising in ways that disrupt or destroy their culture. In 1992, UNESCO already defined 60-70 percent i.e. 3500 to 4000, of all the languages of the world as "endangered" given that children whose parents spoke the language were no longer using it (UNESCO, 2003).

Even in countries where incomes have risen, life expectancy is increased, and a larger percentage of people are able to meet their basic needs as a result of industrialisation, studies consistently question whether individual human *development* or cultural *development* are being promoted or eroded as people fit the machinery and needs of industrialisation.

Economists take it as a given that the meeting of basic needs has freed individuals and the remaining non-endangered industrialised cultures to *develop*, but data suggests otherwise. A recent study in the U.S., for example, showed that "leisure per capita" had not changed since 1900 and that John Maynard Keynes' predictions on increased leisure, freeing humans from the alienation of the workplace and opening up creativity, expression, and differentiation, could not be confirmed (Ramey and Francis, 2006). Simply meeting basic human needs or targeting *growth* does not achieve all of the other objectives of *development* that in fact may be suppressed or lost if they are not the focus. Indeed, economic anthropologists have long used their comparative studies of leisure to make the same argument, dating back to Marshall Sahlins' depiction of societies not forced into the current *economic development* model as the 'original affluent societies' with more leisure and ability to *develop* than peoples today (Sahlins, 1972). Environmental economists are now increasingly making the same argument (Ehrlich and Ehrlich, 1996).

- **Who meets the international standards for development?**

If major *development* agencies are not doing *development*, who does? It is occurring, but the international efforts are largely by focused advocacy organisations that do not use the term *development*. Within powerful, industrial countries, that claim to already be *developed*, it is here where the most attention to *development* is focused. Nevertheless, one could easily argue that the *developed* countries in their public policies are actually regressing as inequalities (economic and political) increase, as minority cultures are assimilated, as pressures for conformity and control increase, and as attention to the individual human potential decreases.

Organisations that do not claim to be doing *development* work but that are focused on cultural survival (Survival International, Forest Peoples Programme, Worldwatch), language protection (Terra Lingua), mental health (Psychiatrists Without Borders), social justice, and rights protections (Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International), usually through advocacy for sustainability, equity/empowerment and public goods, are among those that are offering partial solutions and in some cases strong solutions (where they focus on cultural sustainability and diversity along with individual rights) in *development*.

In the *developed* countries, civic foundations in urban communities that build public libraries, museums, parks, new education projects, and promote empowerment and social change are also doing *development* work.

Indeed, one might use the indicator not just to test international interventions but to look at the agendas of political parties, government, and even school curricula in countries and communities everywhere to measure whether they are really promoting *development* or regressive policies.

How *development* has come to mean its opposite: what happened?

If *development* organisations aren't doing *development*, then what are they doing and how can they be held accountable? How is it that another standard has come to be substituted for international goals that are embedded in treaties and that are relatively clear to anyone who reads them?

In the case of the staffs of *development agencies* themselves and the non-governmental organisations that they fund to do their work, who may all be co-dependent on poverty for their livelihoods, one might simply call their work, 'the

poverty business'. They continue to generate poverty and to maintain populations at an animal level so as to assure they will have continued work (so long as those paying their resources do not also run out of funds as a result of system collapse).

In fact, in terms of changes in *absolute poverty* in the past 20 years, if absolute poverty is defined as an income of \$2 per day, the World Bank notes almost zero progress in meeting even basic animal needs, with the number of poor in 1990, some 2.59 billion people, dropping only to 2.47 billion by 2008 (World Bank, 2012).

Moreover, calculations of income inequality over the past 200 years show that income inequality, as measured by the gini coefficient, steadily worsened from 1820 to 1913 (from .43 to .61) and that it has continued to worsen (to .68 in 2005, slightly down from its high point of .71 in 2002) (Milanovic, 2011).

What appears to be a result of design can be confirmed by anyone who examines the projects, themselves, their lack of attention to any underlying root causes or to outcomes that would achieve actual sustainability or equality (Escobar, 2011; Gunder Frank et al., 1972; Baran and Sweezy, 1968; Wallerstein, 1979; Lempert, 2014). For many smaller organisations that claim to be doing *development* what they are really doing is still just *relief* or *charity* under a fancy name, with little understanding of what they are really doing. One might just call their work 'Santa Claus projects' or 'Money shovelling' or 'Trough filling' since it essentially establishes the same relationship with human beings that they have with their pets or farm animals.

It is common among scholars to blame ideologies like 'capitalism' for these failures (Rist, 2002), but blaming ideologies is paralysing because it hides specific human actions that are to blame and potential actions that can embody solutions. Indeed, this distortion in language also occurred in the so-called 'State socialist' or 'communist' systems and now seems to be occurring in all nation states in the global economy.

We may not know exactly *why* those with power would take the long-term solutions they had designed for the human future and replace it with something destructive, if not suicidal. This author is seeking to explain this phenomenon in other articles (looking at the phenomenon of *cultural suicide* and system collapses and extinctions), using social science approaches of psychology, evolutionary biology and anthropology. Other scholars have offered more philosophical explanations as part of *post-modernist* critiques (Escobar, 2011) that are in agreement in documenting the phenomenon but not in recognising it as something

that could be explained by social sciences using similar cases throughout history. What we do know is *who* has done this and how they have drawn personal benefit by doing so (Lempert, unpublished).

Economists have stepped in to bridge the conflict between linear scientific view of development and the pluralistic humanities view of development within a human social science by reversing the solution created by other disciplines. They have used the pretext of *science* and *human studies* to claim authority in resolving the conflict, but have done neither science nor humanism. Instead, they have worked for the benefit of certain elite interests to insert ideology and distortion. They have headed what is really a discipline of *production engineering* rather than a social science study of consumption, production and human values, and they have acted to promote productivity and consumption under the ideological claim that productivity along a linear path for all societies, to meet basic needs, is *development*.

In signing the treaties, governments and donors agreed that *development* goals were holistic and inseparable, but with the proselytising of economists, they have broken their commitments and substituted another agenda. This new agenda sees human beings as animals; as nothing more than producers and consumers in a homogenous system. It substitutes a definition of *economic development* – of *human capital*, basic health, literacy and social control (*safety*) for the full range of human attributes.

Economics seems to have allied with certain religions (Lempert, unpublished) to promote an agenda that eliminates the goal of *progress* and human expression and *perfection*. It replaces it with the *civilising mission* of the colonial era that is anti-Enlightenment, anti-science. It is an ideology of rapid human reproduction and consumption, with the rest a matter of *fate* and an *invisible hand*.

At the bequest of economists, corporate interests, militaries, and State bureaucracies, and with the agreement of technocrats in the *development* field, the international community has not only conspired to place a basic needs and homogenisation (globalisation) agenda in place of real human diversity and development, but it has assured it would be institutionalised. In the way the contributions of donor countries are now calculated, expenses on anything more than animal needs are calculated as only a percentage of basic needs inputs. The purpose is to assure that countries do not receive *credit* for anything that promotes humanity and implements the treaty agreements on the elements of *development* when calculating the percentage of their incomes they donate.

Implications: for our own society, for other societies and for what we teach

If few are really doing *development* work and we are creating societies to a common standard simply of basic animal needs, degrading everyone to the level of basic needs as the indicator suggests is now being done under the name of *development*, what are we as a species? What future do we have?

Developed countries that no longer *develop* are admitting that they have abandoned any goal of *progress*. We are impoverishing the world of its cultural and individual diversity and of its essential humanity while falsely calling it *development*. If the U.N. and international and national organisations no longer have a vision of humanity that is anything more than that of animals, civilisation has died.

The international system laid out the principles of development, following social science study. Educational systems partly incorporated the *development* view in approaches to the liberal arts that sought to develop whole beings and humanity (Nauert, 2006).

This piece is written in the hope that clarification of the principles in the form of a tool and explanation of the international community's logic and vision for development, and the wrong turns that have been taken, can lead back to the civilised approaches that have been abandoned.

One way to follow this article is to offer better measures of progress on all of the 13 elements of *development*; not just economic equality, but cultural diversity (Lempert, 2010), intellectual development, etc. Another is to incorporate the 13 elements of development directly into curricula, including that of *development studies*.

Years ago, this author and colleagues offered an example of a *Model Development Plan*. Certainly, clarification of these 13 elements would have improved our earlier model of *development* by assuring that we touched on all 13 with specific strategies for each one, though we did address most key areas (Lempert, McCarty and Mitchell, 1995, 1998).

Below is an example of a short preamble for a Ministry of Rural Development that does *development*, discarded by the UN but that is also an example of a small model for re-integrating true humanitarian objectives back into the work of organisations that claim to do *development* work but have lost their way.

Annex:

Draft Decree 73
Reorganising the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

GOVERNMENT DECREE

On the missions, functions and organisational structure of the
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

- ❖ To enhance and protect the existing *communities* and cultures and the *individuals* engaging in these cultivation activities and co-existing with these natural environments and resources, in ways that protect and restore the best of Vietnam's pre-Chinese and pre-Indian (pre-feudal and pre-colonial) cultural traditions and the essence of Vietnam's indigenous Kinh and minority cultures, in combination with contemporary knowledge, to develop healthy, happy, prosperous communities in which the inhabitants choose their own destiny and recognise as the most desirable places to live. This mission will include a role in protecting and promoting those distinct *rural* characteristics of Vietnamese cities – the harmonious use of natural materials, and the love of and integration with the natural environment – that are integral aspects of Vietnamese traditions.

- ❖ rural development – shall refer to the raising of qualities of life and feelings of well-being in rural areas, as defined and chosen directly by and with the full participation and informed knowledge of the inhabitants of indigenous and existing communities and of individuals born in those areas, such that the values of those communities are maintained and the benefits of change remain in those communities for the inhabitants. The test of rural development is whether rural areas are places the inhabitants desire to live and stay, and whether they retain their distinct characteristics, essences, flavor, and traditions, and provide viable alternatives to city life. Rural development does not necessarily imply population growth or urbanisation, and recognises that the urbanisation of rural land may be inconsistent with and in direct contradiction and opposition to rural development.

References

- Asian Development Bank. (2014). *Overview*. Retrieved 19 January, 2014 from <http://www.adb.org/about/overview..>
- Baran, P. A. and Sweezy, P. M. (1968). *Monopoly Capital*. New York: Pelican Books.
- Beninion, F. A. R. (2009). *Understanding Common Law Legislation: Drafting and Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, L. (2004). *Outgrowing the Earth: The Food Security Challenge in the Age of Falling Water Tables and Rising Temperatures*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Brutus. (1787). To the Citizens of the State of New York, in Herbert J. Storing, ed. (2008). *The Complete Anti-Federalist*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Canadian International Development Agency. (2010). *Development for Results, 2010-11*. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca>
- Collins English Dictionary*. (2009). New York: Harper Collins.
- Cross, R. (1995). *Statutory Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daly, H. (2011). *Moving from a Failed Growth Economy to a Steady State Economy* Presentation to the AAAS (unpublished).
- Ehrlich, P. and Ehrlich, A. (1996). *Betrayal of Science and Reason*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (2014). *Our Mission*. Retrieved 19 January 2014 from <http://www.ebrd.com/pages/about/what/mission.shtml>.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *Care of the Self*, New York: Random House.
- Frank, A. G., Cochroft J. D. and Johnson D. L. (1972). *Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Inter-American Development Bank. (2014). *About the Inter-American Development Bank*. Retrieved 19 January, 2014 from <http://www.iadb.org/en/about-us/about-the-inter-american-development-bank,5995.html>.
- Jung, C. G. (1970). *Psychological Types*, in *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Krauss, M. (1992). The World's Languages in Crisis. *Language*, 68(1).
- Lempert, D. (2009). A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations, *Global Jurist*, 9(2), Article 6. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.bepress.com/gi/vol9/iss2/art6>
- Lempert, D. (2011). Democracy Building Democratic Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations, *Global Jurist*, 11(2), Article 4. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from www.bepress.com/gj/vol11/iss2/art4/
- Lempert, D. (1997). Holding the Powers that Be Accountable to Our Ethics Code to Protect Our Integrity and the Peoples We Serve, *Human Rights*, 24(2), Spring 1997. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/professionaethicscodefordevelopmentwork>
<http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/spring97/lempert.pdf>

- Lempert, D. (2008). Why We Need an International Development Donor Monitor, *Policy Innovations*, January. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy_library/data/01464
- Lempert, D. (2010). Why We Need a Cultural Red Book for Endangered Cultures, Now, *International Journal of Minority and Group Rights*, Fall/Winter 2010, 17. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/home>
- Lempert, D. (unpublished). “Is Economics in Violation of International Law?: Remaking Economics as a Social Science”, manuscript on file with author.
- Lempert, D. (2014). A Poverty Reduction Accountability Indicator for International Organizations and NGOs, *Law, Social Justice and Global Development*, 18(1) (forthcoming).
- Lempert, D. and Nguyen, H. N. (2008). How to Tell if Development Projects are Doing Sustainable Development: An Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations, *International Journal of Sustainable Societies*, 1(1). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://inderscience.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&ackto=issue,3,6;journal,1,1;linkingpublicationresults,1:121226,1>
Reprinted at: <http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n8page4.html>
- Lempert, D. and Nguyen, H. N. (2011). The Global Prisoners’ Dilemma of Unsustainability: Why Sustainable Development Cannot Be Achieved Without Resource Security and Eliminating the Legacies of Colonialism, *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 7(1). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol7iss1/1006-031.lempert.html>
Reprinted in *Mother Pelican*. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n10page4.html>
- Lempert, D., McCarty K. and Mitchell C. (1995, 1998). *A Model Development Plan: New Strategies and Perspectives*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood/ Praeger Publishers .
- Liberti, S. (2013). *Land Grabbing: Journeys in the New Colonialism*, New York: Verso Books.
- Locke, J. (1629). *Two Treaties of Government*.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation, *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-96.
- Milanovic, B. (2011). More or Less. *Finance and Development*, (International Monetary Fund) 48(3), September. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2011/09/milanovic.htm>
- Nauert, C. G. (2006). *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe (New Approaches to European History)*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 172-173.
- Nguyen, H. N. (2008). *Toxic Omissions: and Cancerous Growths: Addressing the Unexamined Assumption of Sustainable Consumption in Technologically Innovative Societies*. Masters Thesis, Lund, Sweden: IIIIE Lund University, IIIIE Theses 2008:XX. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from http://www.etd.ceu.hu/2008/nguyen_hue.pdf
- Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. (2008). *Is It ODA?: Fact Sheet*, Document 34086975 pdf, November. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats>

- Orwell, G. (1948). *1984*: New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Pearce, F. (2013). *The Land Grabbers: The New Fight Over Who Owns the Earth*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ramey, V. A. and Francis, N. (2006). *A Century of Leisure*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, Working Paper 12264, May. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w12264> .
- Rist, G. (2002). *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*, Boston: Zed Books.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1762). *Emile, or Treatise on Education*.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1762). *Of the Social Contract or Principles of Political Right*.
- Sahlins, M. (1960). *Evolution and Culture*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Paperbacks.
- Sahlins, M. (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine Transaction.
- Sen, A. (2001). *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Streeten, P. and others. (1981). *First Things First: Meeting Basic Human Needs*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Sutherland, J. Gr. (2010). *Statutes and Statutory Construction*, London: Nabu Press.
- Tolstoy, L. (1967/1863). *On Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- U.N. Convention in the Rights of the Child. (1989). GA 44/25, November 20. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>
- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992). *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>
- U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. (1948). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/genocide.htm>
- U.N. Development Programme. (Undated). “What’s Human Development”, Retrieved 20 November, 2012 from <http://www.undp.org/bz/human-development/what’s-human-development>.
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Unit’s Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. (2003). Participants of the International Expert Meeting on the UNESCO Programme *Safeguarding of Endangered Languages* Paris-Fontenoy, (10–12 March).
- UNICEF. (2003). *Assessment of Vietnamese Laws and Policies Related to Children and Women: Mid-Term Review*, Report Prepared For Distribution.
- U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. (1966). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>
- U.N. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (1966). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cescr.htm>
- U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (2007). Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/512/07/PDF/N0651207.pdf?OpenElement>
- U.N. International Declaration of Human Rights. (1948).
- U.N. Millennium Declaration. (2000). U.N. General Assembly, 55/2, September 8.

- Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>
- Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- U.N. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, James Arroyo. (2013). *Extractive Industries and Indigenous Peoples*, July 1. A/HRC/24/41.
- Voltaire, translated by Morley, J. (1901; 1760s). *The Works of Voltaire*, including “Traite Sur Le Tolerance,” 1763.
- Von Humboldt, W. (1854, translated from German by Coulthard, J.). *The Sphere and Duties of Government*. London: John Chapman.
- Wallerstein, I. (1979). An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order. *The Capitalist World Economy*. New York: Cambridge U. Press.
- World Bank. (2013). *Vietnam Overview*. Retrieved 16 December, 2013 from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/vietnam/overview>.
- World Bank. (2011). *Vietnam Urbanization Review: Technical Assessment Report*, November.
- World Bank. (undated). *What is Development*, Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/english/beyondco/beg_01.pdf
- World Bank. (2014). *What We Do*. Retrieved 19 January, 2014 from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/what-we-do>.
- World Bank. (2012). World Bank Sees Progress Against Extreme Poverty, But Flags Vulnerabilities. February 29. Retrieved 20 March, 2014 from <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/2012/02/29/world-bank-sees-progress-against-extreme-poverty-but-flags-vulnerabilities>