

# *Global Jurist*

## Advances

---

*Volume 9, Issue 2*

2009

*Article 6*

---

### A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations

David H. Lempert\*

\*Independent Scholar, superlemp@yahoo.com

#### **Recommended Citation**

David H. Lempert (2009) "A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations," *Global Jurist*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2 (Advances), Article 6.

# A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations\*

David H. Lempert

## Abstract

The article offers an easy-to-use indicator for measuring whether NGOs, international organizations, and government policies and projects meet the criteria for sustained poverty reduction that reverses legacies of colonialism and that promotes self-reliant (mostly “self sufficient”) autonomous development following principles that have been established by various international treaties and that are recognized by experts in the field. Use of this indicator reveals that most of the major actors in the field of development are actually providing relief rather than development and are creating dependency by treating symptoms rather than long-term solutions. The indicator points to the specific areas where they need to improve in order to fulfill sustainability criteria including tests of whether aid distorts financial markets and business competition, erodes appropriate government functions, and reverses colonial institutions and ideologies that interfere with sustainable consumption within a resource base. The article also offers a sample test of the indicator using United Nations Volunteers (UNV) as a case study.

**KEYWORDS:** poverty, dependency, development, sustainable development, indicator, de-colonialization, civil society, neo-colonialism, U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples, World Bank, UN Volunteers, Millennium Development Goals, GDP, Rio Declaration

---

\*David Lempert, Ph.D., J.D., M.B.A., E.D. (Hon) has worked for more than 25 years in development. Professor Lempert is author of several books including, *A Model Development Plan and Daily Life in a Crumbling Empire: The Absorption of Russia into the World Economy* (2 volumes). He is an anthropologist, lawyer, and educator who has worked in more than 30 countries for the UNDP, UNICEF, World Bank, USAID, EC, WWF, IUCN, and several other development organizations. He is founder and C.E.O. of Unseen America Projects, Inc., leading the design of democratic-experiential/clinical curricula, and has taught at several universities, including as a Fulbright Professor in Vietnam. He is currently promoting several new NGOs: a monitor of donors; an initiative to create a Red Book for Endangered Human Cultures; and Diaspora Bridge Centers in Eastern Europe. Among his innovations are 15 proposed amendments to the U.S. constitution and model constitutions to establish closer citizen oversight and enforcement over public and private bureaucracies and to reaffirm political rights of ethnic communities.

**Introduction:** There is a common self-congratulatory slogan recited by development professionals in Masters programs on development and at conferences on development policy, praising what they describe as their capacity building for independent development as follows, “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day, teach him how to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” The irony of the slogan is that it also describes another kind of dependency between donors and recipients, but a different kind – dependency on the technology of outsiders, replacing or eroding locally run research and development and extension services. Introducing productive technology to “develop” a “poor” community (i.e., one where individuals consume comparatively less than in a “developed” community), actually increases dependency on donors if the “fishing” that is being taught makes the community dependent on export markets or on foreign technological solutions to return clean water, and does not include teaching for local sustainable development planning of population, consumption and environmental protection. The reality is that by only “teaching communities to fish” – intervening in their economic systems and choices without teaching and empowering them for sustainability, the donor community creates dependency of a different kind; postponing poverty rather than curing it.

Many development agencies specifically claim to be doing sustainable human development that fulfills the internationally agreed United Nations goal to “offer people more options” for their independent choices<sup>1</sup> and reinforced by international treaties designed to protect the sustainability, sovereignty, and value systems of the world's diverse cultures. Yet, the reality is that most development work is limited to technology transfer that does not meet internationally agreed standards and that looks only at increasing productivity and providing short term poverty relief or increased consumption, rather than independence and sustainability. The UNDP's Human Development Report that has become one of the standards for measuring progress throughout the world, is explicit that “The economic growth produced by neo-classical economics does not result in human development.” Among competing values that make up the goal of “choice” for a long and healthy life are: political freedom, guaranteed human rights and self-respect that comprise the basic notions of sovereignty and independence.

Part of the problem in development is that these high minded aspirations are rarely measured on any scale. There are no bodies holding development actors accountable to test whether their “charity” and “goodwill” really uphold international values or, as many argue, promote dependency and colonialism in new forms.

There are now important calls within the development community for better measures of project efficiency, including within the United Nations system,

---

<sup>1</sup> U.N. Development Programme, *United Nations Human Development Report*, UNDP and Oxford University Press, 1990. On the web at: [http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr\\_1990\\_en\\_front.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1990_en_front.pdf)

itself, to see that the standards promoted through international treaties are upheld in countries that have signed on to the treaties as well as by the very U.N. organizations whose legal and development missions are based on these treaties. Nevertheless, the standards are only starting to be developed<sup>2</sup>. Even though treaties are now detailing the standards that can be used in the texts of treaties, themselves, more attention continues to be paid to the treaty principles than to standards or measurements. The recent ratification of the U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples, for example, reinforces and further specifies the universal principles related to independence and sustainability of the world's communities that were promoted in previous treaties. This declaration now makes it possible to apply an internationally agreed set of standards to the international community's development interventions in the form of an indicator<sup>3</sup>.

Overall, recent articles by this author have taken some of the initial steps to establish indicators and benchmarks in "development" through which the public and organizations can hold international development actors accountable to international law and to their mission statements for their interventions through inexpensive and easy to use tools to create accountability and transparency in the use of public funds in development interventions.<sup>4</sup> Note that similar steps are being taken, in parallel to this one, in the field of "humanitarian" ("relief") efforts, by independent organizations such as Dara International and the ALNAP (Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action). This article offers another such indicator, with 13 questions, to test how effectively projects reverse colonialism and uphold international values and agreements on sovereignty and independence, continuing the series of earlier indicators on this additional critical dimension.

The step-by-step approach to accountability taken by this author has been to begin with the publication of ethics codes for professionals working in the development field that protect public beneficiaries and legal requirements<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> UNDP Evaluation Office, *Essentials: UNDP Practice Area: Cross-Cutting Synthesis of Lessons Learned*, No. 12, October 2003.

[http://www.worldvolunteerweb.org/fileadmin/kp/Essentials\\_12.pdf](http://www.worldvolunteerweb.org/fileadmin/kp/Essentials_12.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007. On the web at:

<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/512/07/PDF/N0651207.pdf?OpenElement>

<sup>4</sup> David Lempert, "Why We Need an International Development Donor Monitor," *Policy Innovations*, January 2008. Linked to long version on Web:

[http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy\\_library/data/01464](http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy_library/data/01464) See for example, David Lempert, "Democracy Building Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations," (under review, manuscript available from author) for one of three other pieces under review or in the process of publication. See also, footnote 7, *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> David Lempert, "Holding the Powers that Be Accountable to Our Ethics Code to Protect Our Integrity and the Peoples We Serve," *Human Rights*, Vol. 24, No. 2, Spring 1997. Available on Web at:

<http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/professionaalethicscodefordevelopmentwork>

followed by this series of “litmus-test” type indicators that can be used relatively quickly and easily. The first of these indicators was one for “sustainable development,” the global goal of all development interventions including those in the governance area.<sup>6</sup> This was followed by an indicator of “democracy”<sup>7</sup> and now by this piece. This third indicator, for “dependency” is a strong complement to the ideals of “sustainability” and “democracy.” It looks at development interventions within an overall global context for promoting diversity and self-reliance in ways that enrich the globe and assure human survival and competition of different alternatives.

While the idea of an indicator for “dependency” appears to be new – i.e., searches of several social disciplines and applied fields (including the evaluation literature) of the indicator sets used by major international development agencies (the U.N. system, country donors, development banks, foundations, and NGOs) and of the theoretical literature on dependency theory, post colonialism, and sustainable development, do not yield any indices other than lists of principles in international treaties – the idea is simple and well accepted.

The simple principle of independence of adult beings applies equally well, by analogy, to developing groups of human beings. The measure of successful growth and development of children as they turn into adults is of their effective independence from care givers and ability to function on their own to provide for themselves. The measure is not how tall or fat or strong they become or how wealthy, but whether they are able to function capably as “developed” “adult” members of a community, with as much interaction with that community that they freely choose, regardless of their height, size, strength or wealth. All of these other measures relate not to independence but to the quality and health of adult life, along with other measures. They are secondary questions to whether the individual has developed and reached adulthood in the same way that they are secondary as to whether a community has achieved independent development.

The value of an indicator to test the “dependency” impact of donor interventions is that it is a way to ensure long-term success of interventions that strengthen societies rather than just short-term fixes that will demand increasing resources and make human civilization more vulnerable, overall.

---

<http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/spring97/lempert.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> David Lempert and Hue Nhu Nguyen, “How to Tell if Development Projects are Doing Sustainable Development: An Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations,” *International Journal of Sustainable Societies*, 1:1, 2008. On the web at:

<http://inderscience.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,3,6;journal,1,1;linkingpublicationresults,1:121226,1>

<sup>7</sup> David Lempert, “Democracy Building Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations,” (under review, manuscript available from author) for one of three other pieces under review or in the process of publication.

This type of indicator, offered in this article, can be used by citizens of developed and developing countries to hold governments and actors in international development accountable in a way that they now cannot because of claims that their assertions lack an objective and scientific basis and are “political.” It can also be used by the development community and those who donate to them to make a more informed choice on where to put their resources.

For the peoples of developing countries and for professionals, this indicator can also serve as the basis for initiating political or even legal action against invasive or harmful activities that previously were difficult to hold to a common professional standard.

The article begins by defining “dependency” according to basic internationally agreed treaty principles that can be placed into an indicator, compares existing indicators used by political scientists and practitioners to the international standards to which they have agreed, and explains why several international “development” projects now fail in the absence of an indicator. The article then offers a new indicator and tests it on several categories of projects, including a detailed examination of how to use the indicator on an organization like the United Nations Volunteers (UNV).

**Dependency Factors.** There is clear international agreement that sovereignty and autonomy of cultures is a universal value that is to be legally protected by the global community and incorporated as a fundamental concept of development that protects “choice” and diversity. The place where there is debate – mostly among political economists – is not over the principle but only over the extent to which relations between wealthy countries and poor ones, or between elites and poor communities within countries, constitute “dependency;” as well as over which specific institutions are the driving forces or promoters of such relations – governments and a world system,<sup>8</sup> international financial institutions promoting globalization,<sup>9</sup> corporations,<sup>10</sup> foundations and assistance programs themselves.<sup>11</sup> Many international documents list the factors that are considered fundamental to independence, though they have yet to be clarified and placed in context of development interventions in order to be effectively measured and applied.

Defining the Principle through International Standards: The principle of independence and the universal right to global protection that has been established

---

<sup>8</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein. "An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order." *The Capitalist World Economy*. New York: Cambridge U. Press, 1979.

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents*, W.W. Norton & Company, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> David Korten, *When Corporations Rule the World*, Kumarian Press, 1995.

<sup>11</sup> Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*, Vintage Press, 1993.

not merely for individual nation States in the international system but also now for all cultural entities within them, was recognized more than 60 years ago, though not well clarified at the time. Raphael Lemkin, who coined the word for genocide and authored the international genocide law, hoped that this law would be used to criminalize much more than murder and that it would protect the integrity of cultures in all of its dimensions of “choice” in human development, including the reversal of dependency and colonialism. In promoting the principle that first became acknowledged in international law after World War II, Lemkin coined the word “genocide” and the kinds of colonial actions beyond killing that were also to be condemned and reversed as well as to the groups to which the protections applied. He wrote,

"Generally speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be disintegration of the political and social institutions, of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economic existence of national groups, and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group"<sup>12</sup>

The key aspect of this principle is that it condemns the destructive intent and impact on the survival and sustainability of a cultural unit as a whole, in its interrelated aspects: its forms of economic production, its political system, and its social and cultural practices interlinked with these. All together, these constitute the specific and independent areas by which groups must be able to make free and independent decisions required for the group's survival.

In 1992, the international community affirmed this principle in the context of international development choices in what are now known as the Rio De Janeiro principles. In that declaration, the global community defined survivability and development of each cultural unit in terms of its ability to sustainably manage its own resources through independent group choices appropriate to the group's needs. Principle 22 of the Rio Declaration requires support for the “identity, culture, and interests” of both indigenous peoples and communities in the

---

<sup>12</sup> Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation - Analysis of Government - Proposals for Redress*, Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944, p. 79 - 95.

achievement of sustainable development. According to Principle 8 of the Rio Declaration, sustainability is a long-term balance of consumption and production, underlining that it is the independent control of resources and the proper balancing of choices within the framework of one's culture and identity that are to be universally protected and promoted.<sup>13</sup>

This basic framework for stating the principles is itself enough to generate a set of indicator questions for measuring whether development interventions actually promote independent choice. It follows from these international principles that a balanced and independent system is one with strong (repaired and restored or renovated) sustainable cultural traditions rather than one that faces imposed or copied outside systems of economic productivity and measures, and of political relations. Using this set of principles, it becomes relatively easy to begin to generate questions about internal and external political relations that promote sustainability and choice as well as to measure how development interventions are consistent or inconsistent with these principles in the targets they set for their interventions and in the ways they are administered (who they work with, whether they are transparent, how the interventions impact on institutions, technology, choices on values and incentives, and patterns of production, consumption and savings that constitute the fundamentals of an independent system).

Most recently, the U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples has gone even further in reaffirming specific aspects of the principle of sovereignty and independent choice in its preamble, describing what colonization and dependency mean and the negative impacts they have that development policies would need to reverse in order to meet the test. The interweaving of the principles of independence and development is clear in the document. The declaration suggests that part of the "choice" of development includes the choice of consumption patterns, systems of government and production. It reaffirms that sustainable development does not imply homogenization of humanity to the same standards of consumption and production, but only sustainability within each culturally independent choice.

*Affirming further* that all doctrines, policies and practices based on or advocating superiority of peoples or individuals on the basis of national origin or racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust, [Note that this would also apply to consumption patterns and valuation, systems of governance]

---

<sup>13</sup> United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*, 1992. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>



*Concerned* that indigenous peoples have suffered from historic injustices as a result of, inter alia, their colonization and dispossession of their lands, territories and resources, thus preventing them from exercising, in particular, their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests,

*Recognizing* the urgent need to respect and promote the inherent rights of indigenous peoples which derive from their political, economic and social structures and from their cultures, spiritual traditions, histories and philosophies, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources, *Recognizing* that respect for indigenous knowledge, cultures and traditional practices contributes to sustainable and equitable development and proper management of the environment<sup>14</sup>

How the Treaties Offer the Basis for Measurements that Apply the Principles:

Though there are several international conventions and declarations that reiterate the principle of protecting cultural independence against the harms of colonialism, only the most recent international declaration (on indigenous peoples) begins to try to codify some actions that create dependency and that could be used to measure violations of independence in development interventions.

Among treaties that promote the principle of self-determination and autonomy are:

- U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide<sup>15</sup> noted above;
- U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights<sup>16</sup>: under Article 1 and then reinforcing cultural rights under Article 27.
  - o Article 1 – “All peoples have the right of self-determination. ... economic, social and cultural development.”
- U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic Religious and Linguistic Minorities,<sup>17</sup>
  - o Article 2 notes the principle for the international community to safeguard for all groups “the right to enjoy their own culture”
  - o Article 4 reiterates the treatment of minority groups “in full equality before the law.”

---

<sup>14</sup> U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples, *supra*, 2007.

<sup>15</sup> U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948. <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/genocide.htm>

<sup>16</sup> U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966. On the web at: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>

<sup>17</sup> U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic Religious and Linguistic Minorities, 1992. On the web at: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/minorities.htm>

It is the U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples that both reiterates the principle (in the first eight articles) and begins to define the elements (in additional articles) to assure that “control by indigenous peoples over developments affecting them and their lands, territories and resources will enable them to maintain and strengthen their institutions, cultures and traditions”

- Article 1 iterates the “right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms”
- Article 3 reasserts the principle of “self determination”
- Article 4 reiterates the “right to autonomy or self-government”
- Article 8 requires that States provide “redress for: (a) Any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities”
- Article 14 affirms the right to educate for one’s own economic, political and social system, without having to follow others, either of the State or international values;
- Article 18 implicitly affirms the right to oppose colonial and State political systems where these erode “indigenous decision-making institutions”; and
- Article 20 makes it clear what the right of independent development and choice means: “Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems or institutions, to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development, and to engage freely in all their traditional and other economic activities.”<sup>18</sup>

Detail Measures that Currently Exist: Where Current Measures Fall Short: Neither political economists, development anthropologists nor international lawyers have developed specific measures or checklists of colonial influence and control that have been used as indicators, but there is an emerging consensus on application of the principles stated in the treaties. Most of the mechanisms of influence are known to development practitioners and go beyond the economic measures that public finance economists have offered of economic influence or control. A summary of these is presented below.

Among political experts, it is perhaps ironic that while there are now emerging indicators on “freedom” or “democracy,” none of the indicators used in the measurement sets even by organizations that use these names (such as “Freedom House”), address the issues of whether they have moved countries or communities away from dependency and towards “freedom” from continuing outside interventions so that they may stand as “democratic” equals among other

---

<sup>18</sup> U.N. Declaration on Indigenous Peoples, *supra*.

such groups. One can search the major indicators of these organizations in vain<sup>19</sup>. The closest is the Bertelsmann Transformation index, but its ultimate goal of developed status is based on a political and ideological test; whether a country has become a “market based democracy” and not whether or not it is free from outside political, economic or military influence<sup>20</sup>.

Economists have sought to develop measures of foreign investment and control over economies that can provide measures of financial independence and vulnerability of countries in ways that are analogous to discussions of corporate ownership and control. These measures include such factors as the penetration percentage of foreign capital (public and private/transnational), shifts of resources and terms of trade, debt ratios, and economic contributions to output of a country’s “center” and “periphery”. What makes these measures of limited use is that the formulas of percentage ownership or borrowing only measure the financial leverage over economic assets at which economic control shifts, but not whether political and cultural choices are being influenced in other ways that create dependency through particular interventions. These are useful diagnostics for investors and for cross-country analyses but are not useful in measuring the reinforcement or reversal of colonial institutions and mindsets by various development interventions.

Basic Factors to Be Measured in an Indicator of Impact on Independence: The questions to ask of development intervention to determine whether or not it weans a country (or culture/ community) from dependency, start off relatively simply.

---

<sup>19</sup> See for example: Freedom House (2006), *Methodology*. On the web at: [http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=352&ana\\_page=330&year=2006](http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=352&ana_page=330&year=2006); Daniel Kaufmann, Aart Kraay, and Masimo Mastruzzi, *Governance Matters VI: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators, 1996-2006*, The World Bank, WPS4280, 2007; Kekic, Laza, “The Economist Intelligence Unit’s Index of Democracy,” *The World in 2007*, 2007, on the web at: [http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY\\_INDEX\\_2007\\_v3.pdf](http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_INDEX_2007_v3.pdf), U.S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance, *Handbook of Democracy and Governance Program Indicators*, PN-ACC-390, 1998. Available on the Web at: [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnacc390.pdf), Todd Landman, *Indicators for Human Rights Based Approaches to Development in UNDP Programming: A Users’ Guide*, UNDP Oslo Governance Centre, 2006. Similar and updated materials at: <http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/oslogovcentre@undp.org; democratic-governance-practice-group.sk@undp.org>; “European Commission, “Measuring Democracy and Good Governance,” Conference, Munich, January 21-23, 2002, Reported on line at: <http://www.inwent.org/imperia/md/content/bereich4-intranet/abteilung4-06/d1.pdf>; Gerardo L. Munck, and Jay Verkuilen, “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 35:1, 2002.

<sup>20</sup> Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2006: Political Management in International Comparison*, On web at: [http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/fileadmin/pdf/BTI\\_2006\\_Brosch\\_re\\_GB.pdf](http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/fileadmin/pdf/BTI_2006_Brosch_re_GB.pdf)

The goal of outside support, according to the international principles above, must fit one of two conditions. It must either to provide relief for an unexpected occurrence or for losses created by outsiders to bring a system back to where it was before it suffered losses, or it must provide development support to bring a cultural system back to long-term independence and sustainability consistent with its traditions before colonialism or other interruptions or choices rendered the system out of balance and unsustainable. Any support for the internal or external pressures or control that interferes with the return to sustainability promotes dependence. This logic is the basis for measurement of intent and impact.

The key components of colonialism and dependency that need to be reversed or questioned in order to bring systems towards independence are those of political and financial control as well as independent choice of the measures of value of progress that a country or culture chooses once that system is stable. Some of these are clear:

- The measure of sustainability is clear in the Rio Declaration. Sustainability requires maintaining of balance of production and consumption and protection of assets. U.N. principles affirm that it has nothing to do with measures of income or of consumption. This balance is the overall standard of measure for independence.
- The test of whether there is independent choice and values once sustainability is achieved, is whether there are internal measures of progress such as the “Gross National Happiness” index that Bhutan uses, and not whether a country’s progress is determined by measures set by outsiders, such as that of per capita consumption or production relative to that of foreigners and measured in foreign currency or products. Cultures have the right to choose any level of consumption or technology they choose as they essence of development “choice.”
- Political interference that leads to some benefit to the foreign donor, including access to resources, creates an immediate presumption that there is some form of pressure on sovereignty and use of financial and military power for control rather than promotion of independence;
- Promoting the rich in the country/ community through subsidies – distorting or reducing pressure for taxation and accountability; or lessening social solidarity in the country, are also signs of an intervention that is promoting internal colonialism and undermining dependency in a parallel way to the imbalance of power between donors and recipients across borders;
- Any disruptions that push systems towards imbalances in consumption and production within existing resources and knowledge are those that by definition create pressures for dependency;
- Several administrative mechanisms of interventions can themselves create different types of imbalances that promote dependency:

- Lack of promotion of the market where the market could work disrupts the functioning of an economic system and potentially creates dependency;
- Attempt to influence government services or functions through lobbying or through funding such as through NGOs disrupts the functioning of political and social systems and are signs of inducing vulnerability and dependency;
- Lack of measurement of resources and consumption, and introduction of subsidizes and grants without attention to financial incentives can disrupt the functioning of savings and investment systems and can lead to dependency;
- The donor organization, itself, models certain types of relationships. Lack of transparency, oversight of the foreign actors and their relations with government officials can, themselves, reinforce dependency.

Most of the components above reflect principles on which there is agreement and clarity. Interpreting them correctly is a matter of basic education and awareness rather than special expertise, though currently many development professionals are not trained to understand appropriate roles of government, the market and civil society. Yet, the principles are not that difficult to apply.

One area where development professionals are particularly weak, for example, is on distinguishing where different financial approaches are appropriate – where aid should be given as a grant, where it should be given as a subsidy, and where there is no need for “aid” at all but for commercial loans. Yet, the logic of understanding the creation of dependency is not hard to apply. As donors and NGOs rush to funnel money into “poor” areas and to act as mini-governments, building infrastructure, transferring technology, or even opening subsidized banks, the way to understand whether they are creating dependency is to go back to the basic principle and to ask a logical set of questions. Is support is being given to bring a system back to stability after an unforeseen and outside harm (where gifts are appropriate), to protect something of interest to the outsider (like the environment) where a gift or subsidy (if there is shared interest) is appropriate, to help make a system sustainable by changing a behavior (where subsidized loans are appropriate), or simply to generate wealth and productivity without any fix of a broken system (where market rate loans are appropriate)? Violation of these conditions suggests that the approach creates dependency.

**The Wrong Focus.** Unfortunately, while the above principles are simple and not so difficult to measure or estimate, many “development” organizations appear to have lost sight of the objective of building up societies and the groups within them so that they are strong and independent of foreign pressures or influence and

of protecting choice and freedoms. It is a truism in relations between donors and recipients that charity is more often given to help the giver – to continue a system of exploitation or to try to create a reflection of oneself (or one's society) in others – rather than from the motive of altruism that respects human difference and choice.

Without a standard for measuring the difference between “relief” and “development” and for understanding what “choice” really means in the context of development, there is often a tendency to reinforce the very colonial systems in recipient countries that local leaders use to undermine the choices of their majority and minority populations.

Most “development” projects tend to focus solely on improvements in consumption that they call “poverty reduction” that are easily achieved by either transferring resources or transferring capital and foreign productive technologies. These undoubtedly increase productivity and recipients who do not understand what is needed to bring their systems back to sustainability are almost certain to agree to accept what benefits them in the short term. It is easy to create development that seems “participatory” and “democratic” when it asks recipients whether or not they accept a short term gift rather than works to measure what will achieve long term sustainability and independence. Those who do currently include “stability” or “sustainability” as their objective generally err or pay little attention to what these terms actually mean. They often do little in the way of actually measuring what makes a culture long-term sustainable and are interested more in postponing crises or maintaining productivity for only a few years. Projects that are defined as “anti-poverty” or promoting “empowerment” or “equity” actually make populations *more dependent* in the long run if they try to homogenize the “poor” to Western and urban lifestyles in ways that increase consumption and pressures on resources (population growth) but do not continue to increase productivity. Projects that increase both consumption and productivity but that do so at the expense of the resources (that are used up at a quicker pace than actually replenished or transformed) also increase dependence. These are really colonialism and dependency under the pretext of assistance.

Typical of these is a recent initiative where Oxfam touts its business investments in Asia teaching Asian communities to produce more handicrafts in their homes for the international export market. This project, financed by International Finance Corporation, is touted wrongly as a “groundbreaking programme to eliminate poverty” and an example of how Oxfam “empowers” poor recipient communities<sup>21</sup>. Oxfam and the many international donors who

---

<sup>21</sup> Oxfam Prosperity Initiative, 2006, on the project website,  
[http://www.prosperityinitiative.org/our\\_history.html](http://www.prosperityinitiative.org/our_history.html)

Oxfam's Prosperity Initiative website explains that this “groundbreaking program” was actually designed by the International Finance Corporation and the Mekong Project Development Facility,

support this project have taken a clearly agreed international agenda, established in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and backed by other international treaties, for “sustainable development,” long-term poverty reduction and locally independence, and replaced it with an agenda that is really one of short-term “relief” at best. Projects like these in fact promote increased dependence on the world economy and on donors for continued infusions of capital and guidance on what products to produce for foreigners, as these projects simultaneously ratchet up populations, demands, and vulnerability of poor communities.

At the root of the problem, that an indicator can highlight, is an ideological confusion among donors as to what “development” is due to their continued use of colonial measures such as “Gross Domestic Product (GDP)” gains and current consumption rather than on local values and the strength and sustainability of their systems. This is combined with a paternalistic and “enabling” approach to dealing with governments in developing countries that are themselves the legacies of colonialism. Since most funding for “development” comes from governments seeking to promote their “national interest,” the short-term focus of the donors and on the agencies that carry out their projects is on promoting consumption of industrial goods and international exports of resources, as well as on building military and economic alliances, rather than self-reliant development and protection of weak resource bases. In becoming co-dependent on continued poverty and on maintaining relations with post-colonial elites in developing countries to facilitate their work, organizations administering development projects actually have built-in incentives to promote the colonial institutions of dependency that remain in place in developing countries. and to make corrupt bureaucrats their “partners” rather than targets of change. In almost all projects that are described as “development,” there is little or no focus on reforming the colonial political and economic structures that local elites in developing countries simply filled after independence movements. Most current development agents claim that their support for those institutions that are holdovers for colonialism demonstrate their “respect” for local culture. The reality is that this actually promotes continued destruction of local cultures and abuses of resources by an elite whose “culture” is now that of internal colonialism or neo-colonial dependency. Many other critics of development agents have focused on these failures, including a former head of the UNDP.<sup>22</sup>

---

of the World Bank Group, in 2004, then renamed as an Oxfam project in 2006. The project is not only supported by three different Oxfams (Hong Kong, U.S., and the U.K.) and by continued IFC funding, but is also supported by four government donors including AusAID (Australia), the Swiss, the Irish and SNV (Netherlands).

<sup>22</sup>James G. Speth, *The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2008, David Korten, *The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community*, Berret-Koehler Publishers, 2007, Lempert, “Why We Need an International Development Donor Monitor,” *supra*.

**An Indicator to Measure True Independent Development.** To make it easier for organizations and contributors to tell the difference between approaches promoting independence and those promoting unsustainable or even “neo-colonial” approaches, the indicator below with three categories (and a total of 13 questions) is designed for quick use, even by non-experts, as a litmus test of dependency. By asking these 13 easy “Yes or No” questions and then counting up the results, one can determine the success of a project or intervention in promoting self-reliance and independence by the following scale:

*Scale:*

10 - 14 points	A model of humanitarian intervention
5 - 9 points	Comprehensive solution towards building an independent and sustainable system in line with international principles that respect sovereignty and choice in development
1 - 4 points	Partial Solution
0 points	Neutral or Quid Pro Quo: Development aid with an agenda or aid that promotes Independence for some in the framework of overall assimilation
< 0	Project with an Overt or Hidden, Colonial Agenda

Note that this indicator does not offer an absolute scale of “dependence.” It is not offered as a social science research tool but rather serves as a project evaluation and selection tool. It is best used to show the relative value of different projects and means of improving those projects. There is some leeway offered in judgments for calibrating the indicator for specific needs of the user and for application to meet the specific needs of countries. Like most indicators, answers to each question would need to be “calibrated” to assure that different observers make the exact same determinations. To do so would require a longer manual for standardized, precise answers across observers.

Also, the purpose of the indicator is not to measure “Gross Benefit” or “cost-benefit.” It is merely designed to test the relative impact or direction of particular approaches as consistent with key international values that define dependency and to avoid potential harms that can make aid recipients vulnerable.

Measures/ Sub-Factors: Below, is an explanation of how anyone can apply the test to any project by asking the 13 questions and recording the scores. Most of the questions are clear cut in their scoring as, “Yes, comprehensive” (2 points), “Yes” (1 point), or “No” (0 points or negative points for harms). In cases where



there is a judgment call, scorers can opt for a “Debatable” (0.5 points for benefits and 0 points for harm).

The measures of performance can be placed into three categories of questions that follow a clear logic:

- 1) *Positive Beneficial Impact on Independence and Empowerment*: These questions focus on awarding points for interventions that repair the recipient’s own systems rather than create dependency, with measurable intent to do so and measurable impact. (6 possible points for five questions);
- 2) *No Negative or Adverse Impacts Either Weakening Local Institutions that Need to Be Strong or Creating Conditions for Internal Colonialism*: Projects are screened and awarded points for creating no new imbalances and harms/ no promote of systems that change the country and its cultures in ways that make them more vulnerable and reliant on continued help. Negative points are given for impacts that have a hidden agenda to promote interests of the donor, while positive points are given for safeguarding against these harms. (5 questions and a potential score of 5 points or a loss of 5 points.); and
- 3) *Internal Procedures of the Project, Itself, Reflect the Values of Accountability and Self-Reliance*: Points are awarded for projects that demonstrate the values of independence and oversight.

These three categories are the key to scoring success of any change: benefits minus negative impacts, with a bonus for modeling of the characteristics of independence in the project or donor organization, itself. Note that the first category is itself a screening to test whether a project actually achieves anything in the area of promoting independence and reversing impacts of colonialism or authoritarianism at all, and whether it can even be scored within the overall category of projects promoting independent development and choice.

1. *Positive Beneficial Impact on Independence and Empowerment*: This is the category that can be used for screening whether the project and spending really promote independent development, or could potentially have substantive benefit in creating sustainability and autonomy among the recipient community/country. (5 questions and a potential score of 6 points). A project that does not score more than 1 point in this category is already partly suspect as being driven by an outside agenda to favor a dependent relationship rather than to promote real local development.

**Question 1.** *Setting the Recipient on the Path to Independence and Empowerment: Dependency Test of the Input/ Illusory Growth/ Development Not “Relief”: (Project Intent)*: Since this category is easily politicized, it is best to split the test into two questions to avoid falling into the trap of assuming a beneficial intent when

there is really only a focus on symbols or symptoms. The overall question to be answered is this: Is there an understanding in the project design of the difference between "development" (long-term changes in thinking, culture, and institutions, for sustainability) and "relief" (a gift to treat "poverty" symptoms for short-term distressed populations suffering from a natural disaster where there is no internal capacity due to disruption, or where there is a need for a "kickstart" to return to its normal path of sustainable growth)? Or is the project just treating "poverty" symptoms and applying a "relief" approach in a non-emergency situation that will just postpone poverty or distress by only relieving one symptom (such as inadequate productivity to meet a growing population)?

(Positive Test of Intent) The *project fixes a broken social system* that is a cause of its unsustainability and does it in such a way that the underlying problems are cured and the recipient can resolve future problems better on its own without any continuation of inputs. In other words, the assistance goes right to the root causes of the problem and doesn't just treat the symptoms but fixes the underlying systemic problems (over-consumption, poor planning systems, weak research and development investment). In the case of a project that is offering relief following a disaster, the question is whether the aid is just subsidizing causes that led to the disaster by encouraging a behavior that made the recipient more disaster prone (such as over-population on a vulnerable resource or over-construction or weakening of public and private systems for disaster risk management and preparation) and whether it includes planning that will reduce the future risk and improve the response so as to make the recipient less dependent on future aid.

(Negative Test of Intent) The *project does not merely provide a technical input of short term use such as a technology of production* Donating a factory or technology is not a continuing productivity increase but building a research and development institute could be. A technological transfer that appears to increase productivity and that will allow for long-term production using that one technology does NOT create independence. It is phony growth that is simply a transfer.

Scoring: Yes, the project addresses the whole workings of the cultural, political and economic system in a way that tries to set the whole system on a sustainable path where all of its systems are in balance and effective -- 2 points

Yes, the project has impact on a specific system (a government function or a social or political system or set of behaviors) that it repairs -- 1 point

No – 0 points

**Question 2.** *Test of the Impact on the System: (Project Measure of Result):* The project results in *long-term continuing productivity increases* (not just a one-time technology transfer or investment but an additional wave of self-generated increases that occur within the system, itself) *or stable per capita productivity, in ways that the project measures?* This is similar to the previous question and looks for an actual measurable result beyond development intent, to justify an additional point in scoring. In other words, the project does not just introduce foreign technology on a one-time basis or provide an input that cannot continually be improved but promotes continuing investment in research and spurs innovation and creativity that lead to productivity that is measurable, or that provides a systematic way for measuring problems/changes and fixes them without outside help. Donating fish or fishing rods or building new irrigation systems are not sustainable improvements UNLESS the donations are continually maintained from the income it generates and that income is stable “forever”. If population and consumption increase, productivity also has to increase to keep pace, or fish stocks will be in danger of being depleted, as most of the world’s fish stocks are today. This is why the development community’s idea of “teaching hungry people to fish” rather than “giving them a fish” is already an outdated idea. Coffee growing or shrimp raising projects are usually unsustainable since they take income for only a few years (and they also deplete assets). Dams that need to be rebuilt may or may not be sustainable (and may or may not build overall assets) and will show no overall measurable long-term impact on building independence.

Scoring: Yes – 1  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

**Question 3.** *Foreign interests are neutralized* in the project itself. There is no political empowerment benefit to foreign interests that could compete with or trump the local interests. Foreign corporations/investors cannot use changes to increase their power relative to any interests in the country or to exploit any group or

workers or resource in the country or erode the strength of the local cultural values and approaches. Projects that promote foreign trade, foreign investment, commerce, or political or military alliance that is linked to the change, require special scrutiny of the risks to local control. Trade promotion is not per se bad, but the presumption is that a trade project will disrupt a system by making it dependent or vulnerable to political pressure from investors as will any kind of brain drain or foreign investment increasing foreign share of ownership in the country's productive assets (risk of capital flight as well as influence of money on the political system and agendas). In order to overcome this presumption, any project that introduces trade must also show that it has specific components that measure and assure sustainable development (a 50 year projection of the balance between population, consumption, and production) for each group in ways that maintains its features in the context of its environment. If the project has not sought this kind of measurement, it automatically fails the test. If it has this measurement, it must meet the test of sustainable development in a clear way. Note that this question doesn't require the sophisticated diagnostic measurements on the amount of foreign permeability or on concentration of ownership or amount of risks. It just looks at the direction of the intervention, whether the project seeks to protect and immunize the recipient or not (there is already a power imbalance between givers and recipients that creates an ethical responsibility and implies a vulnerability) and whether the goal and impact of a specific intervention is really empowering the locals relative to outsiders or vice versa. That makes it a much easier question to answer.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

**Question 4.** The project promotes *change in government institutions to reverse colonialism (or authoritarian) legacies in the institutions of governance and/or controls over other colonial institutions*. The project takes concrete steps to either reverse or to insulate the country against the legacies of colonialism and dependency through: challenges to government elites who act in the position of previous colonial elites (institutional changes that increase the powers of citizens relative to government officials and to business

institutions or social institutions such as the church or mass media), promotion of controls on foreign actors in the country to make them directly accountable to citizens; reducing the roles of military and police in decisions and/or increasing direct citizen oversight over these institutions; and increases in the roles of indigenous peoples and third world governments in international governance systems, etc. Propping up a dictatorship or an oppressive ruling class on grounds of “not-interfering” with a culture is likely to actually be cultural destruction if the government system is a legacy of colonialism (the case for most governments in developing countries) and any project that justifies this kind of non-intervention on a pretext of respecting local values results in no points.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

**Question 5.** The project *helps reverse any legacy of colonialism in regards to measurements of value (promoting asset protection or some other kind of long-term utility rather than quick sales or consumption)* and replaces standards of performance and success that are based on sales to others (Gross Domestic Product, which is an income measure not an asset measure) or measures of income or consumption in a foreign currency (per capita income and consumption) and in relation to foreigners (assuming that all societies have the same measures of value in regards to ownership and consumption, such as electronics, media, living space, etc.) since these measures are themselves reinforcing of dependency. An independent country focuses on creation of wealth per capita and on ownership of assets, following standard business practices in which success is a measure of accumulating and building one’s wealth. A dependent country focuses on generating income (GDP) or just treating a short term problem (like symptoms of “poverty”) since these are the measures imposed from outside on a system that is to be raided for sales of its wealth and for its ability to purchase from abroad, rather than to build and control its own assets. Bhutan measures its success by “Gross National Happiness” in standards of value that fit its own cultural preferences rather than those offered by others.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm  
Debatable - 0.5, if the project promotes a transition towards sustainable development measures  
No - 0

2. *No Negative or Adverse Impacts Either Weakening Local Institutions that Need to Be Strong or Creating Conditions for Internal Colonialism:*  
(5 questions and a potential score of 5 points or a loss of 5 points.)

**Question 6.** *Funding Mechanism.* The impact of the assistance does not end up subsidizing some other improper spending (allowing a transfer from one category of spending into something else as a result of the gift), reducing pressure on elites who should tax themselves to fund the project, or end up distorting capital markets in the country by offering a gift or subsidy for a kind of productive investment that should be in the form of a loan or in the form of a loan at competitive market rates. If the project merely seeks to find “poor” people to help, but does not analyze the responsibility of the elites in the country to fulfill obligations of social solidarity with people in their own country, the project is part of a collusion in detaching elites globally from their local responsibilities and has a negative impact. It is in fact taking money from poor people in wealthy countries and transferring it to rich people in poor countries in the classic definition of dependency. If the project does not do an analysis of existing government spending and tax policies, it is likely that the project is offering money for the “poor” at the same time that an excessive amount of the budget is being used for military and police spending to control the poor, and the project is actually subsidizing this pattern. If the project is given as a gift rather than a loan and does not include standard financial controls and conditions, it is likely being given with the knowledge that corruption will occur and as a subsidy for corruption and waste, including purchase of luxuries and foreign goods. This question asks about the impact and harm. Note that Question 11 applies this question to whether there is a system in place to look at careful use of funds both by the recipients and by the donor, looking at analysis of consumption categories.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm  
Debatable or not relevant - 0

No – (-1) (Loss of a point)

**Question 7.** *Financial logic of intervention promotes self-financing and there is no negative impact on market mechanisms/ Public vs. Private Sector/ Internal dependency on corporate sector:* The project does not inappropriately subsidize the private sector or any segments of the private sector (particular industries or particular segments such as exporters or larger businesses) in ways that distort the ability of the private sector to develop sustainable, competitive businesses and to fund its own investments and development. An appropriate subsidy to the private sector is one that aids overall competition by promoting business development services (BDS) through creating sustainable business education institutions (consulting firms, business education, workbooks and websites, business associations), creating a regulated and accountable and internally competitive business sector, and that does not simply give grants that promote businesses (funding development banks that are not self-sustaining and follow business principles, offering business education that competes with existing education services and does not improve the existing business education market). The support for any kind of profit making organization – including universities where they compete, hospitals or health care – and public institutions is that they work on market principles providing measurable value (including measurable social value) that are self-sustaining without the support creating distortions. Any support for institutions that earn profits must include not only accountability to the market but also be responsive to public oversight as publicly chartered institutions, and the outside funding and support must also not distort this.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm

Debatable or not relevant - 0

No – (-1) (Loss of a point)

**Question 8.** *Government functions are respected and balance with civil society is promoted appropriately and internally.* The project does not replace a government function with foreign paternalism building parallel systems that are better than government but that do not improve what is wrong, or transfer a government function to another place like civil society because of current underperformance. Nor does the project seek to build a civil

*society that must rely on funds from donors or from elites, in place of direct support and control by the beneficiaries, themselves.* The project must address the failure in the appropriate place in the system without creating a duplicative and/or weaker system and takes an active step to prevent against a potential harm. (e.g., NGOs are not public service providers but provide for private needs and have a role in trying to improve government action; businesses are not “corporate citizens” but are producers to be taxed and regulated to fund public functions, etc.) If the argument of the donor is that the government is too “corrupt” to handle a function and/or that the donor is offering models that “can” be incorporated into government, the project also has the burden of proof in showing that it includes some kind of mechanism for challenging and replacing the ineffective system with an improved model that is publicly accountable. The appropriate role of an NGO is to model a new behavior to try to convince government to change, and to advocate for the special interests of a group with sustainable funding and accountability to that beneficiary group, but not reliant on foreign or other outside funding. The appropriate role of funding for NGOs must also be to ensure that they are sustainable with funding from the beneficiaries and with accountability directly to the beneficiaries, and not dependent on funds from foreigners or from elites who are disconnected to benefits to the beneficiaries and who have different interests.

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm through measurements and clear concepts of government organization and functions  
Debatable or not relevant - 0  
No – (-1) (Loss of a point)

**Question 9.** *Internal dependency/ Internal colonialism:* The project *does not increase any kinds of concentration of power among recipients, either among an elite group* (class, Ministry/ military or financial or media or economic officials or powers, network, institutions, clan or family ties) *or an elite or favored racial or ethnic or religious group*, either a powerful minority or a favored majority group and *helps reverse any legacy of colonialism in regards to minority peoples and builds new self-sufficient communities* rather than reinforcing dependency. Preparing areas to enter the New World Order in which they will be dependent is likely to threaten overall human sustainability. Propping up a dictatorship or an



oppressive ruling class on grounds of “not-interfering” with a culture is likely to actually be cultural destruction if the government system is a legacy of colonialism (the case for most governments in developing countries).

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm through measurements and clear concepts of government organization and functions  
Debatable or not relevant - 0  
No – (-1) (Loss of a point)

**Question 10.** *Sustainability of beneficiary cultures:* The project is appropriate to the recipient cultures and insulates them against pressures for urbanization that result from ratcheting up either population or consumption demands. The project is self-sustainable within the country's resources and has continued local financing and management, with freedom from continued foreign or institutional funding that would create dependency on outsiders for achievement of the project goals. Typically, projects that claim to alleviate “poverty” actually focus on productivity in ways that ratchet up vulnerability and dependency by depleting resources, paying no attention to increasing population (or triggering it by improving health) and increasing demands for higher consumption and living standards. Once communities are started on paths towards industrialization, they have lost their cultures and cannot turn back without either a civil war or starvation to reduce the population. Their only alternative is to seek continued aid and dependency. A project that addresses “poverty” by attacking cultural differences (relative poverty) and not accepting stability of the culture as the goal, even at consumption standards different from those of industrial countries, is really attacking culture. If the project addresses “poverty” concerns, it must differentiate between absolute poverty (hunger and inability to meet basic human needs); relative poverty (inequality and inequity within the system); and comparative poverty (relative to living standards of the donor) and focus on appropriate development and improvements that maintain cultural diversity and choice. Any gifts must be appropriate to the current state of development of the recipient and not beyond their ability to sustainably fund it with their own resources (e.g., a high-tech hospital rather than preventative health in a rural community).

Scoring: Yes – 1, if the project shows awareness of this and protects against harm through measurements and clear concepts of government organization and functions  
Debatable or not relevant - 0  
No – (-1) (Loss of a point)

3. *Internal Procedures of the Project, Itself, Reflect the Values of Accountability and Self-Reliance:* The project does not just seek short-term impact but institutionalizes a process of promoting independence, in the project itself and the way it is run (modeling independence) in the governmental system and/or culture of the recipient. (3 questions and a potential score of 3 points.)

**Question 11.** *Consumption Policy Analysis:* Before offering assistance, the project has *analyzed the recipient's spending and practices to see if wasteful spending* (luxuries, foreign purchases, early child-birth and poor family planning, loss of the labor of women or the elderly or dissenters, addictions, militarism and violence, spending promoting hierarchy and control, corruption) *can be reduced and redirected, and how the project, itself, can make the most cost-efficient use of its funds* for measurable results. Both on the best use of the donor funds (protecting citizens in the donor country) and of the recipients on their own budgeting, waste, and the reasons for it, the project seeks to use state-of-the-art tools for examining consumption and expenditures, including the psychology of consumption. In many cases on the recipient side, a far better project than transferring money is to help stop waste and poor planning, including treating the psychological problems for wasteful spending (addictions, luxuries, short-term thinking).

Scoring: Yes - 1  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

**Question 12.** *Accountability of the donors:* The project itself (the donor organization) is *a model of transparency and direct accountability to beneficiaries and to citizens*, and does not hide behind barriers that require citizens or beneficiaries to demand that government representatives or other elites bestow accountability. Projects that meet this requirement will have open books, clear professional ethics codes, full published reports on their projects, and full use of

measurement tools of benefits in the profession (cost-benefit, baselines, comparative indicators, and industry benchmarks).

Scoring: Yes - 1  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

**Question 13.** *Rewards and Incentives:* The project *rewards behaviors that promote independence and sustainability of recipients and punishes behaviors that promote dependency*. Success of a project does not lead to replication in additional areas using more outside funds but towards promotion of copying by others with their own resources. Failure of a project to be sustainable or to show strong benefits does not invite additional funding because of “continued poverty” but triggers an immediate change and possible accountability. Delayed projects are not rewarded because of good “relationships” have been built and officials or beneficiaries “appreciate” the assistance, but because there are clear standards showing progress towards independence and sustainability and that exceed standard benchmarks for projects resolving similar root causes of the problems. Grants are given with real conditions that have enforceability and consequences without paternalistic justifications that recipients cannot or should not be held to real standards.

Scoring: Yes - 1  
Debatable - 0.5  
No - 0

How Some Organizations Do: After understanding how the test works, it is easy to apply to every new case in just a few minutes and with basic agreement among any one using it. Below are some examples of how different organizations and projects score, from best to worst. In the inset box is a demonstration of how the test is applied step-by-step to one organization. Readers are encouraged to try the indicator on other cases and to present them in an accessible place, to build up a larger data base of scores and comparisons.

Before reading these results, consider the following. Most “self-rating” systems using indicators grossly over-inflate results because of the natural tendency to look uncritically at one’s own projects (why there is a need for clear and objective grading standards) and because there is a tendency to avoid considering several organizations at once when rating those organizations one favors. Any rating instrument needs to be “calibrated,” i.e., tested for consistency using the same test question multiple times on multiple organizations in order to

reveal differences. Each observer doing the test ultimately reaches some internal consistency after a number of tests, but different observers are likely to come up with different results because they are “harder” or “softer.” The scores below are those consistent with the judgment of the author and they are an example of strict application of the ideas, such that weaknesses are revealed as areas where improvement is needed. If such a tool is ultimately adapted by professionals and subject to multiple tests, there would ultimately be a consensus on the scaling and the rating system.

Interestingly, the results suggest that most peoples might actually be better off, in terms of their independence and rights, without current approaches to aid.

*Models of Development Independence: 5 to 14 points*

- The Marshall Plan in Europe - Though it would take an historian to sort out specific institutional changes and it can be debated whether the U.S. was really trying to create strong competitors that could develop in alternative ways (no points awarded in those categories, or for achieving true sustainability), the support to rebuild America’s allies including the far reaching and comprehensive social, cultural, and institutional changes made in Germany to remake the country’s civic culture and to create a non-imperial, federal, democratic Germany can roughly be scored at 7 points. (The project scores well on questions 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8. Others are debatable.) This is a model intervention, but it also occurred under rare and specific circumstances. It also demonstrates that the indicator can be used to score assistance to developed countries as well as to evaluate unusual kinds of development interventions. The Marshall Plan can be compared to the current U.S. occupation in Iraq that can be clearly scored as a colonial project, earning no positive points and at least three negative points for a total of at most (-3) points.
- Cultural Survival, Focus on the Global South – These are examples of advocacy organizations with publications rather than specific development “projects” or organizations running projects, but this advice they give can also be scored as to how it promotes the various issues that are relevant to this kind of organization – at roughly 11 points. Although they don’t promote specific measures, which is where they miss a couple of points, they earn points on almost every question.
- Integrated and Sustainable Community Development Approaches such as a sample project of the Australian Foundation for the Peoples of Asia and the Pacific (AFAP) - AFAP’s project with the Muong in Viet Nam is an example of a donor funded project that is a partial solution that promotes independence because of specific inclusion of systems usually forgotten in the standard development project whose specific project characteristics reflect indicator

measures – interactive research and extension services to assure long term production, strong community oversight of all funds, strengthening of local democratic institutions to challenge State (colonial) paternalism, sustainable resource and consumption planning, and building of appropriate government and non-governmental systems, scoring some 7.5 points. With specific attention to different cultural groups and practices as well as family planning, such projects can score even better. There may be examples of these projects of which the author is unaware. The project mentioned here, that did receive EC and other European country donor funding, was an exception to the usual rule on these projects (see below).

*Projects that do well or poorly:* Falling into a separate category are sets of projects that have the same label describing them but that have extremely variable results depending on the intentions and structure of the projects. “Business development” and “community credit/ banking” projects can either promote dependence or undermine it in the guise of economic ownership and sufficiency, and this is where the indicator questions are important in setting the criteria. The disparity between appropriate and inappropriate approaches is huge, with scores ranging from 8 points to (-1) point depending on how they meet various criteria. This category serves as a reminder that there is a need to be wary and to look behind the names of projects to apply real tests to evaluate what they do.

- Grameen Bank, Following the Self-Help Model (Community banking and small business/ household loan investment) Model Alone – score up to 8 points when they include all of the original attributes of the Grameen Model to promote community financial independence and self-reliance, but less as they are incorrectly copied by donors who have other agendas or have little understanding of why all of the project’s features are important. The project that strictly follows its original model of rebuilding cooperative exchange and savings networks that existed prior to colonial destruction of community systems, earns 4 points in the first category and 4 points in the final category. There is some question as to whether it promotes sustainability and equity (a question with several business promotion projects) but if the funding comes from the community itself and the project is only a catalyst, it earns another point.
- Donor Projects that are Run with Selected Partners, Claiming to Follow the “Grameen Model” but imposing an export driven approach to business development - By contrast, donor driven credit projects that simply give capital rather than organize better consumption in the communities, and that promote loans for projects that change the culture or employ children or that promote exports and unsustainable development, contain many features of seeking to bring communities into the “market” rather than to make them

sustainable. They end up subsidizing failed government credit and development systems. These can be scored at roughly 2 points.

- Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) and Business Development Projects – These projects can create independence or dependence, depending on their real goals and the mechanisms they choose, scoring as high as 4 points (for creating sustainable systems of banking, but promoting little or no other changes towards sustainability) but also as low as (-1) point (for promoting agendas of industrialization and trade that create dependence). For example,
  - Accion International and some GTZ (German development) projects - In communities that are long on the path to industrialization or where traditional informal business systems have been destroyed by colonialism, an SME (or a family and household enterprise) project that uses the concept of business development services and simultaneously promotes strong government regulation of business, without an agenda of trade promotion, can score about 4 points.
  - World Bank, USAID, and Government Donor SME Projects – Trade oriented projects that promote large scale businesses in the name of “SME’s”, projects that favor certain industries and that run their own brand name courses or offer their own loans rather than making business development services work, or that destroy local cultures in order to commercialize their economies in the name of poverty elimination, lose all the points they score, and earn a colonial impact – (-1) point.

*Partial Solutions or Neutral:* 0 to 4 points. Development assistance such as environmental protection, that does not focus on productivity but on protection, is often neutral or a partial solution towards independence. Pure disaster relief work scores as neutral in terms of dependency. Most disaster relief organizations have recently expanded into “development” work that is actually disguised relief and their impact, described in the next category, below, is not neutral but actually negative.

- WWF, IUCN, FFI, (or other environmental organization) Environmental Protection through Alternative Income or Eco-Tourism Projects – Most environmental organizations have bought into models of environmental protection through “poverty reduction” that includes “income generation” through exports of various forms (eco-tourism, sales of non-timber forest products) and disguised urbanization rather than a return to sustainability through traditional practices. Such organizations are pursuing environmental objectives from the perspective of global concerns rather than for strengthening locals and they score around – 0 points as neutral. (They can potentially earn points on questions 1, 4, and 5, but lose points for creating a dependency on exports and for ratcheting up overall consumption.) Some

projects do slightly better if they focus on land and cultural rights and some do slightly worse if they impose outside systems and incentives for protecting the environment without regard to the peoples who live within it.

*Failures:* < 0 points, falling in the “Colonial” range. Most contemporary development organizations claim to be doing much more than they really are and the indicator exposes them, quickly. Many charitable organizations appear to actually be in the “poverty business.” Continued dependency of recipients actually generates more justification for their work and they are co-dependent on poverty rather than on its solution. Government donors acting on national self-interest rather than on the basis of long-term humanitarian interests continue to reinforce the colonial legacies of their countries in previous generations to keep recipients of aid relatively weak and indebted. They score no positive points and then fall into negative points for their adverse impacts, especially on questions 6, 8, 9, and 10.

- UNICEF, CARE, Oxfam (including its “Prosperity Initiative”), Catholic Relief Services, Caritas, Save the Children, International Red Cross, and other “development” NGOs that specialize in relief and “anti-poverty” projects –
- *Neutral in Relief:* When these organizations do relief in emergency situations, their impact is absolutely neutral, 0 points.
- *Creating Dependency in “Poverty” Work:* When these relief organizations expand into activities to alleviate “poverty” outside of emergency situations, they actually work to subsidize elites who won’t help their poor and/or introduce foreign technologies in order to quickly spur productivity and to create the illusion of reducing poverty, they score as Colonial projects, (-3) points. It is disturbing to see UNICEF score in this category since its mission is to assure that laws and treaties that would promote sustainability and rights are enforced, but their work has been distorted to one of financial transfers for short-term relief of symptoms that makes UNICEF co-dependent, like many other organizations, on continued poverty and dependency, in order to justify future work for their organizations<sup>23</sup>.
- World Vision and Religious Mission Projects that Teach the Bible or other religion with Aid – These organizations score even lower than those above given their goal of continuing the colonial mission of replacing traditional systems with their preferred religious doctrine; scoring a Colonial, (-4) points.
- Helvetas, SNV, CIDSE, and other “Minority Area Integrated Development” Projects (a subset of the above) – The standard anti-poverty project in minority communities actually seeks to promote consumption and productivity in ways that homogenize all cultures into one unsustainable

---

<sup>23</sup> Lempert and Nguyen, *supra*.

economic system, without reversing colonialism or creating self reliance. These projects score as (-1) point, promoting dependency because they replace taxes with foreign donations and spur consumption and homogenization of minorities (loss of 3 points), despite the gains they may generate through locally controlled water user systems or participatory extension services that appear to promote “local control” (positive score of 2 points in the first category). This is in contrast to the positive impact of an atypical international NGO project in the same category (the AFAP project, scored above) that promotes independence by paying attention to long-term sustainable development (resource and consumption planning) and democracy. In the AFAP approach with the Muong in Viet Nam, as opposed to the standard “integrated development” project in the field, the concept of “integration” means actual long term balance and not just multiple inputs and the outcome is more than simple treatment of poverty symptoms through productivity increases achieved by transfers of technology or purchases of infrastructure.

- UN Volunteers (UNV), U.S. Peace Corps, Volunteers in Asia, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO), Jewish World Service – It is a bit surprising that projects that claim to be empowering local communities and that are promoted through volunteers, either by governments or by volunteer organizations actually end up reinforcing dependency and score as Colonial - (-1) points. They score low because they are largely geared towards productivity without a focus on reversing colonialism or building sustainable systems. (See chart below with detail scoring for UNV.) Organizations like the Peace Corps that now focus more on “teaching English” and on promoting business, can score even more strongly as Colonial – (-2) points.
- World Bank, Regional Development Bank Loans to national governments as well as Donor “Participatory Local Planning” and “Investment” Initiatives - Loans are at best of neutral impact but generally score as Colonial – (-2) points for empowering and subsidizing elites without promoting real long-term independent development. They lose points for merely supporting trade or infrastructure for production without real changes (roads and school buildings rather than laboratories and research). The international development community claims that its local development planning projects that include community loans promote participation, democracy and empowerment, but they disrupt any attempts to create sustainable development plans with self-reliant taxation and consumption planning and are really no more than investment plans for short-term productivity increases, thus promoting dependency and cultural destruction at local levels, without any attention to underlying structural problems.



- European Commission, USAID, other government and multi-lateral donor Policy and “Capacity Building” Projects for National Governments – The standard projects of these actors, whether they funnel money to Western style NGOs or whether they work with governments to rewrite laws, build trade ministries, or build efficiency, all score as Colonial, (-2) points. Even where the projects suggest that they are promoting sustainability, rule of law or strong citizen based institutions, they actually work to subsidize elites, undermine community sustainability, and do nothing to reverse the impacts of colonialism that benefit donor countries. They score no positive points and lose points for the effects they create (on questions 6 and 9).
- Millennium Development Goal (MDG) and Human Rights Based Approach of the UNDP – The UN system doesn’t really follow the Rio Declaration and the MDG’s do not really promote independence and empowerment, though they are claimed to do so. The actual impact of the approach is to maintain the power of governments and their colonial legacies, promote trade and productivity, assimilate minorities, and transfer technologies for short-term treatment of poverty symptoms that all continue to promote dependency through a system of nation-States and global governance that is itself a product of Colonialism, scoring – (-3) points.
- Gates Foundation, Clinton Foundation, Ford Foundation, Soros Foundation, Asia Foundation and other Foundations – The appropriate social role of foundations is to promote new and innovative approaches that government donors and pure administrator donor agencies do not fund, but most of these organizations today fund activities that do nothing to restore community independence and self-reliance. They focus instead on health improvements (raising populations, consumption, and unsustainability) or on specific populations (women, minority) to integrate them into urbanizing global society, scoring as Colonial, (-4) points to (-2) points depending on the project. In attempting to be apolitical, they more strongly reinforce dependency than even government projects that can at least claim some partial accountability to the public.

Scoring of United Nations Volunteers on the 13 component questions of the indicator:	
Preliminary Information for Assessment	
UNV's Organizational Mission (Claim) <sup>24</sup> and Mandate <sup>25</sup> according to UNV's website and 2007 Annual Report <sup>26</sup> UNV's founding charter and several amendments <sup>27</sup> .	<p>"The United Nations Volunteers is the UN organization that supports sustainable human development globally through the promotion of volunteerism ... through enhancing opportunities for participation by all peoples. ... It values free will, commitment, engagement and solidarity ..."</p> <p>(from Website Mission Statement)</p> <p>The mission is also stated in the 2007 report as to contribute to a: "more cohesive society by building trust and reciprocity." (UNV, 2007)</p> <p>The mandate, established by the UN was to promote "active participation of the younger generation in all aspects of social and economic life." General Assembly Resolution 2659, December 7, 1970 and G.A. 31/131, December 16, 1976.</p> <p>This was amended later to promote participation by "women and men, youth and older people" and to "Extend the notion of volunteerism as an additional valuable component of national development planning"</p> <p>The idea is also to "help enlist public support for development cooperation" and for "building up a new constituency in support of development efforts" as well as "to work with the media to present an attractive image of volunteering" as part of a "sound investment in a country's human resources." G.A. 56/38, January 10, 2002.</p>
UNV's Activities in practice (from its 2007 Annual Report, UNV, 2007):	<p>The results are described as "Advocacy, Integration and Mobilization"</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- producing "solid economic data on non-profit institutions and volunteering" and to "integrate it into the planning and activities" of governments and non-profits</li> <li>- Promoting volunteering on specific goals (that include almost every possible category of development interventions of the UN system or any other organization that wishes to be a partner) of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Gender Equality</li> <li>-- Promotion of the Millennium Development Goals including Environmental protection</li> <li>-- Promotion of Youth participation in sports</li> <li>-- Placing human rights awareness into national programs and public consciousness</li> <li>-- Addressing HIV/AIDS concerns</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>24</sup> U.N. Volunteers (2008), Website Mission Statement, <http://www.unv.org/who-we-are/mission-statement.html>

<sup>25</sup> U.N. Volunteers, General Assembly Resolutions of the U.N. defining the organizational mandate:

G.A. 2659, December 7, 1970. <http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/NR034924.pdf>

G.A. 31/131, December 16, 1976. <http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/NR030314.pdf>

G.A. 56/38, January 10, 2002. <http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/N0147881.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> U.N. Volunteers, (2007), *Inspiration in Action: UN Volunteers Annual Report 2007* [http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2008/annual/English\\_report\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2008/annual/English_report_WEB.pdf)

<sup>27</sup> These are included above with the U.N. General Assembly resolutions.

### Lempert: A Dependency in Development Indicator

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- Training communities in crisis prevention and recovery</li> <li>-- Helping rebuild infrastructure such as hospitals</li> <li>-- Promoting economic production activities</li> <li>-- Building government capacity (generally related to specific MDGs)</li> <li>-- Social integration of minority communities</li> <li>-- Fighting brain drain by providing jobs for locals</li> </ul> <p>The "sectors" of volunteerism linked to UNV's website include: "Activism; Children; Civil Society; Culture and Sports; Disabled People; Education; ..." a total of 22 areas</p> <p>UN Volunteers are: Paid international volunteers (low salary), Paid local volunteers (comparatively good salary), Internet specialists volunteering off-site, and Youth mobilization coordinators in jobs that are often professional work of other agencies.</p> <p>Half of them work for UNDP and governments and half for other UN agencies.</p> <p>There are no priorities stated and there is no clear logic of support or problem focus stated. There are no specific targets, benchmarks or measures described.</p> <p>Some of the activities mentioned in UN resolutions include "awareness raising" on the "role of volunteerism" and "special recognition to volunteers"</p>
Overall analysis of UNV as an actor promoting independence and self-reliant sustainable development (UNDP, 2003).	<p>There are several contradictions built into the role, mission and strategy of UNV: The goal is to promote volunteerism in development planning, to promote solidarity, and sustainable human development, but the main partners are governments and volunteerism is largely a slogan that has little relation to pre-colonial solidarity systems and their restoration other than in a few post-conflict areas. There is no focus on restoring minority communities or on taking back local control and choice. UNV's stated goal is potentially top-down and propagandistic; for government and the UN system to mobilize youth to promote their choices, rather than the range of choice through empowerment, and to try to create stability through pacification of youth and other groups. The approach to volunteerism is potentially a labor tax; putting idle resources to work for government objectives. UNV documents have shown how volunteerism can be used as an empowering tool but this impact has never been built into the mandate or strategies of UNV. Focus on the MDGs promotes a uniform approach that spurs consumption and globalization.</p>

Analysis		
Question	Indicator	Scoring
I.	<b>Positive Beneficial Impact on Independence and Empowerment:</b>	<i>1 point. The tool of volunteerism and some of the specific activities of UNV do support some independence and empowerment, but only weakly.</i>
1.	<i>Setting the Recipient on the Path to Independence and Empowerment: Dependency Test of the Input/ Illusory Growth/ Development Not "Relief": The project fixes a broken social system*? (Measure of intent)</i>	UNV would claim that like UNDP, they are fixing governance systems and restoring country stability by promoting the MDGs and building capacity, and would say that they are going even further by building solidarity through volunteerism. Cynics would say that UNV does nothing to restore indigenous community solidarity and participation systems and does not even measure what is missing. Given that UNV simply responds to calls for

		<p>volunteers by partners and does not independent analysis of sustainability of the communities, cultures or countries where it works, it actually has no way of verifying whether the projects it takes on are putting systems back on a path to stability or are just quick or even political fixes. There certainly is no comprehensive attempt to put any systems back in order. While some of UNV's projects are likely to be empowering, such as work with post-civil war communities and work with women, the promotion of independent and empowering development is only an incidental aim and not a central goal. This means that no points can be awarded here, but that some could be awarded in terms of actual impact.</p> <p><i>0 points.</i></p>
2.	<p><i>Test of the Impact on the System: The project results in long-term continuing productivity increases or stable per capita productivity? (Measure of results)</i></p>	<p>Most UN projects actually fail to promote long-term sustainability and offer just short-term treatment of symptoms through technology transfer, and UNV must be valued in the same way since it follows the UN system. However, in some cases, UNV has documented improvement in communities through its particular tool of advocacy and collective action that can be empowering. Since the impact differs according to project, the results are debatable.</p> <p><i>0.5 points.</i></p>
3.	<p><i>Foreign interests are neutralized in the project itself?</i></p>	<p>UNV follows the UN system and many of the projects of the UN system are now funded directly by governments and private interests to further their specific objectives including trade, export, and marketization and industrialization of the developing world or movement of countries into their political blocs (such as the EU). On the other hand, UNV would argue that it works at local levels and not in the policy area that opens countries up to foreigners, and that it has specific goals that are country protective such as stopping brain drain. Though the project does not offer any system to protect against foreign influence, the determination of whether projects promote foreign interests or neutralize them depends on the project and makes this point debatable.</p> <p><i>0.5 points.</i></p>
4.	<p><i>The project promotes change in government</i></p>	<p>UNV would argue that volunteerism is empowering and that this is in itself a</p>

Lempert: A Dependency in Development Indicator

	<i>institutions to reverse colonialism (or authoritarian legacies) in the institutions of governance and/or controls over other colonial institutions?</i>	challenge to any kind of centralized authority. They would also say that the human rights based approach and reliance on international treaties is one that is rights based and that can challenge the institutional legacy of colonialism. Cynics would note that UNV's mandate is to work with government and that its approach is mostly top-down, to use volunteers for government purposes, with no specific mission of democratization or empowerment. Though the mandate of international organizations can easily be read as one of promoting cultural integrity and sustainability, neither UNV nor other UN organizations are actually putting these principles into their strategies or measurements. There is no debate here at all. The stated and actual mission of UNV is simply for volunteerism to promote goals set by States. <i>0 points.</i>
5.	<i>The project helps reverse any legacy of colonialism in regards to measurements of value (promotes per capita asset protection or utility rather than short term aggregate consumption or production measures that could destroy sustainability)?</i>	The answer to this one is clear. UNV follows the measures of the UN system, of Human Development Indicators and MDGs that rely heavily on short term measures of aggregate productivity and income and do not apply either standard business measures of assets/wealth per capita or any other local measure of happiness or cultural and economic sustainability. Moreover, the MDG's contain foreign aggregate measures that fit specific globalization objectives, such as those of national schooling on the colonial education model. <i>0 points.</i>
II.	<b>No Negative or Adverse Impacts Either Weakening Local Institutions that Need to Be Strong or Creating Conditions for Internal Colonialism</b>	<i>(-2) points. The UN donor agenda ends up subsidizing governments and promoting production and over-consumption that ultimately disempowers communities and makes them dependent on continued aid.</i>
6.	<i>Funding Mechanism. The impact of the assistance does not end up subsidizing some other improper spending, reducing pressure on elites who should tax themselves to fund the project, or end up distorting</i>	UNV measures success in terms of volunteer numbers and the outcomes of its programs rather than on whether it actually creates social solidarity or increases equity in recipient countries. Specific technical assistance projects that are aimed at income generation and productivity could also improperly subsidize government projects that should

	<i>capital markets in the country by offering a gift or subsidy for a kind of productive investment that should be in the form of a loan or in the form of a loan at competitive market rates?</i>	come out of tax revenues or be financed through loans. UNV's charter requires that States not use volunteerism to eliminate paid positions and to weaken existing systems in the country, but there is no assurance that elites do not use volunteerism as a subsidy that erodes government responsibility. Since UNV is already aware that it may be distorting the market of government services by paying relatively high salaries to its National UN Volunteers (a question it is asking consultants to research in late 2008), it seems to already be recognizing that it is creating distortions. (-1) points.
7.	<i>Financial logic of intervention promotes self-financing and there is no negative impact on market mechanisms/ Public vs. Private Sector/ Internal dependency on corporate sector: The project does not inappropriately subsidize the private sector or any segments of the private sector (particular industries or particular segments such as exporters or larger businesses)?</i>	UNV does not focus primarily on income generation and production with the private sector, and it does not look carefully at this issue. Specific projects probably do create distortions, especially if volunteers are replacing paid staff, but the impact depends on the project and is debatable. (0) points.
8.	<i>Government functions are protected and balance with civil society is appropriate. The project does not replace a government function with foreign paternalism building parallel systems that are better than government but that do not improve what is wrong, or that transfer a government function to another place like civil society, or that promote a non-self-financed civil society?</i>	UNV sends volunteers on an ad hoc basis to particular projects that sometimes do shift government work into the voluntary or civil society sector, but the overall effort is not one that creates parallel institutions to replace government functions or to promote specific foreign interests. At the same time, UNV is not addressing the issue of the appropriate roles of citizens in government or outside of government for specific functions. (0) points.
9.	<i>Internal dependency/ Internal colonialism: The project does not increase any kinds of concentration of power</i>	UNV would argue that it empowers minority communities, but its projects with the Roma are designed to integrate and assimilate them into mass society, which is a form of

Lempert: A Dependency in Development Indicator

	<i>among recipients, either among an elite group or an elite or favored racial or ethnic or religious group, and helps reverse any legacy of colonialism in regards to minority peoples and builds new self-sufficient communities?</i>	colonialism that does not follow international treaty obligations. Like other UN organizations, UNV also defines its responsibility as promoting government policies which easily makes it a tool of government elites rather than an independent challenger upholding international standards. While the presumption is that UNV and the UN system promote colonialism through the system of State control, UNV could probably point to some projects or partners who promote a democratizing and advocacy role, creating a bit of debate about why they should not lose a point on this question. <i>0 points.</i>
10.	<i>Sustainability of beneficiary cultures: The project is appropriate to the recipient cultures and insulates them against pressures for urbanization that result from ratcheting up either population or consumption demands. The project is self-sustainable within the country's resources?</i>	UNV technically has the mandate to uphold the Rio Declaration and other UN treaties, to promote sustainable development and sovereignty of communities, but in following UNDP and other donors, it implements the quick-fix "poverty reduction" approach of the MDGs that promotes consumption and does not introduce genuine sustainable development planning. In doing so, UNV is promoting increased consumption and population growth that promotes competition over scarce resources. <i>(-1) points.</i>
III.	<b>Internal Procedures of the Project, Itself, Reflect the Values of Accountability and Self-Reliance</b>	<i>0 points. UNV is a bureaucracy within the larger UN system bureaucracy and does not offer model standards.</i>
11.	<i>Consumption Policy Analysis: The project has analyzed the recipient's spending and spending practices to see if wasteful spending can be reduced and redirected, and how the project, itself, can make the most cost-efficient use of its funds?</i>	UNV would argue that using volunteer labor is, itself, a way of promoting the use of an under-utilized resource, but this question is scored on whether consumption, in general is analyzed. Moreover, UNV does not do analyses of labor markets and use of time, in general, to determine if there are different groups in society who could be contributing more, and where that should be. <i>0 points.</i>
12.	<i>Accountability of the donors: The project itself is a model of transparency and direct accountability to beneficiaries and to citizens?</i>	The UN system has become a government bureaucracy like all others, and is even less accountable than many governments because it claims international sovereignty and demands that citizens address concerns to member governments. <i>0 points.</i>

13.	<i>Rewards and Incentives: The project rewards behaviors that promote independence and sustainability of recipients and punishes behaviors that promote dependency?</i>	UNV does not appear to have any systematization of promoting replication of model projects and the UN system generally evaluates projects and offers continued funding on the basis of “smile sheets” (whether stakeholders are happy and want continued support, rather than according to objective and verifiable standards). <i>0 points.</i>
<b>Total :</b>		<b>(-1) points. Colonial impact.</b> Though UNV has a marginal benefit in certain categories (1 point), the overall UN framework and donor agenda are not currently following the international system’s own promises, declarations and laws, and are instead supporting a globalist and bureaucratic agenda that promotes benefits to the donors and leaves communities and countries on a development path that makes them vulnerable and dependent. Thus, the overall impact of this international organization that declares its support for solidarity and volunteerism/empowerment is actually the reverse of what it claims, when held up directly to its own standards, and is inconsistent with the treaty obligations and mandate that it is required to uphold.

\* Question 1 offers up to 2 points for comprehensive solutions.

### References:

Korten, David (2007), *The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community*, Berret-Koehler Publishers.

Korten, David (1995), *When Corporations Rule the World*, Kumarian Press.

Lemkin, Raphael, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation - Analysis of Government - Proposals for Redress*, Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944, p. 79 - 95.



- Lempert, David (2008a), "Democracy Building Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations," (under review, manuscript available from author).
- Lempert, David (1997), "Holding the Powers that Be Accountable to Our Ethics Code to Protect Our Integrity and the Peoples We Serve," *Human Rights*, Vol. 24, No. 2, Spring 1997.  
Available on Web at: <http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/professionalethicscodefordevelopmentwork>  
<http://www.abanet.org/irr/hr/spring97/lempert.pdf>
- Lempert, David (2008b), "Why We Need an International Development Donor Monitor," *Policy Innovations*, January. Linked to long version on Web: [http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy\\_library/data/01464](http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy_library/data/01464)
- Lempert, David and Hue Nhu Nguyen (2008), "How to Tell if Development Projects are Doing Sustainable Development: An Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations," *International Journal of Sustainable Societies*, 1:1,  
<http://inderscience.metapress.com/app/home/contributions>
- Oxfam Prosperity Initiative (2006), on the project website, [http://www.prosperityinitiative.org/our\\_history.html](http://www.prosperityinitiative.org/our_history.html)
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard Cloward (1993), *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*, Vintage Press.
- Speth, James G. (2008), *The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.
- Stiglitz, Joseph (2002), *Globalization and its Discontents*, W.W. Norton & Company.
- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. (1992) *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*.  
<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/conf151/aconf15126-1annex1.htm>
- U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948).  
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/genocide.htm>

- U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, (2007).  
<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/512/07/PDF/N0651207.pdf?OpenElement>
- U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic Religious and Linguistic Minorities (1992)  
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/minorities.htm>
- U.N. Development Programme, (1990), *United Nations Human Development Report*, UNDP and Oxford University Press.  
[http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr\\_1990\\_en\\_front.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_1990_en_front.pdf)
- UNDP Evaluation Office, (2003), *Essentials: UNDP Practice Area: Cross-Cutting Synthesis of Lessons Learned*, No. 12, October 2003.  
[http://www.worldvolunteerweb.org/fileadmin/kp/Essentials\\_12.pdf](http://www.worldvolunteerweb.org/fileadmin/kp/Essentials_12.pdf)
- U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966). On the web at:  
<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr.htm>
- U.N. Volunteers, General Assembly Resolutions of the U.N. defining the organizational mandate:  
G.A. 2659, December 7, 1970.  
<http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/NR034924.pdf>  
G.A. 31/131, December 16, 1976.  
<http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/NR030314.pdf>  
G.A. 56/38, January 10, 2002.  
<http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2007/N0147881.pdf>
- U.N. Volunteers, (2007), *Inspiration in Action: UN Volunteers Annual Report 2007*  
[http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2008/annual/English\\_report\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/docdb/pdf/2008/annual/English_report_WEB.pdf)
- U.N. Volunteers (2008), Website Mission Statement,  
<http://www.unv.org/who-we-are/mission-statement.html>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order." *The Capitalist World Economy*. New York: Cambridge U. Press, 1979.