DISTINGUISHING DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES FROM COLONIAL BUREAUS EXERCISING SOFT POWER: REFORMING IMPERIAL ECONOMICS AND ITS ADMINISTRATION*

David Lempert

This article offers a method for examining the actual functions of agencies that identify as doing 'development' work, both overseas and domestically, in a way that helps to separate two areas of legitimate functions – development as defined under international legal instruments and 'disaster management' (along with relief, poverty reduction, and global risks to health and climate) – from inappropriate or illegal activities that fit various definitions of colonialism (including internal) and imperialism in contemporary globalization. Quick applications can be used to screen several international and domestic 'development' organizations to suggest partial or serious deviations from their stated missions. Use of a two-part test suggests that most international organizations, government 'development' agencies, and agencies with domestic roles for 'development' are failing to separate disaster management functions from development and/or are pursuing colonial policies under the guise of development. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is offered as a brief case study.

Keywords: *development agencies, globalization, hegemony, colonialism, soft power, imperialism, sovereignty, functional analysis, public administration, UNDP.*

Introduction

As this article is being written, policy debates are continuing in several countries over the appropriate missions and functions of 'development' agencies and their boundaries. In Britain, the Department for International Development (DFID), is questioning its relations to the European Commission's (EC's) agencies and also posing questions as to whether it should retain an independent organization to promote its own foreign policy interests and to prioritize different goals from the EC. Both the EC and DFID question whether their role should be one of promoting "trade" or "aid". In the U.S., the role of the Agency for International Development (USAID) has at various times been seen as either quasi-independent or subservient to U.S. foreign policy interests, with questions of whether "aid" must also serve specific national interests, as well as the boundaries between USAID and other agencies promoting U.S. interests overseas such as the U.S. Commerce Department. Meanwhile, several countries that are themselves receiving foreign aid and 'development bank' loans are, themselves, running their own 'aid' projects and providing loans to their poorer or weaker neighbors. Within their own borders, these countries that are both donors and recipients have domestic agencies that have their own

stated 'development' missions, such as departments of 'agriculture and rural development' and 'minority peoples' or 'mountain peoples' commissions that claim to be 'developing' them. 'Developed' countries also have such bureaus for 'urban development' and minority peoples' affairs (such as the 'Bureau of Indian Affairs' in the United States).

In the theory and history of public administration, the emergence of 'development' agencies both internationally (as adjuncts of Ministries of Foreign Affairs) and domestically, is relatively new and the appropriateness or legitimacy of their interventions in 'development' in fulfilling the definitions and standards of 'development' under international law is subject to question (Lempert 2014b). While there is a healthy debate today over the measures and goals of 'development', there is less examination of the actual public administration of the functions of 'development' within public administration as well as its relative position to other domestic and foreign agencies, as well as international agencies.

Not only are there conflicts of interest between goals of promoting business and other powerful interests or cultural hegemony and the requirements of international development laws and related treaties (Lempert 2012) that blur the goals of commerce with 'development,' but there are also several joint international concerns for global protections in areas of health, security, climate control, and disaster management that are legitimate international relations functions that are easily blurred in interventions falling under the rubric of 'development'.

Governments have typically recognized the functions of foreign affairs in the promotion of peace and security as well as cross boundary concerns, while seeking to fit 'development' somewhere into this agenda, but have offered less attention to protecting international development objectives from being subservient to or manipulated and replaced by conflicts of interest. At the same time, domestically, the functions and missions of providing for general welfare of communities has often been merged with 'development' of those communities in ways that promote central government objectives for control and advance that are also rife with conflicts of interest and without safeguards or protections of community and individual rights that are part of the internationally recognized commitments of 'development'.

In recent articles, this author identified the elements that constitute the consensus under international law for 'development' that are universally recognized and embedded in international laws and treaties (Lempert 2014a, 2014b) and also distinguished and defined the elements for international interventions to achieve the very different goal of 'poverty reduction' (Lempert 2016c). This 'codification' of international development law offers the tools for measuring legal compliance and for holding international donors, multi-lateral development banks and other international organizations, and international non-governmental organizations accountable.[1]

What these measures reveal is that most organizations that self-identify as 'development' banks or 'development' agencies are not in fact engaged in 'development' or 'poverty reduction' under the standards of international law. In fact, they are doing something else that includes both legitimate and illegitimate functions. These tests, however, merely reveal what these agencies are not doing to meet internationally agreed goals of 'development'. They do not specify what they are doing which raises the question. If 'development' agencies in international development, and, indeed, those agencies in recipient, 'developing' countries, that also define themselves

as 'development' Ministries or agencies, are not doing 'development' (Lempert 2015b), what is it that they are doing and is it a legitimate public function? Are these activities in violation of international law? If not, are they simply misnamed or misplaced, calling for administrative reform for better effectiveness and accountability of legitimate public functions? Moreover, given that international 'development' objectives apply to powerful and wealthy countries as well as poor and weak, since 'development' is viewed as a continuous process of social progress and not creation of conformity to a single form of human organization, are these functions appropriately recognized and placed within government structures so that they can be fulfilled?

This article offers a method for examining the actual functions of agencies that identify as doing 'development' work, both overseas and domestically, in a way that helps to separate two areas of legitimate functions – development as defined under international legal instruments and 'disaster management' (including relief, poverty reduction, and global risks to health and climate) – from inappropriate or illegal activities that fit various definitions of colonialism (including internal) and imperialism. An understanding of these and other functions can help to improve government efficiency in the rational placement of functions as well as allow for citizen and international oversight to expose illegitimate functions.

While there are no specific measures or ratings of agencies as a whole, the criteria in this article can be used to hold specific programs and budget categories to public administration standards and can be used in conjunction with previously published legal accountability indicators in the development field that are published by the author. Quick applications of the elements offered in the article can be used to screen several international and domestic 'development' organizations to suggest partial or serious deviations from their stated missions.

The print version of this article is a very short version of the full article that will appear later on this journal's internet site. That article will offer more comprehensive documentation and argument for what is admittedly a very complex subject condensed even there in a short space and requiring a concentrated effort by readers beyond that of most articles. This version is annotated to note where readers may wish to seek the substantive discussions in the longer piece.

The article begins with an overview of the structure and principles of contemporary government administration, highlighting the place that both internal development functions and international development and related international relations functions fit, noting the lack of clear logic of many of these functions in contemporary government structures.

The article then details the specific functions of international relations agencies apart from 'development' and notes the potential for overlaps and conflicts if the separate missions are not clearly delineated.

The following section summarizes the international post-World War II consensus embodied in international law that defines 13 specific aspects of 'development' as well as establishes guidelines and enforcement for some of them, as well as how these are distinguished from other international disaster management functions that are distinct from development, including poverty alleviation and relief. It is also possible to link the 13 specific 'development' roles with expertise in domestic government agencies rather than to assume they are all separate functions to be carried out by 'international' experts or by 'development' experts.

With the international community's legal definitions of 'development', it is then possible to distinguish international interventions that are based on conflicts of interest and that promote either direct economic benefit (colonialism) in violation of sustainability, cultural survival and sovereign 'development' choices of foreign cultures and communities, or direct military benefit (imperialism). Both the mechanisms and the detail goals of those mechanisms that are employed by strong countries and cultures over weaker ones are enumerated.

Given clear definitions and distinctions of development from other legitimate international interventions and from illegitimate (colonial and imperial) development interventions, it is possible to design two quick tests that can be used to determine whether governmental organizations in the area of development have appropriately separated functions for efficiency and avoidance of conflict of interest and whether they screen for and prevent the appropriate international legal approach to development from being usurped by colonial and imperial agendas.

Use of this two-part test suggests that most international organizations, government "development" agencies, and agencies with domestic roles for "development" are failing to separate disaster management functions from development and/or are pursuing colonial policies under the guise of development with no attempts to screen or prevent conflicts of interest that undermine international development law and goals. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is offered as a brief case study in applying the two part test.

Principles of Governmental Professionalism and of Theoretical Place for Development (General)

While there does not appear to be any formulaic approach for the placement of the role of 'development' in public administration theory, partly because the ideas of 'development' and its components like 'sustainable development' are relatively recent, it is possible to derive the places that these roles would fit, both in domestic government functions and in international affairs functions of governments. Taking an inductive approach to the structuring of government administration reveals different theories of government organization that are used today and shows where 'development' functions fit, while also helping to troubleshoot missing functions in contemporary government systems.

Overview of Public Administration Systems

Though most public administration theory seems to focus on issues of accountability and efficiency, rather than government administration structure (Bryson 1988; Emmanuel, Merchant, and Otley 1990; Garrison, Noreen, and Brewer 2005; Nelson and Quick 2005; Robbins 2002; Szporluk 2009), there have been studies of government organization looking at various government 'functions' and where they are placed (Lyden 1975; Myakawa 2000). The United Nations, itself, has been involved in a number of projects with governments, with the stated goal of helping to improve performance of government Ministries, internally, and to eliminate overlaps in overall government structures, under the rubric of 'public administration reform' and 'functional analysis'. Though the author has worked as a consultant in some of these projects, there is no standardized 'textbook' approach to such work.

Regardless of the political form of government – whether a country is a 'developed' country, a 'democracy', a colonial government administered by an outside power and its military, a one-party military dictatorship, or other form of rule – the general organization of public administration systems is similar at the national level. What makes governments different are the roles of citizens in and strength of the judiciary, the legislative branch, local governments, and civil society.

The general role of public administration is the same: that of measuring and protecting a country's assets in all forms (though the ownership and administration of those assets differs with the distributions of economic and political power) with two competing but complementary goals; improving and developing the productivity of and enjoyment from those assets and protecting those assets for future generations. Most public administration analysis focuses on the strength, efficiency and accountability of these functions for the different assets rather than the overall logic of where they fit in a public administration system.

Overall, government agencies can be seen to fit three overall levels of functions for the protection and development of assets.

– At the upper level are agencies for coordination of the various assets. As the ideas of 'development' and 'sustainable development' are recognized, these overall coordination functions would fit into such policy areas. In many governments, today, there are 'planning agencies' (many of them holdovers from the countries of the former Soviet Union and those under their influence that had 'State Plans' but others like MITI in Japan) that are often those of 'planning and investment' and that essentially weigh economic investments.

– At a second level are general government administration functions, including security functions.

– The bulk of government administration is the 'line agencies' that identify and implement policies relating to various types of 'assets'.

At the level of line agencies, there currently seem to be two competing logics for the description and oversight of government assets.

– One logic for government organization, that perhaps has its roots in colonialism, is one of inventories of assets that have an economic value (farm land, minerals, forest, *etc.*), with other functions for their direct control.

– A second logic places assets in categories of human activity (economic, social, and political), though the historic focus has generally been on economic productive activities. Recent concepts of "human capital" and "social capital" are recognized in expanded functions in new agencies.

Placement of Development Functions within Public Administration Systems
Even though one may not be able to find any 'development' agency or ministry in a government system today, making it difficult to identify where international development agencies should coordinate their efforts in countries where they intervene (other than directly with the offices of Presidents or Prime Ministers), it is clear where these functions should fit in the overall scheme of government administration. It is also clear how such functions and interventions are corrupted and they fulfill different functions (placed elsewhere) or inappropriate functions (not in the logic of protection of national assets).

Tables 1, 2 and 3 below, offer an idealized, though highly abbreviated, view of national level public administration functions. The three tables present the three levels of functions described above. What goes beyond this (and will be detailed in following sections) are the specific relations across the three levels in the areas of 'development' and international affairs.

Table 1 presents the overall planning functions. This is exactly where 'development' fits and is also something lacking almost everywhere today. In this Table, the functions of 'development' are split into two planning categories. One is 'sustainable development' in line with international treaties and professional measures for the long-term balance of production and consumption within the constraints of the environment, for countries and for cultures and communities within countries (Lempert and Nguyen 2008). The second is the overall goal of the society for defining and promoting 'progress' in various areas that it chooses, such as technological/economic, social, and political. Countries that today have Ministries of 'Planning and Investment' are based on the colonial model of 'growth' and returns, that may or may not be sustainable, but without any clear social and political progress goals. Since the international community defines a consensus of goals on progress (Lempert 2014a, 2014b, 2016b).), they could be incorporated here as the basic goals, with additional goals added by countries. A third category is that of international agreements for long-term global goals and planning beyond those already established in the categories of sustainable development and other areas of development and progress.

Table 2 presents a list of other overall government management functions that apply to all of the line functions. The three main areas are those of international security and domestic security (to protect the system as a whole) and the system of government administration, itself. This table is important in understanding the difference between 'development' functions, that are part of a long-term planning process and entirely in Table 1, and overall system protections that are for short-term, security of the overall system. Many of the system protection functions that are found in Table 2 (particularly those that fall under the categories of Disaster Management and Security, including functions like short-term Disaster Relief, as well as Poverty Alleviation and that are highlighted in full in the expanded tables, Table 4 and Table 5, explained further below) are confused with 'development' but they are not 'development'. International laws and other legal documents are very clear in establishing the distinctions (Lempert 2014a, 2015d).

All three tables, and particularly Table 3, with the presentation of line functions in categories of national 'assets' as well as areas of human activity (economic, social, and political) as well as of individual human development and protection, include a category for 'complementary and counterbalancing' functions. This column is the key to differentiating whether government functions are 'developing' and protecting assets sustainably or whether they are exploiting them for short-term benefit. While short-term and unsustainable exploitation could simply be a sign of incompetent public administration that is a form of self-destruction, it is more commonly an indicator of some form of colonial or imperial exploitation, either by those outside the system who have no stake in its long-term well-being and progress, or part of a particular group inside the system that seeks to exploit groups and resources over which it has power. Often these two groups are working together.

The idea of these complementary and counterbalancing functions is one of the key features of sustainable development and of development and progress. On the one hand, government administration of assets seeks to promote their beneficial use and it researches and invests in the means of doing so. At the same time, there must be a counterbalancing administration of those assets to protect their overuse and to assure their sustainability and viability. These functions are competing and they must be clearly separate and balanced in order to meet conditions of sustainability and development.

In most colonial systems (both in colonies and in the governments of imperial administration) and former colonial systems, the protection functions have yet to be developed in the same way that the idea of social activity (and social structures and equality) and political activity (and political structures and equality) are not seen as assets to protect and develop.

Higher level functions (those in Tables 1 and 2) also need to be counterbalanced to assure sustainable development and progress. For example, the administration of 'security' through military functions (internationally) and police and penal institutions (domestically) needs to be balanced by functions that promote systems of peace, tolerance and conflict resolution (internationally and domestically) as well as respect for rights and for rehabilitation of offenders (domestically). Generally, these systems are weak or non-existent in colonial systems and former colonial systems, which also characterize most governments today.

These Tables are a useful basis for distinguishing appropriate development functions from other legitimate functions domestically and internationally (such as disaster management and other functions related to global peace and security) as well as those that are inappropriate. Governments that place 'development' in line ministries and without the full set of functions that are envisioned as development (Lempert 2014b and presented in detail below, particularly in Table 6) or that create ministries for specific groups (indigenous or minority or rural communities) are likely viewing peoples directly as assets to be exploited by those not members of those groups. Those are signs of inappropriate, colonial exploitation.

Note that while the appropriate workings of a public administration system require public oversight, enforcement, and equitable interest balancing through empowered representative legislatures and fully representative, openly accessible, empowered judicial systems, the role of the legislature and judiciary is not to define sustainable development and progress simply on the basis of interest balancing. The basic concepts and measures of both sustainable development and what can be described now under international law as 'universal development goals' (Lempert 2015d), though few actually speak of them this way, are fixed. The role of the legislature and judiciary is to crystallize the society's choices for defining its long-term measures of 'progress' and to add these to its planning system so that there are specific measurements for achieving these goals and public spending projects to efficiently realize them.

Note also that this scheme is a simplification of a very complex process of government organization and determining all of the sub-functions with regard to each type of human activity and asset. Invariably, setting boundaries and dealing with overlaps of line functions – *e.g.*, in areas of education, health and safety, policing, – partly involves a bit of art and not entirely a science, to consider all potential uses and protections and to place functions where they will be effectively performed.

The logic of establishing 'functions' and defining them in terms of 'promotion' and 'protection' is also one for seeking to establish specific responsibility of government officials that can be measured in ways as to hold them accountable. Many governments today define 'areas' of public administration by category, as well as tasks, but do not define specific "missions" of public officials. The defining of functions as 'missions' with specific tasks to further those missions (*e.g.*, research the methods of promotion of an asset and the measures of impact of each, design projects to promote an asset, implement those; research the methods of protection of an asset and measures of impact of each, design projects to protest an asset; implement those) can be used as measures of accountability of departments and specific staff.

Table 1

Idealized Government Functions in Model of Governmental Organization: Overarching Planning and Balancing Functions

General Area of Activity	Specific Area of Activity	Assets Protected	Complementary and Counterbalancing Functions
Promoting Various forms of "Progress" and "Development" (Domestic and International)	Planning (Social and Political Sector)	Human Assets	Disaster Management; [Role of Legislature and Judiciary]
Sustainable Development Planning (Domestic)	Planning, Census and Statistics	All (Particularly Natural and Infrastructure)	Disaster Management: [Role of Legislature and Judiciary]
International Treaty Compliance	Global Rights Protections	All	Short-Term Security Concerns; [Role of Legislature and Judiciary]
	International Conflict Resolution	All	[Role of Legislature and Judiciary]

Table 2

Idealized Government Functions in Model of Governmental Organization: General Governmental Administration and Protection Functions

General Area of Activity	Specific Area of Activity	Assets Protected	Complementary and Counterbalancing Functions
International Security	Military	All	Peace promotion and direct public oversight, with local police and militias as counterforce
	Disaster Management	All	Long-Term Development (Table 1)
	Commerce (Promoting Product Sales, not Investment)		Both promotion and protection, with public regulation and oversight as the counter

	Justice system for public oversight of commerce	*All*	–
	Peace, Tolerance and Respect Promotion, Domestically	All	Military
Domestic Security	Police and Prosecutor	All	Peace and conflict resolution along with public regulation and oversight, including judicial, as counter
	Offender rehabilitation system	All	Police, prosecution and prison system
	Justice system for conflict resolution	*All*	–
	Commerce	All	Self-sufficiency and sustainability
	Self-sufficiency and sustainability	All	Commerce
	Justice system for oversight of commerce	All	–
	Peace, Conflict resolution, love and Respect	All	Police and Prosecutor
	Disaster Management	All	Long-Term Planning and Balancing (Table 1)
Government Administration	Finance/Treasury	Public Assets	[Legislature and Judiciary]
	Auditing, Monitoring and Inspectorate	Public Assets	[Legislature and Judiciary]
/International Coordination	Foreign Diplomacy: Long and Short Term Interest Promotion	All	–
/Overall	Justice system for oversight of government	All	–

Table 3

Idealized Government Functions in Model of Governmental Organization: Line Ministry/Department Functions

General Area of Activity	*Specific Area of Activity*	*Assets Protected*	*Complementary and Counterbalancing Functions*
Human	Education	Human capital/	Both promotion and

Population Needs/ Human Resources		intellect and diversity	protection (sustainability/updating, efficiency, application)
		Libraries, Research institutions, Intellectuals	Both promotion and protection (sustainability/updating, efficiency, application)
	Health and safety (environmental, food, drug)	Human capital/health	Both promotion (nutrition, exercise, immunization and preventative) and protection (medical)
	Housing	Housing stock	Both promotion and protection (efficiency, sustainability)
	Welfare (Age, Disabilities, etc.)	Human physical/genetic and lifecycle diversity	Both promotion (security, productivity) and protection (insurance, quality of life)
	Labor	Workplace skills and safety	Both promotion (sustainability/updating, efficiency, application) and protection (unions/bargaining, health/safety)
Economic Productivity	Agriculture (and its natural inputs/assets and *infrastructure*)	Commercial value plants and animals	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability, efficiency, equity)
		Soil	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
		Water	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
		Dams and Irrigation	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability and efficiency)
		Private agricultural infrastructure and technology,	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability and

		including demonstration projects (some overlaps)	efficiency)
	Aquaculture (and its natural inputs/assets and *infrastructure*)	Commercial value aquatic species	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability, efficiency, equity)
		Coast and Rivers	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
	Forestry (and its natural inputs/assets)	Commercial Timber and Non-Timber Forest	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
	Mining (and its natural inputs/assets)	Minerals	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
	Industry, Science and Technology	(Overlap with Human Resources)	Both promotion (value/ competitiveness) and protection (sustainability, efficiency, equity)
	Tourism (and its natural and human made inputs/assets)	Parks	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
		Patrimony (with overlaps with Culture Agency)	Both promotion (value) and protection (sustainability)
	Energy	Renewable and Non-Renewable Assets	Both promotion (value, efficiency) and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption)
Public Infrastructure and Owned Assets	Transportation	Roads, Bridges, Ports, Rail, Energy systems	Both promotion (value, efficiency) and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption)
	Communications	Satellite systems, Telecommunications	Both promotion (value, efficiency) and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption, privacy)

	Public Works	Markets, Public event and political spaces	Both promotion (value, efficiency) and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption)
Natural Public Assets	Public Lands	National parks, buffer zones	Both promotion (enjoyment, efficiency) and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption)
	Biodiversity and Environment	All species and ecosystems	Both promotion (enjoyment, efficiency, natural "services") and protection (sustainability, reduced consumption)
	Weather/Climate and Meteorology	Air and climate quality, unobstructed sun	Both promotion (enjoyment, efficiency, natural "services") and protection (sustainability, reduced pollution and climate change)
	Air and Space	Natural assets of increasing value with space exploration	Both promotion (enjoyment, efficiency, knowledge and exploration) and protection (sustainability/reduced pollution and space junk, reduced consumption)
Social Sphere (Social Capital/ Human Created Assets)	Urban Communities	Integrated sustainable cities, ethnic districts	Both promotion (restoration, livability) and protection (sustainability)
	Rural Communities	Cohesive sustainable ethnic and geographic communities	Both promotion (restoration, livability) and protection (sustainability)
	Culture	Heritage	Both promotion (restoration, livability) and protection (sustainability)
		Arts	Both promotion and protection
		Civil Society	Both promotion and protection (traditional),

			not replacement or control
	Minority Communities	Cultural Diversity and Survival	Both Protection and Promotion/ Restoration (not assimilate or exploit)
	Family	Relationship quality and networks for socialization and care	Both promotion and protection (not elimination or replacement)
Political Sphere	Individual (Civil) Rights	Enumerated rights, protections and pride with tolerance consciousness	Both promotion (equity) and protection (enforcement, balance with community rights)
	Community Rights (Ethnic Federalism)	Enumerated rights, protections and pride with tolerance consciousness	Both promotion (equity) and protection (enforcement, balance with individual rights)
	Local Governance	Various levels of public institutions and systems	Both promotion (local autonomy, culture, sustainability) and protection (revenue sharing, military and economic power to protect the autonomy)
	Civil society organizations	Various private and community institutions	Both promotion (equity) and protection (enforcement, balance with individual and community rights)

Placement of Development Agency Functions within International Governance Functions and Separating Functions of Development from Functions of Disaster Management and Other Possible Overlaps

While 'development' is among the domestic missions of governments for achieving sustainability and achieving certain ends of 'progress', it is also a potential function of all governments in their international relations. As but one of many possible line functions of governments in international interventions, it can be distinguished in different ways from these other functions as part of a logic of oversight and efficiency of international affairs functions. Expanding and clarifying the functions of government in international relations for short-term conflict resolution and international crises and for long-term promotion of international interests helps to separate the legitimate functions of international development from other functions.

The previous tables showed how the general function of global development was part of overall policy functions (Table 1) and differed, in international relations, from the security concerns of governments for their overall protections (Table 2).

Tables 4 and 5 take these different international functions from these previous tables and place them together to show how they relate to each other for coordination and to define their boundaries (including conflicts of interest that require their separation).

Table 4 defines categories of international affairs functions by the interests that governments try to promote and whether they are long-term and global or short-term national (self)-interest. Within these two overall categories of long-term global and short-term national interest, the short-term interests can be divided into short-term functions that need to be balanced, since they can lead to colonialism or imperialism if they are not checked by global interests, and those that do not seem to present such danger.

In the category of functions that promote short-term interests and that have the danger of leading to colonialism or imperialism are military, commercial, and information promoting functions. All of these functions are legitimate parts of protecting security and promoting national interest, but if they are not checked by international law and by national self-restraint to promote long-term global interests of sustainable development, autonomy, and peace, they lead to dangers.

Note that in this table 'development' is in the category of long-term global interest functions and in this category only. Also in the category of long-term global interest functions is disaster management (*e.g*., management of climate change). Disaster management is a security function and it has components of both long-term and short term national security protection; some which provide for long-term global security and some that are just national security concerns (*e.g*., providing relief to neighbors to prevent regional refugee crises).

Table 5 takes the same two broad categories and presents each of the line functions identified in the second column of Table 4 as separate lines in the left column. The purpose of the table is to identify each of these line functions as separate and distinct from the function of 'development' (that is not listed in the table). Though functions like 'relief' and 'poverty alleviation' and 'disaster management' (in general) are often identified as development functions of international development agencies in

their interventions, the international community sees them as distinct and they are presented distinctly in this table. The second column in the table helps to explain the need for these distinctions by stressing the conflicts of interest and overlaps that can occur between these separate functions and 'development'. (The longer piece describes in more detail some of the confusion that often occurs in distinguishing 'poverty alleviation' and 'development'.)

There is a reason why there continues to be confusion between "poverty alleviation" and "development", beyond the different motives that can apply. In many cases, "poverty alleviation" is seen as simply a short-term solution to reduce a foreign threat of civil disturbances or migration, or a way to manipulate weak countries or communities to take advantage of their weakness in order to exploit their labor, resources or markets. However, appropriate and sustainable development does in fact alleviate poverty, if poverty is defined as an imbalance with resources, rather than simply lower comparative consumption.

There are some 12 elements to effective poverty reduction that meets the goals of sustainable long-term reduction (rather than just short-term productivity increases that treat systems) and that also can promote long-term equity. Appropriate poverty reduction addresses key aspects of individual and social development through the achievement of long-term, sustainable absolute poverty reduction (to assure "physical development") and reducing economic inequality. Where such poverty reduction is actually a subset of sustainable development and is part of a long-term solution that respects local consumption choices with full cultural, community rights protections, it is not a separate function. A test for compliance with these elements can distinguish between "aid" under the name of "poverty reduction" that is not intended to create sustainability, long-term poverty reduction, or equity, at all, but is designed to treat symptoms, absorb cultures, and create neo-colonial dependency in a global system where the poor are forced to compete against each other everywhere (most current international interventions) and aid that focuses on root causes of imbalance and inequity with a focus on cultural protection and institutional change (Lempert 2015d).

This table is of immediate benefit in troubleshooting the allocation of government functions to "development" agencies, to assure that such agencies do not comingle functions that are not "development" and that have overlaps or conflicts of interest. The table can also be used as the basis of screening tools like one presented in this article, further below, as "Test 1", to examine whether development agencies are appropriately constituted.

Table 4

International Affairs Oversight Functions and Relations to Line Ministry/Departments

International Affairs Oversight Functions	*Related Line Ministry/Department Functions*
Foreign Diplomacy: Short-Term Interest Promotion that is appropriate but requires checks against abuse	Military; Commerce; Information and Promotion
Foreign Diplomacy: Short-Term Conflict Resolution	International Law Enforcement/Legal Accountability and International Governance (including Indemnifications); Global Security Management/Short-Term Threat Management (Poverty Alleviation, Cross-Border Crime Prevention); Relief (Crisis Insurance)
Foreign Diplomacy: Long-Term Global Interest Promotion [The Counterbalancing Function to Above]	International Development; Disaster Management (Long-Term)

Table 5

International Affairs Line Functions Other than "Development" (Long-Term, Humanitarian Support)

Line Ministry/Department in International Affairs Functions	*Potential Conflicts or Overlaps with International Development Law Requirements*
International Obligations	
Disaster Management (of Non-Military, Natural Threats)	Yes, conflicts and overlaps: the approach is to deal with threats and symptoms in ways that can distort local approaches and sustainability
- Climate and Space Threats	(Same as above)
- Disease control	(Same as above)
- Pest control	(Same as above)
Global Security Management (of Other Human Created Threats)	Yes, overlaps and conflicts: Poverty alleviation is often substituted for "development" and creates dependency rather than sustainability
- Poverty Alleviation	(Same as above)
- Cross Border Crime Prevention	(Same as above0
Relief (Crisis Insurance; an adjunct of disaster management)	Yes, conflicts: relief can create a culture of dependency
International Law Enforcement/Legal Accountability and International Governance	Yes, conflicts: nothing creates legal accountability of the stronger to the weaker and laws and agreements are easily overridden and unenforced, including replacing laws with other conflicting agreements (trade and investor protection agreements, "Development" goals that redefine "development")
- Indemnification and Compensation (UXO, Agent Orange, Climate Change)	(Same as above)

National Self-Interest Promotion	
Military (Response to Military Threats)	Yes, conflicts: the forcing of alliances, sales of weapons, destabilization of "neutral" or strategic border countries
Commerce (short-term interests)	Yes, conflicts: promotion of commerce through marketing and agreements with country leaders can create vulnerability by undermining self-sufficiency and traditional practices of cultures in their environments
– Access to raw materials	(Same as above)
– Access to markets	(Same as above)
Information and Promotion	Yes, conflicts: promotion and information can easily become propaganda and cultural imperialism, changing values and culture

Principles of Development and Compliance with International Law, with Suggestions for Placement of Functions

While it is easy to separate out legitimate international affairs functions of government that are not development from those that are, it is more difficult to assure that the functions of a 'development' agency (whether for international development or forms of domestic development) do not include those functions that are outside the international legal definition of development and that are essentially outside the law. Interventions, both internationally and domestically, that have elements of colonialism or imperialism, are too often mixed in with 'development' functions without any type of screening or oversight; largely a result of the pernicious (and continuing) legacy of imperialism and colonialism. Where development is appropriate, there will already be specific line functions of government that exist to carry out these functions in the normal process of protecting and developing assets and activities at the national level and it is possible to link the 13 categories that the international community defines as legitimate 'development' objectives with these line functions. This section focuses on the ways to identify legitimate development functions under international law and their appropriate placement in public administration, while the next section offers some of the ways for spotting inappropriate development functions, disguising colonial and imperial agendas.

The international community recognizes 13 total elements of 'development' in four different categories. These are the areas of individual development (6): physical (body) development, mental/intellectual development in culturally appropriate ways, spiritual development (appreciation of the natural world), moral development (appreciation of others), social development (appreciation of one's community), and cultural development (appreciation of one's cultural identity); societal level development (3): social equity/ social progress/ equal opportunity for individuals, political equity/ equal rights for individuals, and peace/ tolerance/ demilitarization for individuals; cultural/community level development (1): sustainability (sovereignty) of cultures; and global development (3): social equity/ social progress/ equal opportunity for cultural survival and difference, political equity/ equal rights for cultures (effective federalism), and peace/ tolerance/ demilitarization for protection of cultures (Lempert 2014a, 2014b).

Given the clear international definition, it is easy to identify goals that constitute a set of 'Universal Development Goals' (UDGs) that offer clarity in the fulfillment of public administration line functions in the area of development. While the international community has created 'Millennium Development Goals' and 'Sustainable Development Goals', the reality is that these do not match what are already suggested under international law as 'Universal Development Goals' (Lempert 2014a).

Table 6 presents a summary form of these 13 categories of development and their linked Universal Development Goal missions in the left hand columns. In the right hand column are the specific line agencies in government that either already do or should have the responsibility for implementing these development functions and achieving the goals. Many of these can and do fall into the responsibility of different agencies given overlapping concerns, but could be assigned to specific agencies as the lead agency.

What Table 6 reveals is that while the specific functions of 'development' could be performed within existing line agencies in the 'donor' countries (some are and some are not, depending on the country's commitment to its own development, internally; largely a reflection of how effectively the country's national government is subject to community and public oversight and control) with this expertise then transferred from those agencies in the donor country to counterparts in a recipient country, this is not generally how international development agencies work today. In many cases, there are 'study tours' that include direct visits and exchanges and 'twinning' agreements, but often the 'development' intervention is not between line agencies and/or does not transfer expertise on the functions identified under international laws as development. This is not a conclusive test of whether or not a development agency is actually promoting development but it does raise questions as to whether or not its interventions are legitimate or have some other agenda.

It is also interesting to note from this table that many of the functions of development that a donor country (usually referred to as a 'developed' country) is supposed to be transferring because it already has expertise providing the same functions to its own citizens, may not in fact exist at all in the 'developed' country. Some 9 of the 13 internationally recognized areas of development may not be promoted at all or may only be weakly promoted in the so called 'developed' countries. These include two of the six areas of individual development: Social development and cultural development; all three areas of societal level development: social equity/social progress/equal opportunity for individuals, political equality/equal rights for individuals, and peace/tolerance/demilitarization for individuals, the level of cultural/community level development: sustainability of cultures, and all three areas of global development at the level of cultures: social equity/protection for cultures, effective federalism, and peace/demilitarization. Only four of the areas of development, all in the realm of individual development, seem to be promoted by public agencies in 'developed' countries and the record is certainly little better in weaker countries.

Table 6

Universally Recognized Aspirations for Development ("Universal Development Goals") and the Placement of Government Functions for Domestic and for Foreign Interventions

1.   Individual Development Goals:

	Overall Objectives	*Specific Measures*	*Placement of Function in National Government (Line Agencies) for Domestic Application and Links to International Intervention Agencies*
1.	Physical (body) development	<u>Measurement</u>: Longevity, growth, physical fitness, health indicators <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	Education; Health; Sports; Urban Planning; Public Works; Transportation; Environmental Protection; Labor
2.	Mental development	<u>Measurement</u>: Skills and multiple intelligences development as culturally appropriate and as based on individual cultural aspirations and talents as well as fitted to surrounding environment based on bottom-up decisions by individuals for their needs and aspirations, not top-down by States <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	Education; Health; Culture; Welfare; Labor; Community Planning (Urban Development Planning, Rural Development Planning)

3.	Spiritual (appreciation of natural world) development	<u>Measurement</u>: Not yet developed though under discussion by environmental educators and social studies educators <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	Education; Environment; Air and Space; Health; Culture; Public Lands
4.	Moral (appreciation of others as individuals) development	<u>Measurement</u>: Moral awareness educational measures <u>Actions</u>: Consumption and environmental impact ("footprint") targets for individuals; Family planning, contraception and relationship training and guidance mechanisms; Parenting, mentoring, role modeling and guidance systems in place;	Education; Community Planning: Family
5.	Social (appreciation of community) development	<u>Measurement</u>: Community affinity, participation, and attachment and amount of outmigration and "brain drain" (loss of the most capable people and their skills); Local rituals and events and participation; percentage of tax contributions and donations of all kinds <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	Community; Education; Labor

| 6. | Cultural (appreciation of one's identity) development | Measurement: Bilingualism, cultural identification, cultural knowledge, historic preservation, museums to reverse current rates of cultural and language loss
 Actions: Bilingual schooling and cultural knowledge; promote traditional language restoration and use of customs and skills, museums and exhibits | Culture; Education |

2.	**Societal Level Development Goals**

	Overall Objectives	*Specific Measures*	*Placement of Function in National Government (Line Agencies) for Domestic Application and Links to International Intervention Agencies*
7.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity for individuals	Measurement: 'Gini' Coefficient for Distribution (the standard sociological measure of income distribution) balanced by Culture Rights to Protect Differences/Preferences in Consumption and Production as part of protecting cultural sustainability to lower the gini coefficient through reducing the upper 1% and 25%. Qualify use of gini to assimilated urban or urbanizing groups. Actions: 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.	Individual Rights; Welfare
8.	Political equity/ Equal rights for	Measurement: Governance Mechanisms that change the balance of power and their actual use: juries,	Individual (Civil) Rights

	individuals:	class action lawsuits (where suits are maintained by large groups of citizens as a bloc), private attorneys general (where individual citizens can begin prosecutions on criminal laws to protect the public interest where government prosecutors do not prosecute, often due to conflicts of interest); electoral barriers (that make it difficult for additional parties or individuals to compete against elite interests including concentrations of private and corporate money and power); civilian control of military and police within cultural context Actions: Model constitutions adopted; Participatory civics skills education to certified levels	
9.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for individuals:	Measurement: National and Local Peace Indices (Institute for Economics and Peace/ IEP) Actions: Civilian re-immersion training for those serving in military; Swedish model of military resistance training (a 1970s approach to public non-compliance with authority in forms of effective civil disobedience against invasive centralized control through force); Negotiation skills training and conflict resolution/mediation; Gun control, elimination of death penalty; de-institutionalization and re-absorption of prison populations	Peace

3. *Cultural/ Community Level Goals*

	Overall Objectives	*Specific Measures*	*Placement of Function in National Government (Line Agencies) for Domestic Application and Links to International Intervention Agencies*
1 0.	Sustainability/ (sovereignty) of cultures:	<u>Measurement</u>: Cultural "Red-Book" Measures for cultural endangerment (following the model used for listing levels of species vulnerability used by environmentalists); Global sustainability measures to reverse current rate of cultural extinction <u>Actions</u>: Sustainable development plans at the cultural level for 50 to 100 years; Sustainability transitions	Culture; Community Development Planning; Political Rights Protection/Development; Minority Communities

4. *Global Development Goals*

	Overall Objectives	*Specific Measures*	*Placement of Function in National Government (Line Agencies) for Domestic Application and Links to International Intervention Agencies*
1 1.	Social equity/ Social progress/ Equal opportunity of	<u>Measurement</u>: Cultural Red-Book Measures for cultural endangerment <u>Actions</u>: Natural resource/ wealth accounting on a national and cultural basis as well as per capita to assure	Community Rights; All Economic/Resource and Public Asset Agencies

	cultures:	maintenance; Accession to cultural rights enforcement in international courts of justice	
1 2.	Political equity/ Equal rights for cultures:	Measurement: Measures of Federalism (effective balances of power among different cultural groups, large and small) 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 Actions: Federalism objectives in legislatures, courts, and control of militaries as well as in UN system, itself	Community Rights (Ethnic Federalism); Local Governance
1 3.	Peace/ Tolerance/ De-militarization for protection of cultures:	Measurement: Global Peace Indices; De-colonialization of institutions and of dependency Actions: 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)	Peace; Community Development Planning; Urban Communities; Rural Communities; Minority Communities; Rights Protection

Principles of Imperialism and Colonialism, Distinguished from Development

Colonialism and imperialism have been subjects of social science study for more than a century and international laws and agreements, particularly in the period immediately following World War II, have criminalized many of their attributes (particularly those of genocide and crimes against humanity) while establishing international guidelines on particular behaviors of nations that are to be abandoned. Nevertheless, it is rare to find public agencies using any kind of mechanism to screen their activities in order to eliminate any forms of colonialism and imperialism either internally, in community and minority relations, or in international interventions. Though there does not seem to be any existing screening tool to identify colonial and imperial activities of public functions, it is possible to begin to generate one using some of the common forms of violations on the basis both of mechanisms and objectives to promote national or domestically dominant interests to the detriment of other nations or of weaker domestic cultures and communities.

Studies of imperialism and colonialism, in attempts to reveal their root causes, date back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Marx 1867; Hobson 1902; Kautsky 1914; Lenin 1926). Most of the theories focused on access to specific commercial benefits from weaker countries in the forms of access to their natural resources, to cheap labor (with population growth and population policies keeping wages low), and to markets for goods. Although these early studies focused on specific European empires and their commercial relations ('capital') and have been supplemented by more recent studies of the inequalities of 'free trade' (Gallagher and Robinson 1953) and the creation of 'dependency' and forms of hegemony (Prebisch 1949; Wallerstein 1979), colonialism is historically not exclusive to so-called 'market' economies. Inequality and commercial exploitation are largely similar in more centralized economic systems as well (Said 1994; Comaroff and Comaroff 1986). The common characteristic is the exploitation of various forms of resources in ways that undermine cultures and their resource bases in ways that destabilize, assimilate or eliminate those cultures as independent, sustainable systems.

The characteristic difference between colonialism and imperialism is that colonial systems directly exploit resources of weaker peoples for commercial benefit while imperial systems may exploit resources of weaker peoples for strategic military benefit (Gallaher, Dahlman, Gilmartin, Mountz, and Shirlow 2009; Howe 2002). There are of course overlaps between the two.

While colonialism and imperialism continue in their modern forms, today, what makes them more difficult to see is that the influences may not be directly expressed through military force or population movements. One of the ways these forms of exploitation are disguised is through 'development' activities and the exercise of what international policy makers call 'soft power' (Nye 2004). This 'modern' approach to colonialism and imperialism, which today may occur in the form of 'globalization' and 'harmonization' of systems, occurs through forms of manipulation including ideological, psychological or commercial influence over a country or culture's leaders.

Several critical studies of international 'development' and agencies have identified some of the various ideologies used to promote colonial ('neo-colonial') agendas on weak countries and cultures as well as some of the mechanisms and institutions that serve in this role (Klein 2007; Moyo 1999; Raffer and Singer 1996; Stiglitz 2002). Given the multiple number of forms by which it occurs and the nuances and subtleties of such pressures in ways that hide the underlying agenda, there is no existing checklist or screening indicator to use to directly unmask all of these approaches.

Tables 7 and 8, focusing on the mechanisms and the policies of colonialism and imperialism, are attempts to offer a starting point for such a screening indicator or checklist that can be used to unmask colonial (neo-colonial) and imperial agendas in an attempt to eliminate them from 'development' agencies as inappropriate (and possibly a basis for criminal sanctions).

Table 8, focusing on the specific policies of colonialism and imperialism, applied directly to the targets of exploitation, is in two parts. It creates a list of the different resources that are targets of colonial and imperial exploitation (with the table split in two parts to distinguish these two forms). The right hand column offers many of the ideological justifications that are used today by international 'development' agencies to attempt to dislodge those resources for exploitation by outsiders. In most cases, the ideological justifications that they use (and convince public officials in weaker

countries to also espouse) directly undermine the functions and legal requirements for development that are established under international law and accepted practice. For example, the use of GDP (Gross Domestic Product), a measure of sales, as a goal, is a direct violation of the basic principles of accounting, wealth creation and wealth protection. No business measures its overall success on the basis of sales. The correct measure is assets (wealth), and particularly per capita assets for a country. The reason that 'development' agencies use GDP, rather than measures of assets per capita or of specific productivity improvements by sector, is because GDP easily hides the sales (or theft) of a country's (or culture's) asset base and serves to promote colonial exploitation.

Table 7, focusing on mechanisms of colonialism and imperialism, is both a summary and a complementary table to Table 8. Table 7 takes the different policies (and ideologies) that are found in contemporary colonial and imperial exploitation and links them to specific 'development' interventions as a way of spotting abuses. In Table 7, the goals of using 'development' interventions to manipulate foreign governments in ways that promote colonialism and imperialism are divided into three categories: promotion of colonial economic relations, increasing the top-down authority and control of the leadership in the recipient country so that it can participate more effectively and directly in the exploitation of the peoples and resources of that country, and the detachment of an elite (governmental and non-governmental) in the recipient country from the peoples of that country so as to make the country more vulnerable to exploitation and manipulation with the participation of outsiders. For each of these goals, it is possible to identify specific development 'projects' with particular agencies in a recipient country. Existence of such projects is not direct 'proof' of colonial and/or imperial exploitation or intent, but it is highly suspect (a 'red flag') or such intent, particularly if the development agency's projects do not include a focus and evidence of spending on the very types of projects that are central to development under international law.

These tables (and particularly Table 7) are of immediate benefit in troubleshooting whether development agencies are actually promoting development or are hiding, in whole or in part, agendas of colonialism (neocolonialism) and imperialism, intentionally or negligently. The table can also be used as the basis of screening tools like one presented in the following section, as 'Test 2', to examine whether development agencies are screening out such inappropriate (presumptively illegal) functions or are casting a blind eye.

Contemporary Soft Power Policies Associated with Colonialism and Imperialism, Often Disguised as 'Development': Mechanisms Used for Exercise of Soft-Power and Hegemonic Control

Goal of Interventions	Targeted Officials or Change	Types of Projects
Promote Colonial Economic Relations		
Manipulate economies to promote colonial economic relations	Planning Agencies, Economic Ministries	'Economic Growth' Strategies to Promote Consumption and Production
		Trade Promotion and Trade Agreement Accession, and strengthening of industries producing for foreign benefit
		Foreign Investment Promotion
	Local Governments	Decentralization projects for 'Growth' not Sustainability or Asset Protection
	Infrastructure Ministries	Offer 'gifts' of roads and other infrastructure that promotes resource extraction or sale of foreign products (*e.g.*, build roads to sell cars)
Destruction of Regional Identities and Links to Environment and Traditional Economies	Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture	National curriculum, national and international symbols
Increase Top-Down Authority and Control of Linked Leadership		
Increase Power of Military and Police for Control	Military and Police	'Rights' projects that establish government as the 'duty bearer' and increase government role rather than change the power imbalance
		'Anti-corruption' projects that strengthen government, not citizen
		'Rule of law' and 'Administration of Justice' projects that strengthen top-down law controls
		'Drug control' and other 'security' assistance
Detach and Build Relations with an Elite		
Create a Permanent Elite Group for Negotiations	Parliament	Bureaucratize the Legislature as a Top-Down, Entrenched System
	Ministries of Education, Foreign Relations	Scholarship and 'leadership' networks and programs
	Economic and Economic Line Ministries	Promote privatization and income inequality

Detach Leadership from Locals	Finance	Replace public functions with foreign aid purchases and link government official salaries and revenues to foreign aid or purchases rather than public taxes (links to public benefit)
Manipulate and Purchase Local Elites	Key Ministries and Officials	'Capacity Building' projects that are really transfers of funds and perquisites including travel, as well as 'twinning' projects

Table 8
Contemporary Soft Power Policies Associated with Colonialism, Often Disguised as "Development" (Detail)

Targeted Resource	*How Resource is Exploited*	*Affiliated Policy to Create Vulnerability*
Land and its Attributes		
- Agriculture and products	Cash crop export replaces sustainable use and self-reliance	"Free Trade"; Agricultural Extension and Technology transfer for "productivity increase and "Poverty Reduction"; Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and integration with environment; Concentration of Land; Sedentary agriculture of swidden cultures; Corporate contracts with farmers; Missionization and other cultural change, top-down, called "free flow of ideas"
- Natural Products on Land	Deforestation or hunting, export sale of forest product	"Free Trade"; Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and integration with environment; Building of infrastructure (roads, ports); Sedentary agriculture of swidden cultures; Replacement of communal land rights with individual rights; Missionization and other cultural change, top-down, called "free flow of ideas"
- Tourism, Retirement of foreigners; Living space for population overflow	Appropriation of land	Sale of land to foreigners; Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and integration with environment;
- Waste disposal or hazardous, polluting production	Quality is deteriorated, precluding sustainable local use	"Free trade"; Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and

		integration with environment;
Resources		
- Resource for Export	Sale of resource without a full reinvestment and protection of the value of the asset	Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation; Forced or "voluntary" resettlement; Missionization and other cultural change, top-down, called "free flow of ideas"
- Resource for Production (e.g., hydropower)		Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and integration with environment; Forced or "voluntary" resettlement;
Human Population		
- Transition of labor to export oriented and corporate investment production rather than locally directed on owned resources with hiring of cheap/competitive labor	Use of labor for non-traditional, culturally sustainable economies, disintegrating existing family, social and productive relations	Measure of national "income" (GDP) in foreign currency, or benefit in another outside ideology, rather than wealth/asset value, per capita or per culture, or use of local valuation for self-sufficiency, sustainability and integration with environment; Population growth as a "right", with no sustainable population planning; "Job creation" or "income generation"; Technology transfer for "productivity increase and "Poverty Reduction"; Women's rights to free women's labor; State schooling to prevent learning of traditional economic skills and cultural values; Wage labor; Missionization and other cultural change, top-down, called "free flow of ideas"
- Brain Drain	Disruption of local genetic and talent pool	Technology transfer for "productivity increase and "Poverty Reduction"; "Free migration"
- Export Labor (trafficking, indentured servitude)	Disruption of families and culture	Population growth as a "right", with no sustainable population planning; "Job creation" or "income generation"
- Unprotected labor for social experimentation (drugs, psychology)	Deterioration of human capacity	Population growth as a "right", with no sustainable population planning; "Job creation" or "income generation"
Markets		
- High value	Disruption of	Advertising to create tastes;

added product sales	traditional self-sufficient, sustainable production on resources, without debt and loss of sovereignty	Foreign education of elites to promote and represent products; Technology transfer for "productivity increase and "Poverty Reduction"; Missionization and other cultural change, top-down, called "free flow of ideas"
- Low quality product dumping	Degradation of eco-systems and human capacity	Foreign education of elites to promote and represent products; Investor protection agreements to prevent regulation

Table 9

Contemporary Soft Power Policies Associated with Imperialism, Often Disguised as 'Development'

Targeted Resource	*How Resource is Exploited*	*Affiliated Policy to Create Vulnerability*
Land		
– Military Bases	Militarism of land	Militarization to designate a 'common enemy'
– Weapons testing	Degradation of land	Sacrifice for a reputed 'common enemy'
Resources		
– Denial to competitive country	Disruption of culture and sustainability	Sacrifice for a reputed 'common enemy'
Labor		
– Soldiers	Death for a foreign benefit	Sacrifice for a reputed 'common enemy'

Tests of Government Functions Placed in 'Development' Agencies, Foreign and Domestic

At present, there are no existing indicators to measure and assure that development agencies, either internationally or domestically, adhere to the principles of public administration and the requirements of international development law. This section offers two quick tests that can be used for that very purpose.

While two recent international treaties guide international interventions and reference the idea of standards for donors – the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008), now followed and reinforced by the International Aid Transparency Initiative signed in Busan (2011) – they offer few specifics to uphold development agencies to actual agendas of development and little enforcement even if they did, thus reflecting the exact problems they claim they are trying to solve. Given that international development agencies may themselves have conflicts of interest and may not be willing to monitor themselves for adherence to international law, one cannot expect them to do so.

To make it easier for practitioners and the public to tell the difference between professional, appropriate, and legitimate development functions in agencies and those

that belong elsewhere or are not development at all, it is easy to transform the principles presented in this article, above into two separate tests, presented below.

By simply asking two sets of four questions, practitioners and the public can make basic determinations on whether development agencies have appropriate distinguished their appropriate functions (the first test) and whether they have screened out functions that are potentially in violation of international law because they promote colonialism and/or imperialist national self-interest (the second test).Forsomeone who already knows these fields and is familiar with other legal screening tests, this process is relatively quick and easy. For those who are new to this, specific references are provided for some of the questions of the two tests to aid in making detailed determinations.

Test I., to determine whether the government functions of development are placed distinctly in a development agency, separate from other legitimate but potentially overlapping and competing non-development international affairs functions, the test makes a quick selection of line items taken directly from Table 5. The questions simply ask whether the logic of separation of functions has been followed. The questions focus on the category of disaster management functions in Table 5, choosing one key element from three of the four subcategories to test; querying whether those most closely mistaken for "development" are kept separate from development.

Test II directly follows the three categories of Table 7, which presents the areas in which development projects often hide mechanisms and agendas of colonialism and imperialism. The questions in this test simply ask whether examples of such potential abuses can be found in an agency's programs and whether there is any clear screening within the agency to prevent (or prosecute) such approaches. The quick test does not suggest whether or not such failures are endemic to the organization because it does not ask what percentage of projects, number of projects, or portion of focus and impact are in these categories. However, one can certainly follow up this quick test by asking such questions.

Note that both sets of tests can be applied to both development agencies of national governments as well as international organizations of different types that claim to act in the sphere of development, including development banks and multi-lateral international development agencies.

While the first test is geared to the international sphere, the second test can also be used on domestic agencies that claim to perform a "development" role internally. Departments for "rural development", "urban development", or for oversight of specific minority populations (indigenous and other minority peoples) can be put to the test to see if their functions are those of internal colonialism. Readers seeking to test government agencies that promote decentralization or that claim to promote gender equality should use specific tests in those areas since international law is clear on requirements in those categories (Lempert 2016a and 2016c).

The tests are as follows. Most of the questions are clear cut "Yes" (1 point) or "No" (0 points), but in cases where there is a judgment call, scorers can opt for a "Debatable" (0.5 points). A score of 2 or more in either category should be a cause for alarm and for additional scrutiny, including calls for reform.

> **Test I.** *Existing and Appropriate Separation of 'Development' and Disaster Management Functions*: Are the competing and overlapping functions of 'development' and disaster management in two separate agencies or in one agency with a 'firewall' between them, or are there overlaps, distortions and need for separation? (Four questions)

Question I.1. *Recognition of Public Administration Practice of Separating Different Competing Functions where there are Conflicts of Interest*. Has the governmental organization recognized two distinct areas of international concern – 'development' (from the perspective of the sustainability of specific cultures) and disaster management (an overall international goal for short-term security from specific recognized threats) and has it separated these functions into distinct agencies or departments with attempts to avoid conflicts of interest so as to assure the objectives and outcomes are independent?

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question I.2. *Recognition of Short Term 'Relief' as Distinct from Development*. Has the governmental recognized specific distinct areas of international concern – 'development' (from the perspective of the long-term sustainability of specific cultures) and short-term disaster relief to avoid instability, crisis and starvation, and to act as insurance supporting current practices (an overall international goal for short-term security from specific recognized threats) and has it separated these functions into distinct agencies or departments with attempts to avoid conflicts of interest so as to assure the objectives and outcomes are independent?

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question I.3. *Recognition of Short-Term 'Poverty Alleviation' as Distinct from Development*. Has the governmental organization recognized specific distinct areas of international concern – 'development' (from the perspective of the long-term sustainability of specific cultures) and short-term 'poverty alleviation' that increases productivity or consumption (through foreign investment or sale of resource assets or foreign directed promotion of trade or industry) to avoid instability, crisis and starvation, and to act as insurance supporting current practices (an overall international goal for short-term security from specific recognized threats) rather than long-term sustainable consumption, addressing root causes of poverty and assuring security and balance within the recipient group's resource base, and has it separated these functions into distinct agencies or departments with attempts to avoid conflicts of interest so as to assure the objectives and outcomes are independent? (See Lempert 2015d for specific detail use of this indicator.)

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question I.4. *Does the Organization Recognize Indemnification and Compensation as Distinct from Development*. Has the governmental organization recognized specific distinct areas of international concern – 'development' (from the perspective of the long-term sustainability of specific cultures) and short-term compensation for past harms an international actor has created through war or hegemony (an overall international goal for holding countries accountable through the international justice system) and has it separated these functions into distinct agencies or departments with attempts to avoid conflicts of interest so as to assure the objectives and outcomes are independent?

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Test II. *Promotion of the Universal Development Goals Recognized in International Treaties, Rather than Any Competing Colonial, Imperial or Globalizing/Regionalizing Agenda*: Are the functions of 'development' consistent with the basic international post-World War II legal documents for sustainable development, cultural protections, peace, security, and human development or do they reflect self-interested goals of more powerful cultures for hegemony, assimilation, and collectivization in ways that undermine human cultural diversity and sustainability? (Four questions)

Question II.1.   *Promotion of the Four Levels and 13 Categories of Development Established by the International Community in its Post-World War II Consensus for Reversing Colonialism*. Does the governmental organization recognize the key components of 'development' incorporated in the key Post-World War II treaties for cultural survival, and sustainability, including local community/ cultural choices of consumption, production and economic and social life, that can be listed as the 'Universal Development Goals' in ways that avoid conflicts of interest with foreign agendas for globalization, assimilation, trade, nation-states, and political relations? (Lempert 2014a, 2014b)

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question II.2.   *Establishes Controls to Prevent Development Interventions from Serving as Mechanisms for Promoting Colonial Economic Relations*. Does the governmental organization recognize the conflicts of interest between strategies for promoting 'economic growth' (consumption and production), trade, foreign investment, decentralization, and infrastructure and the needs for sustainable development, cultural protections, sovereignty protections and other keys to 'development' and take steps to prevent distortions that promote foreign interests and colonial or imperial agendas? (Lempert 2009a, 2012, 2015d)

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question II.3.   *Establishes Controls to Prevent Development Interventions from becoming Mechanisms for Strengthening Top-Down Authority and Control by a Leadership that is Linked to Foreign Interests*. Does the governmental organization recognize the conflicts of interest between strategies for protecting 'rights', good governance, equity, and social protection and the solidification of military and police powers that reinforce inequalities and can undermine local development agendas and needs in favor of promoting elite and foreign interests, and take steps to prevent distortions such distortions? (Lempert 2011, 2010)

Scoring: Yes – 1.
Debatable – 0.5.
No or not relevant – (0).

Question II.4.   *Establishes Controls to Prevent Interventions from Serving as Mechanisms for the Strengthening of Elites and Detachment of Elites from Local Communities and Peoples and their Interests for 'Development'*. Does the governmental organization recognize the conflicts of interest between strategies for promoting 'capacity building', governance, and the needs for sustainable development, cultural protections, governmental transparency and accountability, economic equity and other keys to 'development' and take steps to prevent distortions that strengthen an elite to promote foreign interests and colonial or imperial agendas? (Lempert 2009b, 2011, 2015e)

Scoring: Yes – 1.

Debatable – 0.5.

No or not relevant – (0).

Applying the Test to Various 'Development' Agencies, in Brief

After understanding how the indicator works, it is generally easy to apply to several kinds of public agencies. What the two tests reveal is that most international organizations, government 'development' agencies, and agencies with domestic roles for 'development' are failing to separate disaster management functions from development and/or are pursuing colonial policies under the guise of development with no attempts to screen or prevent conflicts of interest that undermine international development law and goals. Indeed, the author is aware of no government development agency or development organization anywhere that is actually fulfilling a development mission in accordance with international law.

The array of descriptive categories for the three areas of public organizations that can be evaluated using the two tests (international development organizations, international development agencies of national governments, and domestic development agencies) is presented in Table 10, below, with some examples as well as suggestions for renaming agencies in order to recognize their actual functions more clearly, behind the current euphemism of 'development' (Lempert 2015c).

For readers who wish to directly walk through the application and scoring of the eight questions of the two tests, the scoring of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is presented in a chart in the annex to the full piece on-line.

Table 10

**Results Matrix for Classification, Reform, and Renaming of 'Development'
and Related Agencies**

Type and Examples	Scoring on Two Criteria of Agency Functions		*Prognosis: Need for Restructuring or Renaming of Agency to Reflect Actual Functions and Requirement for Restructuring?*
	Mixed, Additional Functions (Addition of Disaster Management and Other Functions) (Under 2 points)	*Inappropriate (Colonial and/or Imperial) Functions Disguised as Development (Under 2 points)*	
International Organizations			
Organizations that are inappropriate on both counts and appear to serve interests of colonial powers	Yes	Yes	Yes, agencies doing everything but development that are international organizations are really promoting globalization
United Nations Development Program			*United Nations (Globalization) Program*
World Bank			*World (Globalization) Bank*
ADB, IADB and other regional development banks			*(Regionalization) Bank*
Organizations that are not development agencies but may have some development functions	Yes	No	Projects need to be screened to assure that the impact does not override or undermine 'development'
World Health Organization	Control of health threats may interfere with balanced development approaches		-
Interpol	Control of security threats may interfere with balanced development approaches		
Organizations	No	Yes	These organizations

that Serve a Colonial Mission			my claim to complement 'development' but with an actual intent to undermine it
World Trade Organization			*World Globalization/ Colonization Organization*
Bi-Lateral Development Agencies			
National Development Agencies Serving National Interests	Yes	Yes	Agencies need both restructuring and legal challenge to eliminate colonial functions
USAID, DfID, AUSAID, EC, GIZ, etc.			*e.g., U.S. Agency for International (Disaster Management and Colonization)*
Domestic 'Development' or Minority Affairs Agencies			
Domestic Agencies serve interests of the dominant or powerful group	Not applicable	Yes	Agencies need legal challenge to eliminate internal colonial and assimilative functions, including political restructuring to secure rights and autonomy/federalism
Bureau of Indian Affairs (US); Rural Development Agencies (Several countries)			*Bureau of Indian (Assimilation); (Internal Colonialism) Agencies*

Conclusion

Public oversight of both international and domestic agencies in the area of development is clearly failing. Not only are their functions still colonial (neo-colonial and internally colonial) and imperial, but many of the key functions agreed on by the international community for development in developed countries simply do not appear in contemporary government structures.

The idealized public administration charts and the two tests of functions of development agencies that are presented in this article can expose the problem and point to solutions, but like other public administration tools, these must be in the hands of those willing and able to use them.

Holding governments accountable is particular difficult even today in the modern era where governments claim to be more representative and accountable than at any time in history. While there are potential legal mechanisms for holding governments accountable, internationally they are difficult to use and unlikely to be invoked by powerful countries against themselves or against governments in weaker countries on whom they impose or seek to impose colonial and imperial relations.

The only way that change can really occur is if those public voices who have an interest in the oversight act collectively to protect their interests.

This article offers simple tools as weapons of empowerment, to at least facilitate that effort, as part of a codification of laws and standards that could ultimately be enforceable both by those paying for the interventions and those at the receiving end. This is part of a larger effort, particularly in the area of development and sustainability, for holding governments accountable before it is too late (Duncan, 2014; Lempert, 1997; 2008, 2015c).

These tools take away excuses that oversight is too difficult for ordinary citizens and that we must simply wait, pray, and rely on experts to change in ways they have little incentive to change, rather than to take on the burdens of citizenship to protect the public interest in promoting effective, efficient and law abiding public organizations.

Scoring of the United Nations Development Programme on the Two Tests

Analysis		
Question	**Indicator**	**Scoring**
Test I.	*Existing and Appropriate Separation of "Development" and Disaster Management Functions*	*<u>Weak</u>. The UN system seems to have started with a clear understanding of the difference of international functions since its legal framework is very clear in distinguishing "development" from other kinds of international security goals (Lempert 2014b) and the system created several agencies that began to separate functions. In consolidating functions under UNDP, the UN appears to have undermined or corrupted the commitment to public administration standards. Some of the distinctions remain.* *1 to 1.5 points*

I.1.	*Recognition of Public Administration Practice of Separating Different Competing Functions Where there are Conflicts of Interest?*	No or debatable. Although the UN has several agencies with different functions, including the World Health Organization for health crises and climate/environmental organizations for global threats in those areas and does not use UNDP for direct response relief efforts for immediate needs, UNDP and the UN system do not generally distinguish between global security concerns for various international categories of threats and the legal foundations of UN treaties for "development". UNDP is essentially a catch-all agency that takes any projects working with governmental agencies in areas where donors offer funds to support policy or implementation changes. The goal of UNDP in recent years has been to create "one UN" agency to do everything rather than to segregate functions. "Disaster management" projects to create frameworks for countries to deal with disasters are run directly through UNDP. *0 or 0.5 points.*
I.2.	*Recognition of Short Term "Relief" as Distinct from Development?*	Yes, or debatable. Emergency, crisis relief efforts are generally separated in the UN system and organized through specific agencies like the UN High Commission for Refugees, UNICEF (children in crisis), and WHO for health emergencies. *1 point.*
I.3.	*Recognition of Short-Term "Poverty Alleviation" as Distinct from Development?*	No. UNDP projects claim to be doing "poverty alleviation" and include every form of "income generation" and trade promotion that conflict with international law defining "development" and "sustainable development" and affiliated community and environmental rights protections as distinct from poverty alleviation. *0 points.*
I.4.	*Recognition of Indemnification and Compensation as Distinct from Development?*	No. UNDP has become opportunistic in its willingness to take on almost any kind of project with any partner that funnels funds through its system and to recipient government administrators, including "demining" projects in some countries that are added as "development goals" without any connection at all to legal indemnification or compensation approaches.

		0 points.
Test II.	***Promotion of the Universal Development Goals Recognized in International Treaties, Rather than Any Competing Colonial, Imperial or Globalizing/Regionalizing Agenda***	***<u>Non-existent</u>. Not a single system consistent with screening for conflicts of interest of donor agendas and actual treaty agreements on "development" and rights protections is in place within UNDP and projects in every category further elite linkages, state controls, and a single globalization agenda that is increasingly harmonized with the globalization and trade agendas of the World Bank and major multi-national corporations who are also seen as potential "partners" for funding.*** ***0 points***
II.1.	*Promotion of the Four Levels and 13 Categories of Development Established by the International Community in its Post-World War II Consensus for Reversing Colonialism?*	No. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of the UN and their expansion into Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) both violate and reverse the set of legal documents of the international post-World War II consensus for development. The UN promotes nation-states and globalization in ways that reflect colonial rather than rights-based strategies. (For full, detailed analysis, see Lempert, 2014a and 2014b) *0 points.*
II.2.	*Establishes Controls to Prevent Development Interventions from Serving as Mechanisms for promoting colonial economic relations?*	No. The new "Sustainable Development Goals" that are the mandate of UNDP has a built-in conflict between "growth" and "sustainability" and is designed to promote productivity and trade. UNDP works directly to promote national schooling and does little or nothing to protect local cultures since its "client" is the leadership of nation states. Despite the UN treaties that protect community and national sovereignty and choice, UNDP applies no screening to enforce those protections. (Lempert, 2009a, 2012, 2015d) *0 points.*
II.3.	*Establishes Controls to Prevent Development*	No. The current UNDP approach to "rights protections" in its anti-trafficking interventions and others is to strengthen military and police as the "duty bearers" (a UN created ideology that channels project money to enforcement and

	Interventions from becoming Mechanisms for Strengthening Top-Down Authority and Control by a Leadership that is Linked to Foreign Interests?	not to root causes, including empowerment of the victims). The current approach to anti-corruption is to strengthen government (often the very source of the corruption) rather than citizen oversight and controls. "Administration of Justice" projects focus on efficiency of top-down laws not on their responsiveness and not on citizen empowerment. The relationship created is one between government elites working together on single, united agendas that defy the very goals of "development" for rights protections. (Lempert, 2010, 2011) *0 points.*
II.4.	*Establishes Controls to Prevent Interventions from Serving as Mechanisms for the Strengthening of Elites and Detachment of Elites from Local Communities and Peoples and their Interests for "Development"?*	No. .UNDP's projects are largely "capacity building" that transfers funds, perquisites (foreign travel, contacts, equipment) and prestige to bureaucrats to maintain them in power rather than to create mechanisms for holding them accountable or replacing them. UNDP projects with parliaments have become attempts to create "permanent" parliamentary staffs that are unaccountable to the public and cannot be removed, with skills for top-down public manipulation and with linkages to parliaments and leaders of donor countries. UNDP concepts of "good governance" are to use questionnaires for citizen "satisfaction" with government decisions rather than actual control and accountability. UNDP projects are run with secrecy agreements with government officials to evade transparency. (Lempert, 2009b, 2011, 2015e) *0 points.*
Sum-mary of Two Tests	<u>**UNDP is currently an example of a government organization acting in the international arena with no clear legal mission for "development" consistent with international law and no clear boundaries with short-term disaster management. It is an opportunistic agency that seems willing to do anything that it can find donors to fund, using its access to governments and its position as an intermediary between governments to re-establish ties between government elites in promotion of an international neo-colonial globalization agenda.**</u> **Though UNDP originally had a clear set of laws on which to base its functions and the UN system was beginning to segregate and recognize different international functions of "development" and various aspects of international disaster management, along with other international functions for global peace, security, exchange, and**	

> **understanding, that has currently disappeared. To make the organization's name consistent with its current operations, the term "Development" in its name should be replaced with the term "Globalization" or "Globalization and Disaster Management" so that it would be the United Nations Globalization and Disaster Management Programme.**

REFERENCES

Accra Agenda for Action. 2008. URL: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT /Resour ces/4700790-1217425866038/ACCRA_4_SEPTEMBER_FINAL_16h00.pdf.

Bryson, J. M. 1988. *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations: A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation 2011. *Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness*, 29 November – 1 December. URL: http://effectivecooperati on.org/resources/.

Comaroff, J., and Comaroff, J. 1986. Christianity and Colonialism in South Africa. *American Ethnologist* 13: 1–22.

Emmanuel, C., Merchant, K., and Otley, D. 1990. *Accounting for Management Control*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Gallagher, J., and Robinson, R. 1953. The Imperialism of Free Trade. *The Economic History Review* 6: 1–15.

Gallaher, C., Dahlman, C. T., Gilmartin, M., Mountz, A., and Shirlow, P. 2009. *Key Concepts in Political Geography*. New York: Sage.

Garrison, R. H., Noreen, D., and Brewer, P. C. 2005. *Managerial Accounting*. New York: Irwin/ McGraw Hill.

Grinin, L. E., Ilyin, I. V., and Andreev, A. I. 2016. World Order in the Past, Present and Future. *Social Evolution and History* 15 (1): 58–84.

Hobson, J. 1902. *Imperialism: A Study*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Howe, S. 2002. *Empire: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kautsky, K. 1914. Ultra Imperialism. Die Neue Zeit, September. URL: https://www.marx ists.org/archive/kautsky/1914/09/ultra-imp.htm.

Klein, N. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Mac Millan.

Lempert, D. 2009a. A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations. *Global Jurist* 9 (2): 1–40. URL: 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, D. 2009b. Why Government and NGO Projects Fail Despite 'Evaluations': An Indicator to Measure whether Evaluation Systems Incorporate the Rules of Good Governance. *Journal of Multi-disciplinary Evaluation* 6 (13). URL: http://journals.sfu.ca/ jmde/index.php/jmde_1/article/view/243/247.

Lempert, D. 2010. A Human Rights Education Project Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations. *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy* 3 (1). URL: http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/view/617/713 and supplementary file. Also at: www.ried-ijed.org.

Lempert, D. 2011. Democracy Building Democratic Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations. *Global Jurist* 11 (2). Article 4. URL: www.bepress.com/gj/vol11/iss2/art4/.

Lempert, D. 2012. A Quick Indicator of Effectiveness of 'Income Generation' and 'Sustainable Business Initiatives' in International Development. *Economology* 2: 2. URL: http:// www.economologos.com/Lempert_EJ_II_Feb_2012.pdf.

Lempert, D. 2014a. Universal Development Goals for This Millennium. *Consilience*. Summer 2014, Issue 12. URL: http://www.consiliencejournal.org/index.php/consilience/article/viewPDFInterstitial/383/207.

Lempert, D. 2014b. A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons/ *Journal of Economics and Social Policy* 16 (2). URL: http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp/vol16/iss2/3.

Lempert, D. 2015c. 'The 'Newspeak' Dictionary of 'Development': Deconstructing Development Discourse and Calling Things by their True Names. *Transcience: Journal of Global Studies* 6 (2). URL: http://www.transcience-journal.org/.

Lempert, D. 2015d. A Poverty Reduction Accountability Indicator for International Organizations and NGOs. *Law, Social Justice and Global Development* (forthcoming). URL: http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/lgd/2015-1/lempert.

Lempert, D. 2015e. A Quick Indicator of Effectiveness of 'Capacity Building Projects of NGOs and International Organizations.' *European Journal of Government and Economics* (forthcoming).

Lempert, D. 2016b. The Myth of Social Progress, Revisited. *Human Figurations: Long Term Perspectives* (forthcoming).

Lempert, D. 2016c. An Accountability Indicator for Gender Equality Projects of NGOs and International Organizations. *Journal of Human Rights in the Commonwealth* 2 (2). URL: http://journals.sas.ac.uk/jhrc/article/view/2263/2190.

Lempert, D., 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): 44–54. 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.

Lenin, V. I. 1926. *Imperialism: The State and Revolution*. New York: Vanguard Press.

Lyden, F. J. 1975. 'Using Parsons' Functional Analysis in the Study of Public Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 20 (1): 59–70.

Myakawa, T. 2000. *The Science of Public Policy: Essential Readings in Policy Science*. London: Routledge.

Marx, K. 1867. Progressive Production of Relative Overpopulation or an Industrial Reserve Army: Modern Theory of Colonialization. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Berlin.

Moyo, D. 1999. *Dead Aid: Why Aid is Not Working and How There is Another Way for Africa*. London: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

Nelson, D. L., and Quick, J. C. 2005. *Understanding Organizational Behavior.* 2nd ed. Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.

Nye, J. 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. 2005. Paris. URL: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf.

Prebisch, R. 1949. *The Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems*. E/CN, December. Santiago, Chile: ECN, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

Raffer, K., and Singer, H. W. 1996. *The Foreign Aid Business*. London: Elgar.

Robbins, S. P. 2002. *Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Said, E. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Publishers.

Stiglitz, J. 2002. *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Szporluk, M. 2009. A Framework for Understanding Accountability of International NGOs and Global Good Governance. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 16 (1): 339–361.

Wallerstein, I. 1979. An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order. In Wallerstein, I. *The Capitalist World Economy* (pp. 269–282). New York: Cambridge.