

Universal Development Goals for This Millennium

David Lempert, Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., E.D. (Hon)
International Development Consultant
email: superlemp@yahoo.com

Abstract

This essay uses established United Nations treaties and agreements on human “development” and progress, that were part of the post World War II consensus, as a basis for rediscovering and reaffirming those “universal development goals” that were intended to be the measure of “development” success within all of the world’s countries and that can be recognized again as the U.N. sets its agenda and measures for post-2015 “development goals”. The author notes how the U.N.’s “Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)” established for 2001 to 2015, abandoned the earlier global consensus to substitute a narrower vision duplicating the “civilizing mission” of European colonialism. This approach undermined global aspirations and substituted a vision of homogeneity and basic needs with no possibility for progress. Current attempts to “fix” the failures of the MDGs with “Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)” continue to subvert the earlier agreements. The 13 principles for development that the international community outlined as the basis of humanity’s development vision after World War II can serve as the basis for contemporary “Universal Development Goals.”

Author’s Note

David Lempert, social anthropologist and attorney, has pioneered approaches in comparative studies of development while also building the infrastructure for practical application and for interdisciplinary social science. He has worked in more than 30 countries and has founded NGOs or projects in democratic experiential education, heritage protection, and sustainable development. This article is among a series of applied indicator and professional codes that he has published as part of an effort to protect professionalism and create accountability in the “development” sector/international interventions while promoting civilization and “progress.”

Keywords: United Nations, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); sustainable development, progress, development

1. Introduction

Imagine a world where the leaders from all of the most powerful and technologically advanced nations could not offer a single goal for their own progress. Imagine if their only aspiration was increased productivity and consumption and that the only additional idea that they could add to that would be to assure that it might even be “sustainable” rather than destructive. Imagine that the only other set of ideas they could suggest as part of their aspirations was to try to assure that those of different cultures, whose resources had been exploited for centuries, would be

allowed some minimum support so as to partly live like those who had exploited them.

Such a world would be a dead world, with no imagination and no future. It would have no social progress. It would promote no creativity other than for technological efficiency. It would offer nothing for the human potential at the level of the individual, or cultures, or societies or the globe.

We do not have to imagine it. That is, in fact, the world we live in today. Yet, only three generations ago, at the end of World War II, when the leaders of the world got together, the vision they had and signed in a number of basic treaties and agreements for humanity, was one that recognized a full spectrum of human possibilities in goals for “development”.

As this article is being written, committees are being formed throughout the world under the auspices of the United Nations and its Member governments to propose a set of “development” goals for the future of humanity. Non-governmental organizations and individuals are also seeking to draw up a list of the world’s development goals. These will replace the most recent set of goals that had been called the Millennium Development Goals and that are scheduled to be revised in 2015 (U.N. Millennium Declaration, 2000).

In fact, there already is a set of universal development goals that are recognized by the international community. It is visionary. It needs no political process to establish because it is already accepted and codified. The problem with it is simply that it is hidden under mounds of material and it has long been forgotten.

This article demonstrates how established United Nations treaties and agreements on human “development” and progress, that were part of the post World War II consensus, can serve as a basis for outlining those “universal development goals”. This paper uses the tools of basic social science research and law to unearth and present again these hidden and forgotten “universal development goals” as a step in re-endorsing them for acceptance and implementation by the global community for our human future. In doing so, they may be re-affirmed as the measure of “development” success within all of the world’s countries as the U.N. sets its agenda and measures for post-2015 “development goals”.

After unearthing these universal objectives, the author explains how the post-war treaties sought to change the cultural processes of colonialism and empire that led to the World Wars of the 20th century and how that process has essentially failed. The U.N.’s “Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)” established for 2001 to 2015, abandoned the global post-war consensus and reverted to the narrow “civilizing mission” of European colonialism in a way that undermined global aspirations and substituted a vision of homogeneity and basic needs with no possibility for progress. The piece further suggests how current attempts to “fix” the failures of the MDGs with “Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)” continue to subvert the earlier agreements and to potentially recreate the conditions that led to world war and the need for the original post-war consensus.

Finally, the piece helps crystallize the 13 areas development that the international community outlined as the basis of humanity’s development vision and points to a new set of actionable universal measures to fulfill the universal development goals.

2. Methodology: Unearthing the Universal Principles of Development that are the International Consensus

The method for extracting key legal principles from laws and legal documents is relatively straightforward. The reason it hasn't been done before in the area of "development" is also not hard to explain, since this is a relatively new area of international law.

The 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 and legal documents to reconstruct the underlying principles in order to apply them (Cross, 1995; Beninion, 2009; Sutherland, 2010).

Although there is no formal body of "international development law" that is recognized as such, and there is certainly no "case law" of judicial interpretations of the principles and elements of "international development" and its various aspects like "poverty reduction", there already are several international laws and treaties that define the basic elements of rights and dignity that are part of the international consensus. Some of these laws, for example, identify the essential elements for survival of communities and right to choice patterns of consumption for living sustainably (U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide ("Genocide Convention"), 1948). Others define what is needed for children to "develop" to attain their full potential as human beings (the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (the "CRC"), 1989. For development law to be recognized as a formal set of codified principles, it simply needs to be systematized through a process of statutory analysis and placed in a format equivalent to other legal "treatises" in other areas of law.

Identifying and systematizing laws in different areas 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. Not everything is explicit, but there are also some implied conditions and elements for the overall principles to work. That method can be applied here.

The fact that international legal scholars and development practitioners have yet to produce a treatise or codification of laws on "development" is perfectly understandable. This area of international law is new. Attention has focused more on international commercial law and on criminal law where specific parties had immediate needs for legal remedies and lawyers. Moreover, the details of the principles of development have taken some time to elaborate. Although some of the basic frameworks were established immediately on the founding of the United Nations, in the United Nations Charter, (1946) and its initial declarations, some principles on rights of children and minority groups, that are fundamental to elaborating the concept of "development", took more time before there was an international consensus on what was "universal". The CRC appeared forty years after World War II and some of the fundamental rights of ethnic groups that were codified into criminal law in the Genocide Convention were only now more recently

spelled out in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007).

While the universal principles now underlying these laws are now available to be systematized and the process is relatively straightforward, there have still been questions on enforcement procedures. What is available is a set of overlapping, confusing legal documents, sometimes appearing contradictory and with unclear applicability, ranging from enforceable international criminal laws to declarations or as conventions without clear enforcement processes. But just because enforcement procedures may not be clearly specified, that does not mean that the principles of development that are recognized as international universals with the consensus of the international community cannot be spelled out for use in the form of universal development goals. They certainly can be.

This author has now been completing codification process in the area of international “development”. The author has worked through the details of codifying the principles of international development in a recent peer review article (Lempert, 2014) as one of a series of steps that are codifying international development law in a treatise. Such works are subject to peer review to assure a consensus and use of appropriate professional methods and tools. The author has now completed 12 such articles with 8 of them now published or forthcoming. The one of specific interest here is the one that sets the framework; the principles of “development”. Others work to codify sub-principles within the framework, codifying the universally recognized international legal principles for “sustainable development” (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008) as well as other principles like “poverty alleviation” and “sovereignty”. Below is a quick summary of the international community’s principles for “development” in general, and their basis, taken from that recent article. They are presented here as a foundation for examining what has gone astray in establishing universal development goals and then for placing those “Universal Development Goals” (“UDGs”) before the international community so they may be reaffirmed.

3. What the International Community and the U.N. Charter Established – Summary

The internationally accepted framework principles for “development” that are found in international laws fall into four categories, at the level of the individual (personal development), society, cultural group, and at the global level (for relations among peoples) with a total of 13 elements. They are found in some of the most basic international laws and treaties that specifically use the word “development.”

The key international treaties that recognize universal principles of “development” are:

- the *University Declaration of Human Rights* written at the founding of the United Nations in 1948, that sets an overall framework;
- the *Convention on the Rights of the Child* that introduces concepts of individual (personal) development and of communities (1989) and
- the *Genocide Convention* that was also signed in 1948, as one of the basics of international law, establishing the elements of development for cultures and ethnic groups. Though still relatively recent and not universally accepted

given questions on enforcement, 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. The UNDRIP is written to protect “indigenous peoples” but it embodies the principles of cultural and community vitality for all human 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 the concepts of development that are mentioned in the basic documents above.

In brief, the international community recognizes the following 13 universal elements of “development” in four categories.

Individual/Personal Development:

1. *Physical (body) development:* The international community values developing individual physical abilities as part of health, confidence and awareness as well as cultural expressions and economic and social activities that rely on body expression.
2. *Mental development:* The international community recognizes the importance of developing both intellectual/mental abilities and also mental health (“psychological treatment”/“responsible life in a free society”/“rest, leisure and recreational activities”). Added separately, though certainly part of mental attributes, is science. The international community recognizes mental development as 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 international community recognizes the value of individuals development “respect for the natural environment” (biophilia and stewardship of biodiversity of eco-systems), along with religious freedom and the value of peace and tolerance, that could be said to be spiritual. 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:* The international community recognizes respect for rights and fundamental freedoms”; “respect for civilizations 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, international agreements recognize the development of individual “respect for parents, cultural identity, language and values”. 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 including "cultural and artistic life" and protection of "archaeological and historical sites, artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature" as well as economic and political practices and skills that are beyond "social" and artistic or religious. Pride and understanding 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: The international community's recognition of societal level development is both as a means to promote individual development and an ends at promoting a universally recognized ideal of a "good society". There are three elements.

1. *Social equity/ "Social progress"/Equal opportunity*: The international community recognizes this aspect of development as 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 international community recognizes the development of political equality as an essential to full access to resources for the highest attainment of individual potential. It includes political rights such as free expression of views and "freedom of thought, conscience and religion" as well as "freedom from fear" along with attention to human "dignity". 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-militarization*: The international community also recognizes that the pre-requisite for human development is "an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding". "De-colonialization" 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. The goal of the international community is not to simply reduce conflicts, through homogenization 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.

Cultural/Community Development: The international community does not specify what cultures (ethnic groups) require to develop, but the overall right of cultural development is recognized 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 recognize the specific sovereignty of cultures that are not nation states, the international community does recognize the pre-requisites of sustainability.

Global Development: The international community establishes pre-requisites 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. Achievement of these objectives also requires understandings and change in powerful cultures as part of a recognition of what is required for long-term human progress and survival. There are three elements.

1. *Social equity/ "Social progress"/Equal opportunity:* The international recognition of social equity amongst cultures is not a call for equal consumption and production patterns in a homogeneous world system. It is the recognition of equal opportunity of peoples to their environments to live and function comfortably and sustainably within them without pressures from others that would take away those economic bases and resources that are fundamental to 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.
3. *Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization:* It is also a universal principle that cultures also require demilitarization and an end to hegemonic pressures if they are truly to be free to *develop*.

Anyone reading the above list of development elements cannot fail to recognize them both as fundamental human aspirations and as a set of principles that has also somehow disappeared from discussions of "development". The "universal development goals" that the international community began to establish after World War II were visionary. The intent in establishing international commitment and consensus was to change the cultural processes of colonialism and empire that led to the World Wars of the 20th century and to build a new vision for humanity. Now, some 70 years after the end of the Second World War, it is clear that the process has failed. The previous national mindsets that led to those wars seem to have reappeared.

What has happened is that the U.N.'s "Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)" established for 2001 to 2015, abandoned the global post-war consensus and reverted to the narrow "civilizing mission" of European colonialism. They undermined global aspirations and substituted a vision of homogeneity and basic

needs with no possibility for progress. Now, current attempts to “fix” the failures of the MDGs with “Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)” appear to suffer from the same lack of memory and vision in ways that continue to subvert the earlier agreements and to potentially recreate the conditions that led to world war and the need for the original post-war consensus.

4. The Millennium Development Goals and their Failure

It is easy to see the difference between the universally established international principles for “development” and those that characterize both the Millennium Development Goals as well as almost all discussions today of “development”. One simply needs to compare the two lists to see how little they have in common. It is also easy to recognize that the failure reflects a reassertion of the same ideologies that led the world to World War II. With a little bit of research, it is easy to find an example of development policies in empires prior to World War II and to see that their “development” policies, though under slightly different names (such as the “civilizing mission” of the French in its colonies), are essentially indistinguishable from the approaches in the Millennium Development Goals today.

In the year 2000, in choosing ways to measure “development” and progress for humanity, the world’s leaders created what they called the “Millennium Development Goals”. They chose eight areas of “development” and established target groups as well as target outcomes. In doing so, they seemed to completely abandon the universal development goals that they had painstakingly established in laws and treaties and replaced them with the lowest common denominator for humanity; a focus simply on basic animal needs for human beings and their assimilation into a homogeneous urban vision of State schooling and equal treatment of males and females as employees. Whichever way one runs the comparison, it is easy to see the disconnect.

In a recent article, this author examined the eight MDGs that the international community had selected for 2001 to 2015 and asked whether they were universally applicable to all countries and fulfilled the elements of development as established in the elements of international laws and treaties (Lempert, 2014, Table 1). For all eight, the answer was clearly “no”. (In brief, the eight MDGs are: end poverty and hunger by increasing resources of the lowest 25%, offer university primary education, promote gender equality, reduce infant mortality and promote child health, promote maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, address environmental sustainability through species protection and lowering of ozone and CO₂ levels, and promote global partnerships in the area of trade, finance, technology transfer, debt relief and governance. Details can be found on the UNDP website and in UNDP documents as well as in specific country documents (UN Millennium Declaration, 2000; UN 2013).)

Table 1. Universally Recognized Aspirations for Development and the International Community’s Recognition of Them through the Millennium Development Goals

1. Individual Development Objectives:

	<i>Elements</i>	<i>Response of the International Community through the MDGs</i>
1.	Physical (body) development:	Limited in recipients and in applications. Current MDG 1 (on poverty and hunger) partly addresses basic animal needs as do MDGs 4, 5 and 6 that focus on basic health (infant and child health, maternal health, and HIV/AIDS) but the approach of the MDGs is just to support minimal physical development of “the poor” and then to stop.
2.	Mental development:	Dubious. Current MDG 2 (primary education) promotes top-down universal primary State schooling for those not yet subject to it or excluded from it, but such schooling often destroys cultures and traditional education. It is not responsive to individual desires and does not seek to improve mental development of the vast majority.
3.	Spiritual (appreciation of natural world) development:	Abandoned. Current MDG 7 (on the environment) promotes green space and lowering of pollutants but does not change the attitudes or policies that have led to environmental damage because of the loss of spiritual appreciation for nature.
4.	Moral (appreciation of others as individuals) development:	Abandoned.
5.	Social (appreciation of community) development:	Abandoned.
6.	Cultural (appreciation of one’s identity) development:	Abandoned and Contradicted by MDG 2 (primary schooling) that generally works to assimilate cultures and substitute traditional education with State directed classroom education.

2. Societal Level Development Objectives::

	<i>Elements</i>	<i>Response of the International Community through the MDGs</i>
7.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity for individuals	Dubious. Current MDG 1 (poverty and hunger) focuses on the lower 25% but tries to resolve inequity through productivity and cultural destruction to generate short-term incomes for the “poor”, rather than through empowerment or

		distributional equity policies without any social solidarity and changes in distribution of opportunity; Current MDG 3 (gender equality) tries to achieve equality in the area of gender, only, and in ways that do not protect traditional cultures and do not deal with any inequities to males or underlying causes of gender inequity (e.g., militarization and violence).
8.	Political equity/ Equal rights for individuals:	Abandoned other than for women through MDG 3 (gender equality) and without addressing underlying causes of gender inequity or inequities faced by men.
9.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for individuals:	Abandoned.

3. Cultural/ Community Level Development Objectives:

	<i>Elements</i>	<i>Response of the International Community through the MDGs</i>
10.	Sustainability/ (sovereignty) of cultures:	Abandoned and Contradicted by MDG 8 (promoting global partnerships) that promotes trade and technology transfer to the detriment of resource protections and sustainability.

4. Global Development Objectives:

	<i>Elements</i>	<i>Response of the International Community through the MDGs</i>
11.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity of cultures:	Abandoned and Contradicted by MDG 8 (promoting global partnerships) and MDG 2 (primary education) that work to urbanize and homogenize cultures rather than to promote diversity and equity between them.
12.	Political equity/ Equal rights for cultures:	Abandoned and Contradicted by MDG 8 (promoting global partnerships) and MDG 2 (primary education) that work to urbanize and homogenize cultures rather than to promote diversity and equity between them.
13.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for protection of cultures:	Undermined. Current MDG 8 (promoting global partnerships) tries to do this through homogenization and globalization in ways that actually destabilize cultures and long term prospects for peace (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011).

Here, we can see the disconnect by running the comparison in reverse. Table 1 lists the principles that form the UDGs (in the left column) and analyzes how the eight MDGs do in furthering them (the right hand column). Although one needs to be familiar with the eight MDGs and how they are actually interpreted and applied by the international community in order to fully follow this analysis, one does not have to know all of the details of the MDG applications to see the clear disconnect between the UDGs and the MDGs. Table 1 suggests that of the 13 UDGs, the MDGs directly undermine prospects for one of them (global peace and tolerance), abandon and partly undermine four of them, fully abandon four and partly abandon another, and directly recognize only three with either dubious or limited impact and scope.

The MDGs have essentially hijacked the U.N. system's "development" agenda. Instead of "development" as defined by universal international principles, the MDGs have substituted the goals of globalization; raising consumption on a certain number of indicators, through and including nation state schooling and trade. The goals seek to promote consumption and assimilation/homogenization in place of "development". No development goals are applied to wealthy and powerful countries; they are deemed to stagnate.

The international community's original vision focused on human beings and their aspirations at all levels for their individual personal development, for improvement of their communities, for diversity and tolerance, and for a better world. In its place, the MDGs substituted a focus on production of things as the measure of humanity and the meeting of basic animal needs while losing site of alternatives (Schumacher, 1973; Brown, 1984 to 2001).

While it is not easy to explain "why" the international community has collectively decided to close its eyes to humanity's universal aspirations for development and its approach for avoiding a return to the kind of world that led to World War II, it is easy to show that this is indeed the case by comparing the view of "development" during the colonial era before World War II with the approach taken in the MDGs.

Though there are no specific studies of the origin of the MDG agenda, there is a way to test the anthropological axiom that systems continue in their cultural patterns unless forced to change. There are excellent historical records of European colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the period before World War II, describing the work of missionaries, charities and governments in working with local peoples and native peoples.

For the purposes of this article, the author chooses three of the 30 countries in which he has worked for this test: Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, where the author has worked for most of the past 10 years documenting colonial history and sites (Lempert, unpublished). The French "civilizing mission" in its colonies was very clear in the form of church hospitals, state schools, health infrastructure, and foreign laws and concepts of "equality" (Jameson, 1993; Logan and Askew, 1994).

Table 2 places the MDGs side by side with the French "civilizing mission" in a way that elicits the striking similarity between the two. In the left column are the MDGs. The right column describes the French equivalents. Although we could also create a table with the UDGs, such as Table 1, and consider whether the French offered anything else beyond the MDGs that matched the UDGs, the results would

only show some minor differences. The French did pay some attention to documenting historical and cultural sites, building technical schools and higher education, and to landscape and art in ways that go beyond what the MDGs do today. If anything, the MDGs may be even more narrow than pre-World War II “development” under the French. The results would be similar for other pre-World War II colonial empires.

What is also clear from the table is that the MDG approach replicated the fatal legacy of post-World War I European relief that led to World War II; treatment of symptoms of poverty in ways that generated high population growth but with little or no focus on sustainability; thus assuring poverty and collapse as children reached adulthood.

It is also striking that it is the governments of the former colonies that have signed onto the MDGs. The anthropological explanation is that the leaders of these former colonies were trained in the colonial mentality and their systems also often continued much like those under colonial rule but simply with local elites replacing the foreign powers (Gunder Frank, et. al., 1972; Wallerstein, 1979).

Table 2. Colonial Origins of the Millennium Development Goals: French Colonial Interventions

<i>Millennium Development Goal and Measures</i>	<i>Analysis of French Colonial “Civilizing Mission” Activities on the basis of whether they Reflect the MDGs and their Implementation (Using Indochina, 1860 – 1945)</i>
1. End Poverty and Hunger, including increasing the share of the lowest 25%	Yes, the French introduced the same productive ideology for reducing poverty that is found in UNDP projects based on the MDGs; promoting small business and export crops and building sanitation systems, irrigation systems and roads along with schools, and using community labor for investment to combat “poverty”. Treatment of minorities imposed the same leveling effect as today, including abolition of slavery to protect the lowest 25%, without concern for sustainability or wealth protection.
2. Offer Universal Education (at the primary school level)	Yes, the French introduced community schools (same as the State schools of today for nation building and symbol manipulating skills) to promote French literacy and to unify the areas under their control and replace local autonomy.
3. Gender Equality	In a relative sense, yes. The French created schools for girls as well as for boys and the idea was to create the same gender relations as in Europe, including protections of women through French legal codes, though the concepts of equality were different from today.
4. Child Health (reduce infant mortality)	Yes, this was a key goal of French Missionary activities and associated hospitals as well as of specific health institutes like the Pasteur Institutes. They promoted vaccines and sanitation campaigns much like the MDGs.
5. Maternal Health	Yes, the mother and child hospitals were a key to the hospital and health systems introduced by the French. The French symbol was that of Mary and Baby Jesus.
6. Combat HIV/AIDS	In a sense, yes. Though there was no HIV/AIDS, there was venereal disease and the French established special clinics (e.g., Hanoi) for soldiers and local prostitutes to receive treatment.
7. Environmental Sustainability: species protection, lowering of ozone and CO ₂ levels.	In a sense that the U.N. has subverted the goal of natural asset protection to that of clean water and cherry picking interventions that protect aspects of the environment but do not protect sustainability of peoples or assets, one can say that this was the French model for water sanitation and parks. The French environmental consciousness was limited to aesthetics (landscaping and gardens) in a way that is analogous to the MDG

	approach to symptoms rather than root causes.
8. Global Partnership: rule based trade and finance, sustainable debts; technology transfer, good governance, debt relief	Yes, the French idea of technology transfer (technical schools and institutes, scholarship and work permits to France) and “civilizing” the locals was all based on a concept of globalization/ French civilization that promoted trade and solidarity.
Total	5 of the 8 MDGs appear to be taken <i>directly</i> from the French colonial model while the remaining three, that are more time specific, seem consistent with the French colonial ideology for “civilizing” the natives.

5. Attempts to “Fix” the MDGs with “Sustainable Development Goals” and Other Schemes and Where they Fail

While the international community is now calling for new sets of development goals such as “Sustainable Development Goals” (“SDGs”) and other goals and measures, there is still a disconnect with the international consensus on development as established in the universal development principles.

As the period designated for the MDGs comes to a close in 2015, there is recognition that they have failed on perhaps the single most important element for global peace and security; sustainable development. But this is only one of 13 integrated elements of “development”. Recent analyses of the MDGs have made it clear that they have failed in environmental protection and sustainability planning (UN Fact Sheet, 2013) and this failure, alone, can undermine all of the purported achievements on the other MDGs (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008).

At the time this article is being written, the focus of the international community is simply on SDGs; an initiative promoted by the Rio +20 of June 2-12 with Open Working Groups (U.N. “A New Global Partnership”, 2013). But it is easy to see that the thinking still does not incorporate the universal principles of development and simply continues the MDGs under the banner of “sustainable and equitable economic growth” in the belief that “eradicating poverty is the greatest global challenge facing the world today (p. 1).

The problem is also visible in the key measure used in the international community of well-being that continues to be promoted. The major measure of development that is now used internationally is the “Human Development Index” (HDI) constructed by Amartya Sen and Mahbub ul Haq in 1990 (Sen and ul Haq, U.N. Human Development Report). The inclusive measures for generating the index are really those of productivity without cultural or individual diversity. 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 or poverty reduction index according to the international agreements.

6. Reaffirming the International Community’s Universal Development Goals and Making them Actionable after 2015

The international community already has a set of 13 universal development principles that have international legal status and that can apply to every country and independent and diverse paths for development. They simply need to be recognized as goals, called what they are – Universal Development Goals (UDGs) – and specified with targets that can be measured and provide the basis for actions and not just words on paper.

This article does not establish what the specific targets should be. That is for

the peoples of the world to decide in offering the full potential of their creativity and aspirations. It simply refocuses the debate within the established legal framework that has been forgotten and shows not only that such a framework exists but that the aspirations are indeed measurable.

Table 3 reaffirms the visionary model of development that is already enshrined in international law but has been forgotten. It presents the four categories of 13 universal international principles of development as UDGs in the left column. The right column offers reference to the professional measures that already exist for establishing the targets that make these actionable.

What is important to recognize is that the UDGs are not simply something imposed or induced on the poor by the rich. They are measures of “progress” in which all countries and individuals can continually monitor their own improvement.

Table 3. Universally Recognized Aspirations for Development (“Universal Development Goals”) and their Measures and Targets

1. Individual Development Goals:

	<i>Overall Objectives</i>	<i>Specific Measures</i>
1.	Physical (body) development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Longevity, growth, physical fitness, health indicators</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Universal health care; Sustainable livable cities – park space and recreational facilities and time in school, work, neighborhoods; bike lanes; Reduction of environmental pollutants</p>
2.	Mental development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Skills and multiple intelligences development (Gardner, 1993) as culturally appropriate and as based on individual cultural aspirations and talents as well as fitted to surrounding environment</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> Based on bottom-up decisions by individuals for their needs and aspirations, not top-down by States (Lempert, Briggs, et. al., 1995)</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Equal right to education rather than economically stratified schooling; Schools have the equivalent of laboratories, gardens, workshops; Integrated teaching with community field work and integrated with different age groups and with environment; Universal psychological care; Lifelong learning vouchers; Libraries, museums and arts development</p>
3.	Spiritual (appreciation of natural world) development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Not yet developed though under discussion by environmental educators and social studies educators (Lempert, Briggs, et. al. 1985)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Nature retreats and excursions in school curricula; rooftop and community garden spaces and green spaces; pets and plants; restoration and use of eco-systems (marine, riverine, forest, coast); Study of basic technologies and crafts within the outdoor environment; Study of ancestors’ technologies, cultures and ways of life as part of history and social science education beyond the classroom and as part of cultural education and tolerance education</p>
4.	Moral (appreciation of others as individuals) development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Moral awareness educational measures (Piaget, 1965; Higgins and Kohlberg, 1989)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Consumption and footprint targets for individuals; Family planning, contraception and relationship training and guidance mechanisms; Parenting, mentoring, role modeling and guidance systems in place;</p>

5.	Social (appreciation of community) development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Community attachment and amount of outmigration and brain drain; Local rituals and events and participation; percentage of tax contributions and donations of all kinds (Scotland, 2004; McConnell, 2002; Packham, 2008)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Volunteer work activities for all levels of society and all ages; Universal service but also de-militarization for those serving in militaries; Sustainable government systems through taxation not resource sales or foreign subsidy; Democratic experiential education (Lempert, Briggs et. al., 1995)</p>
6.	Cultural (appreciation of one's identity) development:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Bilingualism, cultural identification, cultural knowledge, historic preservation, museums</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> Reverse current rates of cultural and language loss</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Bilingual schooling and cultural knowledge; promote traditional language restoration and use of customs and skills, museums and exhibits</p>

2. Societal Level Development Goals

	<i>Overall Objectives</i>	<i>Development Goals</i>
7.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity for individuals	<p><u>Measurement:</u> "Gini" Coefficient for Distribution balanced by Culture Rights to Protect Differences in Consumption and Production as part of protecting cultural sustainability</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> Lower the gini coefficient through reducing the upper 1% and 25%. Qualify use of gini to assimilated urban or urbanizing groups.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> through taxes on wealth, income, and transfers but do not create a leveling effect or homogenizing effect in consumption among cultures in different environments with different choices.</p>
8.	Political equity/ Equal rights for individuals:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Governance mechanisms that change the balance of power and their actual use: juries, class action suits, private attorneys general; election barriers; civilian control of military and police within cultural context (Lempert, 2009b; 2011)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Model constitutions adapted (Lempert, 1994); Participatory civics skills education to certified levels</p>
9.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for individuals:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> National and Local Peace Indices (Institute for Economics and Peace/ IEP)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Civilian re-immersion training for those serving in military; Swedish model re-introduction of military resistance training; Negotiation skills training and conflict</p>

	resolution/mediation; Gun control, elimination of death penalty; de-institutionalization and re-absorption of prison populations
--	--

3. Cultural/ Community Level Goals

	<i>Overall Objectives</i>	<i>Development Goals</i>
10.	Sustainability/ (sovereignty) of cultures:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Cultural red book measures for cultural endangerment (Lempert, 2010); Global sustainability measures (Brown, 1991; Center for the Advancement of a Steady State Economy)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> Reverse current rate of cultural extinction</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Sustainable development plans at the cultural level for 50 to 100 years (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008); Sustainability transitions (Daly, 2011; Dietz and O'Neil, 2013; Lempert, McCarty and Mitchell, 1995, 1998)</p>

4. Global Development Goals

	<i>Overall Objectives</i>	<i>Development Goals</i>
11.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity of cultures:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Cultural red book measures for cultural endangerment (Lempert, 2010)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Natural resource/ wealth accounting on a national and cultural basis as well as per capita to assure maintenance; Accession to cultural rights enforcement in international courts of justice</p>
12.	Political equity/ Equal rights for cultures:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Measures of federalism assuring minority culture vetoes and control of national and international military and police forces; designations for minorities in legislatures; designations for minority blocks in selection of judges (Lempert, 2009b)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Federalism objectives in legislatures, courts, and control of militaries as well as in UN system, itself</p>
13.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for protection of cultures:	<p><u>Measurement:</u> Global Peace Indices (Institute for Economics and Peace/ IEP; Galtung, 1975); De-colonialization of institutions (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011) and of dependency (Lempert, 2009)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u> To be negotiated</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> Sustainable development plans for all countries; Footprint reduction for all countries; Dependency reduction and lack of foreign dependency on outside for key areas for major cultures (e.g., energy)</p>

6. Conclusion: Breaking the Cycle and Achieving Human Progress

Since the industrial revolution, authors have been writing about how humans have become alienated from nature, alienated from each other, in communities that are failing and in ways in which they are “growing up absurd” (Goodman, 1947, 1956; Roszak, 1978). The international community already has a way to overcome the absurdity, to create meaning, to define “progress” and to promote human aspirations in the way of “development”. It needs to remember what they are, dream again, and face the reality of what is likely to happen if these principles, designed to stave off the next world war, are not followed.

It is time to focus again on the earlier consensus reached by humanity. It is time to follow those agreements in an enlightened vision for humanity that offers measures of progress before choosing a dark vision of humans simply as animals satisfying basic consumption needs.

We already have a blueprint for Universal Development Goals. We need to agree on the measures and set targets. It is a process in which everyone can consider his or her own aspirations for individual development, for community protections and development and for real human “progress” for all countries and peoples, not just of meeting basic needs in the most exploited countries.

The MDGs did not offer anything to measure for the U.S. or Europe or Japan but the UDGs do. And it is easy to see if they are moving forward or backwards. (In many ways, it is clear that they are moving backwards; regressing and either stagnating or reversing development!) In political action, one can use the UDGs as a standard for political leaders. Are they promoting development and progress or are they actually limiting humanity and regressing? The same can be applied to the international system, itself, to see whether governments are protecting or failing humanity. The answers may explain why governments may fear to be held to these standards.

For personal development, one can try to measure one’s status in a way that is separate just from material goods and comparative well being, but that considers the whole person and being human. For community development, one can consider personal and community. The results one finds on the individual and community level may also not be pleasant, but they do offer motivations to act.

Governments and the international community are currently using measures that seem to push the world to its lowest common denominator. Appeals are made to “security” or to animal needs but not to real peace or development or progress. The UDGs are not only a way to direct action but a test of where we are, where we are going and whether we are being led or mis-led.

The international community developed them for good reason. Human reason suggests that we must reaffirm this legacy of face the consequences of another World War.



Bibliography

Beninion, Francis Alan Roscoe (2009). *Understanding Common Law Legislation: Drafting and Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Lester (1981), *Building a Sustainable Society*, Worldwatch Institute, New York: W.W. Norton.

Brown, Lester (1984 to 2001), *State of the World* (Annual Series), Worldwatch Institute, New York: W. W. Norton.

Center for the Advancement of the Steady State Economy, www.steadystate.org

Cross, Rupert (1995). *Statutory Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daly, Herman (2011), "Moving from a Failed Growth Economy to a Steady State Economy," Presentation to the AAAS (unpublished).

DeVries, R. & Zan, B. (1994). "Moral Children: Constructing a Constructivist Atmosphere in Early Education." New York: Teachers College Press.

Dietz, Rob and Dan O'Neil, (2013). *Enough is Enough: Ideas for a Sustainable Economy in a World of Finite Resources*. San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Galtung, Johan (1975) *Essays in Peace Research, Volume 1*. Copenhagen: Eljers. pp. 334-339.

Gardner, Howard (1993). *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodman, Paul, (1956). *Growing Up Absurd*. New York: Vintage.

Goodman, Paul and Perceival (1947). *Communitas: Means of Livelihood and Ways of Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gunder Frank, Andre, James D. Cochroft and Dale L. Johnson, (1972), *Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP), on the web at: www.economicsandpeace.org

Jamieson, Neil. *Understanding Vietnam*, University of California Press, Los Angeles, California, 1993.

- Kohlberg, L. & Turiel, E. (1971). "Moral development and moral education". In G. Lesser, ed. *Psychology and Educational Practice*. Scott Foresman.
- Lempert, David. (Unpublished manuscript). *Copycat Pirates of "Indo-China": The Vietnamese Identity through Time*. On File with Author.
- Lempert, David (2011), "Democracy Building Democratic Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations," *Global Jurist*, Volume 11, Issue 2, Article 4: www.bepress.com/gj/vol11/iss2/art4/
- Lempert, David (2009). "A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations," *Global Jurist*. Volume 9, Issue 2, Article 6. <http://www.bepress.com/gj/vol9/iss2/art6>
<http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/gj.2009.9.2/gj.2009.9.2.1296/gj.2009.9.2.1296.xml?rskey=kmzvhP&result=1&q=Lempert,%20David>
- Lempert, David (2009b), "A Human Rights Education Project Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations," *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy*, November, 2009 Volume 3, Number 1, 2010. <http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/view/617/713> and supplementary file. Also at: www.ried-ijed.org
- "Ukraine's New Constitution: Continuity Under the Banner of Change with a Proposal for Authoritarian to Democratic Transitions," *Demokratizatsiya*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Spring 1994. On the web at: <http://www.demokratizatsiya.org/Dem%20Archives/DEM%2002-02%20lempert.pdf>
- Lempert, David (2010). "Why We Need a Cultural Red Book for Endangered Cultures, Now," *International Journal of Minority and Group Rights*, Fall/Winter 2010, No. 17
Also available on Web: <http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/home>
- Lempert, David (2014), "A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons," *Journal of Economics and Social Policy*, (forthcoming). On the web at:
- Lempert, David and Hue Nhu Nguyen (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, 2008. <http://inderscience.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,3,6;journal,1,1;linkingpublicationresults,1:121226,1>
Reprinted at: <http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n8page4.html>
- Lempert, David and Nguyen Nhu Hue (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*, Volume 7, No. 1.

<http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol7iss1/1006-031.lempert.html>

Reprinted in *Mother Pelican*:

<http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n10page4.htmlv>

Lempert, David, Kim McCarty, and Craig Mitchell (1995, 1998). *A Model Development Plan: New Strategies and Perspectives*. Greenwood/ Praeger Publishers: Westport, Connecticut.

Lempert, David with Xavier Briggs and others (1995). *Escape From the Ivory Tower: Student Adventures in Democratic Experiential Education*, Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers/ Simon & Schuster.

Logan, William S. and Askew, Marc. *Cultural Identity and Urban Change in Southeast Asia*. Deakin University Press: Geelong, 1994.

McConnell, Charlie (2002). *Community Learning and Development: The Making of an Empowering Profession*. Edinburgh: Community Learning Scotland.

Packham, Carol (2008). *Active Citizenship & Community Learning*. Exeter: Learning Matters Ltd.

Piaget, J. (1965). *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. The Free Press: New York.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Roszak, Theodore (1978). *Person: Planet: The Creative Disintegration of Industrial Society*. New York: Doubleday.

Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*, New York: Harper and Row.

Scotland Government, (2004). *Guidance for Community Learning and Development: Working and Learning Together to Build Stronger Communities*, on the web at: Community Learning and Development website.

Sen, Amartya and Mahbub ul Haq, (1990), *United Nations Human Development Report*.

Sutherland, Jabez Gr. (2010). *Statutes and Statutory Construction*, Nabu Press.

United Nations Charter (1945), 59 Stat. 1031 (June 26).

U.N. Convention in the Rights of the Child (1989), GA 44/25, November 20.

<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>

- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (1992), *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*.
<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>
- U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948).
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/genocide.htm>
- U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966). On the web at:
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>
- U.N. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966). On the web at: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/cescr.htm>
- U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, (2007).
<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.
On the web at: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>
See also: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- United Nations (2013), “Report of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda: A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development”, May 30.
- United Nations (2013), “2013 Fact Sheet on the MDGs”
On the web at: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/environshtml>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, (1979). "An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order." *The Capitalist World Economy*. New York: Cambridge U. Press.

Acknowledgments: Thanks to Professor Paul Kingston, head of the Critical Development Studies Department at the University of Toronto, for challenging the author to outline a positive definition of “development.”