

DEALING WITH THE POST 2015 DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES.

Naresh Singh*

There is growing consensus that the 2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) with all their limitations have been very useful in mobilizing attention, resources and action to addressing development concerns around poverty, gender, health, education and environment. While significant progress has been made, there is also consensus that MDG's will remain important in the post 2015 era. However, the loudest calls from "a million voices" speak to an agenda centered on the injustice people feel because of growing inequalities and insecurities that exist particularly for poorer and marginalized people. The challenges are complex and interlinked, requiring a sustainable development agenda that is integrated, holistic and universal, applying to all countries and all people. The call is for a new agenda built on human rights, and universal values of equality, justice and security. Better governance underpins many of their calls. These calls are not new and have either not been addressed, or have been addressed and failed. Transformation will require nothing less than a rethinking of the dominant narratives of our current civilizations.

INTRODUCTION

During this second decade of the 21st century we have observed or will observe the 20th anniversaries of the United Nations world summits on various dimensions of development including Education (Jomtein,1990), Human Rights (Vienna,1991), Sustainable Development (Rio, 1992) Women (Beijing,1993), Population (Cairo, 1994), Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995), Human Settlements (Cities) (Istanbul, 1996), Food (Rome, 1999); and also the Millennium Summit with its millennium development goals, (New York, 2000). The targets of the millennium declaration are to be achieved halfway through the decade, in 2015. World leaders will then gather at the United Nations and elsewhere to reflect on the progress the world has made and it will be viewed mainly through the

*Independent Consultant and Honorary Visiting Professor, School of Government and Public Policy, O.P. Jindal Global University.

lens of sustainable development or through one of its dimensions. They are likely to conclude that the results have been mixed. Although some progress has been made, it is not enough. They are likely to articulate a new vision based at least partly on the outcome of the Rio +20 Conference (Brazil 2012) entitled the *Future We Want* and partly on the “million voices” process entitled the *World we Want*. They would seek new commitments, resources and strategies to accelerate progress and are likely to adopt existing strategies slightly modified at best, to achieve a new set of bold targets which they will call for in a loud and unified voice. They will not notice, or may pretend not to notice the huge gap between the weakness of their strategies and the ambition of their targets. They will also commit to be more accountable and to deliver on their promises, but the targets will not be reached in the time frames they set unless the analysis of past performances are rigorous and hard hitting - and above all, a new world view and radically different strategies flowing from it are pursued. This will demand political, business and spiritual leadership at a whole new level as the lynchpin of failure or success. This paper, prepared on the eve of the post 2015 era seeks to frame the debate in context of capitalism and democracy as the dominant drivers of world progress and failure. It suggests a new public policy agenda on what can be done differently to put the world on an equitable, just, secure and sustainable development path.

REVIEWING THE PAST TO INFORM THE FUTURE

Just after the end of the Second World War, the ideas of development and underdevelopment were significantly influenced by the Americans who had a dominant world position. In order to consolidate that hegemony and make it permanent, they conceived a political campaign under the guise of a global development agenda. In the words of President Truman at his inauguration in 1949 : “ *We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas...The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit - has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.*” Reflecting on this statement, Gustavo Esteva commented: “*On that day (20th January, 1949), 2 billion people became underdeveloped. In a real sense, from that time on, they ceased being what they were in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others’ reality: a mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of the queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority.*” Esteva further notes that since then development has connoted an escape from an undignified condition called underdevelopment and concludes that for someone to conceive the

possibility of escaping from a particular condition it is necessary first to feel that one has fallen into that condition. The real tragedy of the pursuit of development since then has been the acceptance of that view by the leading economists of the developing countries and hence, development as the search for the way of life of the West begun!

It is enlightening then to take a quick look at the journey that followed so that we are well positioned to avoid repeating what we have done before and now expect different results. In the first decade of international development after the Second World War, development was conceived purely as economic growth in average GNP per capita. Issues of distribution, inclusion, equity, and job creation were not considered. Unsurprisingly, social problems remained and in many cases increased and as a result the next decade focused on social development. But that only led to the realization that development required both economic growth and social development - one was not possible without the other. Thus, socio-economic development as a more integrated approach was adopted. When this approach did not seem to work as well as expected, a shift from a focus on the development of things to a development of people occurred, and the human development paradigm was born. A decade later it was observed that the human development approach was not delivering as well as imagined, leading to the development community deciding that it would focus only on the basic needs and dimensions of human development. That approach too did not produce the desired outcomes as was hoped for, but influenced a shift on how development took place. It ushered in participatory and endogenous approaches to counter the top-down and outside driven approaches. In parallel was the rise of another approach to development influenced by concerns over environmental pollution issues. Attention turned to the sustainable development paradigm which sought to achieve development objectives without damaging the natural environment.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The concept of sustainable development (SD) was introduced in the policy making literature at the global level in 1980 as part of the global conservation strategy of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). It is of course considered to have been brought into the mainstream international policy and political debate by the Brundtland Commission which started its work as the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1982. The IUCN launched its landmark report, "Our Common Future", in 1987, which provided the

most commonly used definition of SD as one which meets the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs. It was perhaps the most brilliant political consensus ever achieved in the UN, between northern pre-occupations with increasing environmental concerns and southern concerns with increasing poverty. It was not that ecological degradation was not present in the countries of the south; but their overriding preoccupation was with addressing poverty. Since the achievement of this consensus, the world has been constantly reminded that a political consensus is not necessarily a formula that lends itself to easy public policy making either in content or in process. In terms of process, SD has been subjected to more public consultations than any other development concept, from international and global forums through regional, national, sub-regional, to village and community levels. It has acquired the highest levels of “ownership” becoming a household word, more so, than any other, to all people from all corners of the planet in just about 2 decades.

In this regard, the consensus on SD must be considered to have been the subject of the most successful policy consultations ever, leading to the widespread ownership. In order to achieve this, however, the phrase had to be appropriated by each vested interest group to articulate their concerns. And so it became common place to apply the adjective “sustainable” to any noun in any context, without any regard to possible policy content and contradictions between policies. The substantive policy content in SD was earlier defined in terms of policy outcomes as economic efficacy, social equity, and ecological integrity achieved in an integrated and balanced manner. Political and cultural dimensions were soon added to this 3 pillar definition to give a more comprehensive, but not necessarily a more useful policy definition. But making public policy with these goals has remained as elusive as ever.

SOME PROGRESS BUT NOT ENOUGH

The question then, to what extent has the world succeeded in moving towards SD, during the last 2 decades is, notoriously difficult to answer. One set of reasons for this difficulty is the challenge of measuring progress towards SD. Fortunately, we have made considerable progress in this regard from the “how to” process issues which have been articulated in terms of systems thinking and post normal sciences, to indicators and indicator sets which are now in widespread use at different unit levels of analysis from cities to countries and landscapes. We also now have a range of global assessments such as the Millennium Ecosystems Assessment,

the Millennium Development Goals, the State of the World, and several others. Overall these reports present a mixed picture of progress with deteriorations in freshwater, agriculture, fisheries systems and little progress in making industrial, transportation and energy systems more ecologically sound. While poverty has been reduced, the most significant reductions have taken place in China at high ecological costs.

Even where we have been fortunate to have local level improvements; the overall planetary systems, especially the climate, atmosphere, oceans and forests linked systems are severely challenged. Every time we have a global economic downturn, action on SD becomes even more difficult. Global political leadership from the US is not likely in the near future, as the most promising leaders once in power (Al Gore as Vice President) and now Obama as the President fail to deliver in spite of their best intentions because of partisan political interest leading to gridlock in congress. The European Union would then seem to have this responsibility for global leadership on SD squarely on its shoulders, but we will have to wait and see how far it will be able to deliver especially as it now finds itself in dire financial straits. The United Nations in the meantime has been playing the role it does well, that of churning out international conferences and declarations with global political commitments to work towards SD.

PUBLIC POLICY CHALLENGES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Why is progress on SD so intransigent? A summary of the challenges or barriers to change would include lack of a collective sense of Agreement on what is to be sustained, shared Knowledge of how to solve these problems, broad access to the required Technologies, the Economic ability to pay for the changes, the other Social priorities and cultural norms that need attention and finally the Political will to take action (Trudgill 1990). In the face of these formidable barriers, we naturally turn to our democratically elected governments to show leadership and take action for change. Overcoming these barriers however need long term commitment and investments, which short term five year elected governments who will be seeking re-election and must have results to show at the end of their term, will not be motivated to undertake. Fortunately, this expected myopic behavior has been overcome in many ways, and governments have established National Environmental Protection Agencies(EPA), Wildlife Agencies signed on to international treaties of various kinds, established social safety nets and welfare programs, and when the economy is doing well have periodically shown the kind of enlightened public policy leadership

necessary for SD. As such, a slew of “command and control” policies in which pollution control or other environmental standards have been established, and are monitored and enforced to various levels of efficiency.

Similarly, a wide range of market based instruments such as tradable emission permits, or the more recent carbon trading mechanisms and markets have been established. On the other hand win-win policies that are both good for poverty reduction and for environmental conservation have been established. (UNDP, World Bank, UNEP, EU). On the side of the Private Sector, many corporations have come to see the green economy as a new business opportunity and seeking to exploit various niches in their areas of business, many are reporting on triple bottom lines going beyond profitability to include social and environmental accountability. The biggest success in SD policy making has come from heightened awareness of people from across the globe and the sharp rise of civil society activism holding both governments and private sectors accountable for their actions or their lacking in guiding the planet to a more sustainable future. So, there has been intense activity over the last 2 to 3 decades in the making public of public policy for SD. And yet it seems to many who have been involved from the beginning that nothing much has changed. In the BBC world debates (Sunday, February 28, 2010), Nobel laureate Wangari Matthai was a member of the panel when the moderator did a flashback to a speech she had given on BBC in 1982. She commented that the same speech is as relevant today.

The real challenge to democracies dealing with SD public policy dilemmas is not their short term elected office, as much as it is the interface between democratic decision making and the capitalist mode of production and distribution of goods and services and the question of which of these is dominant. In all countries of the world today the idea of progress is still measured principally by the economic growth rates which are of course driven mainly by increased consumption. Indeed, quality of life and level of consumption are considered by many to be synonymous. In the rich countries of the world, their capacity and desire to produce and consume more and more have gone completely out of control and entered a phase which Robert Reich calls “Super-capitalism” in his recent book by the same name. Gandhi had said that world had enough for everyone’s need but not enough for a single man’s greed. What we have today is a collective greed that knows no bounds.

On the other hand, the capacity of these countries to make collective decisions and public policy to achieve the things people say they value such as clean air and water, good education for their children, health care for all, more family time and less hours of work, peace and stability

and reduced poverty and inequality, is way behind. In other words, while capitalism is excelling at its role in the blind production of wealth which is increasingly concentrating in the hands of the few, democracy is failing badly to keep pace. Collective decision making and public accountability is failing badly, both within countries (be it in North America, Western Europe, China, India or Sub-Saharan Africa), and among countries in international forums, where individual country opportunities for trade benefits and wealth creation drives all else. This is the harsh reality of the world we live in where the trend is more of super-capitalism and less of collective decision making and public accountability in the other interests of society (at least in relative terms).

The relationship between democracy and development remains tenuous by most recent accounts, but cannot conclude that democracy is either helpful or necessary to development, whether defined as economic growth or more broadly, (Przeworski et al, 2000, Rueschemeyer et al 1992, Ringen, 2007). Many are prepared to say however that democracies have a much better chance than autocracies or dictatorships at promoting development. In terms of economic growth it seems that democracies are stable above a per capita income of about US \$6000; (Przeworski et al, 2000). Can we arrive at a societal consensus that per capita incomes above a certain threshold, for example US \$20,000 is economically unnecessary and maybe ecologically harmful? It is of course important to note that there are different types of democracies, including open access competitive democracies and closed access societies in which there is a rent seeking relationship between economic and political elites (North et al. 2009; Sorensen, 2008; Ringen , 2007) as there are different types of capitalism including good and bad capitalism (Baumol et al 2007). In any event it seems abundantly clear that democratic governance, as we know it today, is by itself neither going to help us significantly to generate or maintain economic growth, nor will it have a significant impact on moving us to a path towards SD. Indeed, many scholars see an incompatibility between democracy and economic growth for both economic and political reasons (Sorensen, 2008). On the other hand, it is hard to see how we will get there without some form of democratic governance. To resolve this conundrum, we will have to go below the veneer of apparent homogenous democratic societies, down to a class analysis of the rich, middle and poor segments of society, and their interests and roles in possible social transformation. A lot has been written in the poverty and sustainable livelihoods literature on the importance of poverty reduction to sustainable development. Similarly, there is ample literature on the importance of a prosperous middle class

to poverty reduction and indeed to viable democracies (Ringen, 2007). Most recently the role of the super-rich in social transformation has been described in ways that could be of significant value in the pursuit of SD (Nader, 2009; Rothkopf 2008).

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

And so here we are, after six decades of development experience - the last two of which have been in wrestling with sustainable development. Now, we are taking stock of the extent of achievement of the millennium development goals (MDG's) to which world political leaders committed their countries in 2000. The eight MDG's were to eradicate extreme hunger and poverty, achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB, ensure environmental sustainability and develop a global partnership. Considerable success has been achieved, although much remains to be done. Notable progress has been made in poverty, health, (water, malaria), and primary education. Much more has to be done in the areas of environment, maternal deaths and HIV. To illustrate, the proportion of people living in extreme poverty has been halved at the global level. The world reached the poverty reduction target five years ahead of schedule.

Over 2 billion people gained access to improved sources of drinking water. This means that the MDG of attaining the drinking water target was met five years ahead of the target date, despite significant population growth. Remarkable gains have been made in the fight against malaria and tuberculosis. Mortality rates from malaria fell by more than 25 per cent globally between 2000 and 2010. An estimated 1.1 million deaths from malaria were averted over this period. Death rates from tuberculosis at the global level and in several regions are likely to be halved by 2015, compared to 1990 levels (MDG Report 2013). There can be reasons for optimism when one takes into account the recent star performers in multidimensional poverty that include Bangladesh, Nepal and Rwanda. However, we need to be cautious as even in countries with strong economic growth in recent years, the MPI analysis reveals the persistence of poverty. India is a major case in particular. There are more MPI poor people in eight Indian states alone (421 million altogether in Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal) than in the 26 poorest African countries combined (410 million) (OPHI 2010).

POST 2015 AGENDA

While governments will meet in 2015 to determine the final shape of the post 2015 agenda, a major input will be the report entitled the *World We Want* which documents the outcome of global consultations with more than a million people. According to UN Secretary-General Ban ki Moon “*The consultations have revealed the continuing indignity of poverty, inequality, injustice and insecurity.*”

Equality and non-discrimination also stood out as a key message: people are demanding justice, participation and dignity. Inequalities and social exclusion exist particularly for poorer people, women and girls, those in rural areas and urban slums, people living with disabilities, indigenous people, migrants and displaced people, and others who are marginalized for reasons related to religion, ethnicity or sexual orientation. The insecurities they face compound each other: for instance, the lack of a decent job can leave people without access to health services and living in conditions that are unsafe.

In addition, people have said emphatically that the challenges – and indeed opportunities – they face are complex and interlinked. These point to the need to go beyond a silo approach and arrive at a future sustainable development agenda that is more integrated and holistic. The shift here, as described in detail in the next section is not so much in the ‘what’ as it is in the ‘how’, except for the new dimension of a secular spirituality to underpin the traditional dimensions. People demand that this new agenda be built on human rights, and universal values of equality, justice and security.

Better governance, of markets and of the environment, underpins many of their calls. There is also a strong call to retain the focus on concrete, measurable goals, and yet improve dramatically the way we measure progress against them. Finally they hope that a data revolution will support an accountability revolution.

The cry for this kind of world has been around forever. It must now seem as though we will never get there but we can get closer for sure. So why has progress been so slow and what can we do to accelerate it? Our quick response to this question is usually, “Let’s see what is working and do more of it.” For instance, if we look for a country that is doing well at reducing inequality and exclusion, we find Brazil is currently being celebrated. We find that what was working there includes: 1) Macro-economic stability, contractionary monetary policy and institutional reform; 2) A degree of luck in that Brazil benefited from global shifts of commodity prices, and

also increased flows of credit and FDI at just the right time, allowing for growth to blossom; 3) Growth was then combined with social policies and well-targeted programs including *public education, social security, conditional cash transfers* and a *minimum wage law*. This resulted in significant reduction in poverty and inequality. The Gini coefficient dropped 9% between 2001 and 2009!). To continue this success Brazil has an ambitious 2011 National Plan to lift 16.2 million people out of poverty.

One might conclude that what is at work here is a combination of a developmental state, sound macroeconomic fundamentals, accessing global markets, assertive social policies and some luck! But how do we replicate that in India, South Africa, Pakistan or China? The challenges and limitations quickly become obvious. And so while we should continue our lesson learning we have to be conscious of their very limited replicability. Going forward, a renewed public policy agenda will have to incorporate some radical departures from business as usual.

TOWARDS A NEW POST 2015 POLICY AGENDA

The post 2015 agenda will have to come to grips with the challenges and dreams articulated in both reports: *The Future We Want* and *The World We Want*.

How then can we make public policy for SD in today's world and indeed that of the foreseeable future? How can the democratic initiative seize the upper hand so as to put capitalism at the service of society as a whole and support sustainable development without losing its unmatched efficiency at producing wealth in the form of goods and services which people value? What kind of transformation will be required for a world that is more sustainable, just, equitable and secure? The following are some points of departure to consider:

- a) We need to reiterate what is at stake and what we want to sustain. At stake are the very planetary conditions which allow the human species to be dominant among biological species alive today and to have the potential to live in unmatched freedom, peace and stability for generations to come. What are to be sustained are diverse and resilient options of livelihoods for all. The SD enterprise is not about people having the luxury to love and protect their environment or giving charity to the poor, it is about a common human endeavor to protect the essence of human survival as we know it and to assure its future evolution. It is about what we do today to identify, nurture and sustain the options for lasting global peace, prosperity and creativity.

- b) The need for a paradigm shift from the Newtonian clockwork universe in which we would, by reductionist science, be able to explain all phenomena around us and be able to determine and achieve desirable future states of the world by the application of resources, knowledge and technology; to one which is co-evolving and self-organizing in inherently unpredictable ways, has long been articulated. The evidence and urgency for this shift has increased significantly over the last two decades and needs to be consolidated and widely communicated so that the shift can be accelerated. This paradigm shift is really a worldview shift in which, the way people make meaning of the world around them, the values they cherish, their vision of the sacred, right through to the what and how we teach in schools and universities, what is rewarded in the workplace, what constitutes a successful individual, what are the most desirable social virtues, how we make public policy and what we demand of our elected governments will shift dramatically. Kauffman, a world class evolutionary biologist and one of the fathers of complexity theory (2008) provides a comprehensive analysis of the evidence defining the limitations of the reductionist physicist's view of world and the evidence in support of a biosphere that is a co-constructing emergent whole that evolves persistently. The evolution of the universe, biosphere, the human economy, human culture and human agency and action is profoundly creative and cannot be reduced to or explained by the motion of elementary particles.
- c) Kauffman (2008) offers a profound new world view of a secular sacred that we can all share regardless of religious persuasion: "Agnostic *and atheist 'secular humanists' have been quietly taught that spirituality is foolish or at best questionable.*" (ibid p 8)... " *If we are members of a universe in which emergence and ceaseless creativity abound, if we take creativity as a sense of God we can share, the resulting sense of the sacredness of all of life and the planet can help reorient our lives beyond the consumerism and commoditization the industrialized world now lives, heal the split between reason and faith, heal the split between science and the humanities, heal the want of spirituality, heal the wound derived from the false reductionist belief that we live in a world of fact without values and help us jointly to build a global ethic. These are at stake in finding a new scientific worldview that enables us to reinvent the sacred.*"p9.
- d) Some of the consequences of this new worldview are now being teased out by current research leading to insights with important policy implications and practical applications. This includes the recent work at Harvard's Center for International Development led by Ricardo Hausmann (2008) on some new dimensions to economic growth theory

in which they reveal how the density of product and capability spaces in a country explain economic performance in a manner different from the general equilibria models in common use and builds on Kauffman's (2008) theories of webs of economic growth. The importance of this work is that it sets the stage for a better understanding of the relationships between economic and ecological systems in way that will be useful to policy makers. Work in behavioral economics, which has now become mainstream, in areas such as choice architecture, in which the way people make choices can be socially engineered (Sunstein and Thaler, 2008); and in the measurement of happiness as distinct from per capita incomes (Frey, 2008) are opening vistas of tremendous promise especially the possibility of conceptually delinking quality of life from consumption. Other recent work by Geoffrey West and his colleagues at Santa Fe Institute point to a number of similarities between all living complex systems where simple power laws explain complex connections. They are now extending this work to explain how cities grow and behave. Others have now gone even further to crafting concrete tools and guidelines for making policy in a complex, self-organizing uncertain system. Emery Roe (1998) in his book -"Making Policy in the Face of Complexity" outlines a practical tool he calls "Triangulation", in which orthogonal policy making tools such as cost benefit analysis, narrative policy making, local justice systems etc. can be used together to bring different perspectives of a complex system together. Swanson and Bhadwal (2009) have produced a primer entitled: *Creating Adaptive Policies: A guide for policy making in an uncertain world*. They suggest for example that "Adaptive policies anticipate the array of conditions that lie ahead though robust up-front design using (i) *integrated and forward-looking analysis*; (ii) *multi-stakeholder deliberation* and (iii) by monitoring key performance indicators to trigger *automatic policy adjustments*. But not all situations can be anticipated. Unknowns will always be a part of policy making. Adaptive policies are able to navigate towards successful outcomes in settings that cannot be anticipated in advance. This can be done by working in concert with certain characteristics of complex adaptive systems, including (i) *enabling the self-organization and social networking capacity of communities*; (ii) *decentralizing governance to the lowest and most effective jurisdictional level*; (iii) *promoting variation in policy responses* and (4) *formal policy review and continuous learning*. Designers and implementers of adaptive policies embrace the uncertainty and complexity of policy context, and consider learning, continuous improvement and adaptation of the policy a natural part of the policy life-cycle."p15.

- f) While the arguments above demand a radical departure from business as usual, we are where we are, and must continue to build on the success we have achieved apart from the on-going initiatives we are currently undertaking at international, national and local levels. We have, over the years developed a formidable body of international environmental law, conventions, treaties, standards, protocols, guidelines and commitments and these need to be enforced. To do this more effectively, a world environmental organization with powers similar to the WTO has been under discussion, should be established. In developing countries, national conservation strategies, poverty reduction strategies, national sustainable development plans, and local agenda 21, should be integrated in a bottom-up way and reinvigorated with adequate resources. They should now be shaped as part of the social contract between citizens and their governments in which they undertake to be mutually accountable for the welfare of the people and the environment both now and for the future. The most powerful tool available to countries and the international community in this regard is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The challenge here has been the weak attention given to economic, cultural and social rights. The recent work of the Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor has now provided a compelling synergy between human rights and markets. This has a great potential of serving to strengthen the rule of law for all and the application of human rights based approaches to development. Perhaps the greatest success that we have achieved in the field of SD over the last few decades has been the meteoric rise in awareness of environmental and SD issues. This awareness can now be combined with social media technology and appropriate leadership from youth groups and influential people such as entertainment stars, Olympic athletes, Nobel prize winners etc. to create a new wave of awareness, possibility and hope to usher in the new world view described above.
- g) To conclude, let us recognize some existing areas with the greatest potential for change towards SD. For convenience these are described at the physical, socio-economic and human levels, but it is recognized that they involve the ecological, cultural, political etc.
- At the physical level of the world - is the movement to a lower energy consumption pathway which would include but not be limited to renewable and nuclear energy options; and would extend to a way of life and use of technologies through which we actually use less energy and matter while improving the quality of life for all, but especially the disadvantaged.

- At the socio-economic level - are the movements to generate economic growth which has a smaller economic footprint and fair rather than free trade, which are more importantly in the emerging area of social enterprises and social entrepreneurs, where private sector businesses aim only at producing profits that are required to meet the costs of doing business, rather than at poverty reduction and environmental value addition. This requires changes in tax laws which will allow new integrated models of charities and businesses. Many developed countries such as Canada and the UK are examining options on the best way to do this.
- Finally, at the human level - is the movement to recognize the spiritual nature of humans, the understanding that humans are spiritual beings having a material experience, and not the reverse. A first and perhaps easy and palatable step especially for secularists and atheists is the embrace of a secular spirituality or sacredness in the ceaseless creativity of the universe which is all around us and for which scientific evidence abounds. This cuts across and has nothing to do with organized religion.

IMPLEMENTING THE AGENDA

Implementing this agenda will be difficult but doable. It will have to be embraced by both policy makers and practitioners in one camp, and, by academics and policy entrepreneurs including think tanks in the other. Policy entrepreneurs and think tanks usually build bridges between academic research and policy practice and will follow the action areas actively undertaken by practitioners and academics. Policy makers and practitioners are constrained by real politics, vested interest groups, democratic contestation over feasible options apart from time and financial constraints. They can therefore only be expected to make incremental changes and might only be able to deal with issues as outlined in point 4 above. And so any radical departures, suffering as they would from all the challenges outlined by Kuhn and Hacking (2012), would require independent and credible inquiry; disruptive thought, teaching and research; cognitive shifts and bold advocacy. For all of this, hopes are pinned on academia and in particular, the university. But only certain universities and a few academics in these institutions would be ready, and hence this call is made to them. It is likely that a smaller, newer university now building its name and pedigree will have the motivation, energy, vision, leadership and indeed naiveté to undertake this work. To make it more digestible the implementation agenda might be organized as follows:

- **For Schools of Government and Public Policy: Inclusive Prosperity**
 - *Inclusive Growth* is more than pro-poor growth, growth with equity, equitable growth, microfinance or safety nets, aiming to achieve a new framework of engagement between people's capabilities and opportunity structures including non-alienation, legal empowerment, workers as owners etc.
 - *Inclusive Governance*: New social contract between state and citizen, Rule of Law, Access to Justice, property, labor, business rights, institutional reform. Formal and Informal sectors. This is crucial because more than 80% of the population of developing countries live in the informal sector unreached by formal institutions and without being a part of the existing social contract.
 - *Making public policy in the face of complexity*: adaptive policies, beyond cost benefit analysis, narrative policy analysis, local justice systems etc.
 - *Process*: Fostering the process of self-empowerment.
- **For Schools of International Affairs: Local and Global Conflict and Security**
 - Understanding conflict as sources of shocks and stress to livelihoods and vice-versa.
 - Rebuilding livelihoods after disasters (slow and rapid onset) from humanitarian relief to recovery and further to sustainable livelihoods.
 - Use Resilience (household and institutional) as the organizing framework.
 - Rethink the international institutional framework revealing the politics at work and use insights to focus efforts on prevention and recovery from disasters and conflicts.
 - Promote more south –south and triangular cooperation.
- **For Schools of Business: Building MSME's in developing countries**
 - Focus on Small Economies: Why? Small is ugly but can be beautiful.
 - Conceptualizing Small Economies: Where are they? Formal or informal?
 - Standard business development services approach likely to be inadequate.
 - Build on what they are doing well.
 - Legal mechanisms to empower informal businesses to make it easier to do business in the formal sector (taxes, registration, services, protection).

- Capital beyond traditional microcredit.
- Role of local government in supporting MSME's at local level.
- MBA in financing MSME's.
- **For Schools of Law: Legal Empowerment of the Poor**
 - *Legal Exclusion*: 4 billion people not able to use the law to improve their lives and livelihoods. They live in the informal or extralegal sector.
 - Legal identity.
 - Access to justice and the rule of law.
 - Property rights and security of tenure.
 - Labor and business rights.
 - Making the law work for everyone.
 - Enabling law to empower street vendors, rickshaw pullers, waste pickers, taxi drivers, and 90 % of the Indian population who make their living in the informal sector.

By now the reader might be thoroughly disappointed with this business as usual agenda proposed above after all the rant about a radical departure. But this is deliberate as the strategy is to start where these traditional schools as are now and for the radical agenda proposed to be gradually infused into their curricula by a school of humanities which would address issues like those below.

- **For Schools of Humanities: Fostering some Fundamental Shifts and Re-thinking what it is to Human.**
 - From linear logical frameworks based on reductionism to complex adaptive systems based on holism: from *or* to *and*.
 - From realities which fit our theories to the reverse.
 - From power as a zero sum game (win –lose) to power as a positive (win-win).
 - From the *world as it is* OR the world as we *wished it*, to working with the emergent world.
 - From having to being, from ego-system economy to ecosystem economy (equilibrium to evolution).
 - From religion to secular spirituality (reinventing the sacred).
- **And: Rethinking what is defined to be human**
 - To be a human being before being an Indian, a Canadian, a thinker , a practitioner , a Hindu , a Muslim, a Christian etc. : peeling off

layers of imposed identities.

- Residual cosmic consciousness, that light as oneself, from which all else is derived. Having to being can then happen!
- Celebrating our oneness has been neglected in the celebration of our diversity (we are more than 99% identical).
- Can we give academic respectability to the secular sacred, natural creativity, and evolutionary economics?.
- Advance the academic struggle to give respectability to behavioral economics and happiness studies.
- The time has come for humanities and liberal arts to forge the transition to a new civilizational narrative.

CONCLUSION

The development challenges of the post 2015 era are not new. The fact that they persist require fundamentally new ways of thinking about and pursuing development. Leaders will have to reassert that development is about political mobilization of people for attaining their own objectives, that it is naive to pursue goals others have set, and yet see their challenges not in isolation but as shared with all of humanity. Governments will have to renew the social contracts with their citizens as the fundamental frame for the new transformations that are necessary.

New public policy ideas are as much the challenge as are institutional deficits, lack of systems thinking, not taking connectedness and complexity seriously and the lack of leadership to make these changes. A small step forward in the beginning to address this agenda is to train more of our people to step out of their disciplinary silo's and begin to think and work in trans-disciplinary ways, going beyond familiar attempts at multi-disciplinarily. This cannot happen without a strong leadership from the humanities.

References

- Baumol, W.J; Litan, R.E and Schramm, C.J., 2007, *Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism and the economics of growth and prosperity*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor, 2008, *Making the Law Work for Everyone*. New York: UNDP.
- Esteva. G., 2010, "Development". In W. Sachs (ed.) *The Development Dictionary*. London: Zed Books.
- United Nations, 2013, *MDG Report 2013*. www.un.org.
- Frey, B.S. 2008. *Happiness: A Revolution in Economics*. Masseurcheuts: M.I.T Press, USA.
- Hausmann, R., 2008, *The Other Hand. High Bandwidth Development*. Paper prepared for Brookings Development Conference, May, 2008.

- Hidalgo C. A; Klinger, B; Barabasi, A.L and Hausmann, R., 2007, "The product space conditions the development of nations". *Science* 317: p.482.
- Hidalgo, C.A. 2009. **The Dynamics of economic complexity and the Product Space. CID Working paper No. 189.** December, 2009. New York: Center for International Development. Harvard University.
- IUCN-UNEP-WWF. 1980. **World Conservation Strategy.** IUCN. Switzerland: Gland..
- World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. **Our Common Future.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kauffman, Stuart., 2008, *Reinventing the Sacred. A new view of science, reason and religion.* New York: Basic Books. .
- Kuhn, T and Hacking I., 2012, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (4th. Edition).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nader, R., 2009, *Only the Super-Rich Can Save Us.* New York: Seven Stories Press.
- North, D.C; Wallis, J.J., and Weincast, B.R., 2009, *Violence and Social Orders A conceptual framework for interpreting recorded human history.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, *MPI Reports, 2010/2013.* www.ophi.uk.org.
- Przeworski, A; Alvarez, M.E; Cheibub, J.A and Limnongi, F., 2000, *Democracy and Development Political Institutions and Well Being in the World 1950 to 1990,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reich, R., 2008, *Super capitalism: The Transformation of Business, Democracy and Everyday Life.* New York: First Vintage Books Edition.
- Ringen, S., 2007, *What Democracy Is For? On freedom and Moral Government,* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Roe, E., 1998, *Taking Complexity Seriously. Policy Analysis, Triangulation and Sustainable Development.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Press..
- Rothkopf. D., 2008, *Superclass: The global power elite and the world they are making,* New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Rueschemeyer, D; Stephens, E.H and Stephens, J.D., 1992, *Capitalist Development and Democracy,* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Sorensen, G., 2008, *Democracy and Democratization: Processes and Prospects in a Changing World.* New York: Westview Press.
- Swanson, D and Bhadwal S. eds., 2009, *Creating Adaptive Policies A guide for policy making in an uncertain world.* New Delhi: Sage Publications. .
- Thaler R.H., and C.R. Sunstein, 2008, *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Trudgill, S.T, 1990, *Barriers to a better environment. What stops us solving environmental problems?* London: Belhaven Press.
- Truman, H., 1949, *Inaugural Presidential Speech.* Washington.D.C: US Inaugural Addresses.
- United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD). 2012. *The Future We Want.* www.uncsd2012.org
- United Nations Development Group. 2013. *The World We Want.* www.worldwewant2015.org
- West, G., 2008, "Searching for Simplicity in Complexity. Growth, Innovation, Economics of Scale and the Pace of Life from Cells to Cities", Presented at the *World Knowledge Dialogue. Second Symposium,* Switzerland.