GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND ITS DISCONTENTS: RETHINKING THE THEORY AND PRACTICE

By

Anna Malavisi

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree

Philosophy – Doctor of Philosophy

2015

ABSTRACT

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND ITS DISCONTENTS: RETHINKING THE THEORY AND PRACTICE

By

Anna Malavisi

Global development is comprised of a system of ideas, policies, institutions and individuals all concerned with the amelioration of the living conditions of those populations living in disadvantaged conditions. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 25, Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and Article 22, Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized. So, in a way the system of global development has been set up as a way to respond to these two human rights, first to provide all children, women and men with the fulfillment of basic necessities and second to ensure that the social and international order responds appropriately. However, in the reality this is not so. I argue that if we are really serious about the impact of global development, then this requires a rethinking of the theory and practice.

Despite efforts made to contribute to the amelioration of people's lives in the name of *development*, human development indicators continue to be alarming: more than a billion people are malnourished, 884 million people do not have access to clean water, basic sanitation is denied to 2.5 billion people and 774 million people cannot read and write. Although the causes of these evident deprivations are not entirely due to development, it could be argued that due to the ineffectiveness of development these situations are not adequately addressed. Some of the problems particular to development include the implementation of inappropriate projects and programs; the dynamics of relationships between the multiple actors who play a role in development often entrenched in power and domination; and poor mechanisms of accountability. This has resulted in trillions of dollars invested in the name of development, but I would argue with poor results.

In my dissertation I offer a more in-depth analysis and understanding of the current development paradigm, its theory and practice. There are two fundamental problems in development. First, there is a rather token and weak presence of an ethical dimension and second, the suppression of knowledge or what Boaventura de Sousa Santos calls, "a form of epistemicide." There is another dimension to the way the global north has imposed a capitalist and imperial order on the global south that is often missed or blatantly ignored. This is epistemological. Therefore, I argue that implementing a strong ethical approach to development and understanding epistemic injustice in development will help to respond to severe global problems such as poverty and hunger in a different way. I particularly focus on neglected tropical diseases (NTD), a group of tropical diseases that occur all over the world but are markedly absent from the affluent countries. Using the example of NTD, I analyze how current development paradigms and approaches fail to address gross injustices such as the health disparities in the treatment and cure of these diseases. My ultimate aim is to offer an analysis of the problem of NTD from a development ethics perspective which intersects with feminist epistemology. From my own analysis which also draws on my experience, I venture to argue that one of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice is grounded in theoretical discussions of knowledge, and how this knowledge is then applied in the practice.

First, I introduce an interpretation of global development from a theoretical standpoint as well as its practice. Second, I analyse the situation of NTD, and particularly Chagas Disease as a consequence of the failings of development. Third, I argue for a strong ethical approach in development and propose what a strong ethical approach should entail. Fourth, I discuss the notion of epistemic injustice in global development. Lastly, I offer some recommendations for the practice of development based on a strong ethical approach and epistemic justice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the guidance and encouragement of my advisor, Stephen L. Esquith and my committee members Sandra Harding, Judith Andre and Kristie Dotson. I express my sincere gratitude to them, for their ongoing support and belief that I could actually do this. This dissertation would also not have been possible without the understanding and patience of my three daughters, Bianca, Adriana and Maya, but also my parents, Italo and Mafalda.

I also need to express my sincere gratitude to the management and baristas of Grand River Café and Espresso Royale in East Lansing, for supplying me with the coffee and space which enabled me to complete this dissertation.

PREFACE

My interest in pursuing a PhD in philosophy comes from a long trajectory working as a development practitioner for 16 years in Bolivia. Over the course of these years having worked in national and international Non-Government Organizations (NGO), and coordinated with other national and international NGOs, bilateral governments, multilateral institutions, corporations and community based organizations I became quite skeptical and despondent about the true impact of our work. Did we really make a difference? Who were the true beneficiaries of development projects? It seemed that so much money was being invested in the name of development with disproportionate results. That is, for the amount of money invested in development programs and projects this should be able to reduce extreme poverty, but in fact this is not the case. For me, one of the problems is the gross absence of ongoing critical analysis and reflection: thinking through some of the very complex issues that arise in development from a perspective grounded in ethical principles. Critical analysis and reflection just wasn't taking place on the ground. It was frustrating to be part of a system of NGOs where one gets so caught up with writing grants and reports, executing projects, etc. that no time is dedicated to taking a step back, to think through if in fact the work is having any real impact. We had all become cogs in a machine responding to the requirements of the grant, the questions of a reviewer, or the question of where the next round of support will come from.

What I also realized was that this kind of development work would continue, since it is so entrenched in the global economic system in which countries continue to invest large amounts of money via bilateral agencies or NGOs. Therefore, it is naïve to think that quashing development theory and practice, as post- and anti-development theorists suggest will lead to any desirable outcome. What is urgently needed is a paradigm shift in the way we approach development.[1] More critical voices are

[1] I have opted to use the term paradigm throughout my dissertation to best describe what is meant by development. I talk about the development paradigm. Paradigm in this sense is consistent with the dictionary's definition: a

needed which would allow for the analysis and reflection of development from an ethical perspective as well as a social, economic, political and cultural one. Bearing witness to the constant shortfalls and limitations of development, some successes but also the failures, I began to question development and to think about it more critically. My questioning highlighted the need for more critical analysis and reflection at large, and in particular, ethics, which was not taking place. This disquietude brought me to the United States to study philosophy!

In a world where there is much affluence, there is also much suffering. There are millions of children, women and men who do not have access to clean running water, a safe and secure supply of food, electricity, education and the fulfillment of other human rights, and it is a moral failing on the part of individuals and institutions. For Thomas Pogge, as for me, to do philosophy is to better understand problems we are confronted with on a daily basis. In Pogge's words, "I continue to believe that philosophers can illuminate what really matters. The best support for this belief comes not from abstract argument. It comes from showing by doing: from working through a problem so as to make evident its importance" (2010, 8). This is my aim; I will work through an aspect of the problem of global development "so as to make evident its importance." And I write this on behalf of the millions of children, women and men who suffer undeservedly at the hands of a global economic order. But also, for the thousands of women and men working in development in any capacity, in an endeavor to kindle the desire to think beyond the given and the expected. I believe there is an urgent need to shed our complacencies and blinkered views.

I entered development work as an idealist who believed that I could bring about some change in the world, who believed that through my work alongside children, women and men from a different culture and from more disadvantaged situations I could contribute to making their lives better. It wasn't long before I realized the reality, that development is just one big business or a juggernaut as it has been

---

framework containing the basic assumptions, ways of thinking and methodology that are commonly accepted by members of a scientific community. It is also consistent with Thomas Kuhn's use of paradigm in his influential book; *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. His concept of paradigm incorporates the key theories and rules but also the application of those theories.

described. I suppose in retrospect this should not have been difficult to see, considering the structures and policies in place, as well as the prominent actors who play a role in development. And, while I think I contributed to enhancing the lives of some individuals, I think that I contributed nothing to alleviating the structural problems of development – which is where change needs to take place. I benefitted greatly from this experience, even as I perpetuated a failing system.

One of the main struggles I have dealt with during the writing of this dissertation has been the position I should take. Should I completely reject development and argue for alternatives to development, or should I argue that the paradigm of development needs to shift? Audre Lorde says, "The master's tools cannot dismantle the master's house" (1984, 112). She is not alone. Gustavo Esteva in a recent book on the future of development says that to change development one needs to work outside it. He says, "The conundrum is that most of the problems cannot be solved within the developmentalist framework but outside it," (2013, 145). I think it is worthwhile to unpack this further. Lorde, in talking about the master's tools says the following, "they may allow us temporarily to beat him at this own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change," (1984, 112). I am sympathetic to both these position - the view that change must come from outside. Yet, I cannot give up the urge to generate some degree of change within the developmentalist framework. I believe there is an urgent need for change there.

To be able to generate real change there must be an adequate understanding of what the principal problems are. And the best way to grasp what the underlying problems of a system are is to work within it. What is of some concern is that if only change can happen outside the framework, then what do we say or do about the billions of people who are currently in disfavourable situations, living desperate lives at the price of global development policies and programs? And what about the thousands of institutions and agencies, and the people who work within these? What about those who want to ameliorate the lives and conditions of the former. So, while I think it is important to work outside the system, this may be a necessary condition but it is not a sufficient one for the extent of change that is

required or desired. Also, I am not advocating that we use "the same tools" – we need to use different ones. And this is what I hope my dissertation offers.

What I attempt to do here is to encourage a more in-depth analysis and understanding of the current development paradigm, its theory and practice. For me, there are two fundamental problems. First, there is only a weak ethical dimension, and second, there is the suppression of knowledge, or what Boaventura de Sousa Santos calls, "a form of epistemicide." That is, there is another dimension to the way the global north has imposed a capitalist and imperial order on the global south that is often missed or intentionally ignored. This is epistemological. Therefore, I argue that implementing a strong ethical approach to development, and understanding epistemic injustice in development, will help to respond to severe global problems such as poverty and hunger in a different way. I particularly focus on neglected tropical diseases (NTD), a group of tropical diseases that occur all over the world but are markedly absent from the affluent countries.[2] These diseases are recognized as neglected tropical diseases because they are neglected by global institutions, national governments and pharmaceutical companies. NTD are an excellent example of a failing development paradigm with a weak ethical compass and pervasive epistemic injustice.

Using the example of NTD, I analyze how the current development paradigm fails to address structural injustices such as the health disparities in the treatment and cure of these diseases. I will consider epistemological foundations of development, arguing that this is where the problem begins. My ultimate aim is to offer an analysis of the problem of NTD from a development ethics perspective which intersects with feminist epistemology. Based on my own analysis, I argue that one of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice can be found in theoretical discussions of knowledge, and how this knowledge is then applied in the practice. I am offering some new tools of analysis to dismantle the master's house.

[2] However, there is now evidence of cases of some NTD in Europe and the U.S. due to high migration rates from the poorer countries to these regions.

Since parts of my dissertation originate from when I was a development practitioner in Latin America, I consider it to be important in my analysis of global development to include what theorists from Latin America are also saying; I will not limit my discussion to development theory from the west. In my work I have tried to be as inclusive as possible insofar as bringing in viewpoints and positions from western and non-western thinkers. Some may wince at the thought that here is another white western woman appropriating women of colors' knowledge. Yet I believe that it is important to learn from what others say and do, and use their insights to shape our own thinking.

The target for achieving the Millennium Development Goals is 2015. So we are at an opportune time to evaluate the progress and achievement of these goals, but also to analyse and assess the obstacles and challenges which have arisen and hindered their progress. There is currently much discussion taking place in regard to the post -2015 development agenda. This is an excellent opportunity to take into consideration ethical issues. The post-2015 development agenda is once again an ideal vision; the goals are 'ideals'. I would like to see us approach this from a different perspective - an approach which begins by raising the issue of global structural injustices and considering the reasons why these happen. We need to gain a greater understanding of why so many children, women and men are left behind - why some human lives are valued more than others. Some difficult and uncomfortable questions need to be asked and confronted.

I would suggest that we broaden the economic, social and environmental pillars of sustainable development to include ethics as a key aspect. Just as we cannot conceive of development without sustainability, we should not conceive of sustainable development without ethics. Incorporating ethics and epistemic justice will allow for a more critical discussion and analysis of the development processes and realities, and therefore help us to understand where we are, how we got here and where we need to go.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"We all need to be challenged out of our mistakes, stupidities, complacencies—especially when it is our own intellectual blinkers that prevent us from seeing them as such. This is the preeminent role of philosophy."

"What is philosophy?" Graham Priest, 2006

Introduction

Global development is comprised of a system of ideas, policies, institutions and individuals all supposedly concerned with the improvement of the living conditions of those populations living in disadvantaged conditions. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "Article 25, Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and Article 28, Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized" (1948). So, it could be argued that the system of global development has been set up as a way to respond to these two human rights, first to provide all children, women and men with the basic necessities and second to ensure that the social and international order responds appropriately. However, this has not occurred. As I write this, a child will die from the effects of poverty and by the time you finish reading the entire dissertation another 510 children will do the same. Every minute, 34 people die due to poverty-related causes, most of which are not so difficult to prevent. Among the 34 who die every minute more than 17 will be children, many will be girls, and many will be of color or other minority group. The solution for most of these problems is multifaceted but does include basic efforts such as adequate nutrition, access to safe drinking water, as well as access to basic health care and medicines.

As a result of globalization, the many processes and multiple interactions and interdependencies this produces I have chosen to use the term global development instead of international development. This offers a more encompassing view of the situation. Global development expresses the breadth and depth of the idea; it is more than just relations between or among nations. Thomas Pogge begins his discussion on global justice with rendering obsolete distinctions "between intra-national and international relations," (2010, 15). He says, "Today, very much more is happening across national borders than merely interactions and relations among governments. For one thing , there are many additional important actors on the international scene: international agencies, such as the United Nations, the European Union, the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund,

as well as multinational corporations and international non-government organizations (NGOs)" (2010,14). These important actors act within a global institutional order and set the development agenda. Limiting the discussion to international development can make less visible, the role and significance these actors have.

According to Thomas Pogge, the fact that the level of global poverty is so high – that the basic human rights of so many people are not fulfilled -- calls for an urgent moral response. He attributes the causes and extent of global poverty to the global institutional order. The problem is structural but avoidable. According to Pogge, "a 2 percent shift in the distribution of global household income could wholly eradicate the severe poverty that currently blights the lives of nearly half the human population" (2010, 12). However, despite efforts made to contribute to the amelioration of people's suffering in the name of development, human development indicators continue to be alarming: more than one billion people are malnourished, 884 million people do not have access to clean water, basic sanitation is denied to 2.5 billion people and 774 million people cannot read and write (Pogge, 2010, 11). Although the causes of these evident deprivations are not entirely due to development, it is clear that due to the ineffectiveness of development these situations are not adequately addressed. Some of the problems particular to development include the implementation of inappropriate projects and programs; the dynamics of relationships between the multiple actors who play a role in development often entrenched in power and domination; and poor mechanisms of accountability. This has resulted in trillions of dollars invested in the name of development, but I would argue with poor results. Taking a glimpse at Haiti before and after the earthquake, it is not hard to see some of the failings of development, particularly when you consider that development agencies have been in that country for over 50 years.

The concept of justice I use as a component of global justice derives from the concept of injustice. I will move away from the ideal theory of John Rawls and consider what it means to start off from the recognition of injustices such as poverty, inequality, marginalization and discrimination. So, rather than discussing and analyzing what the ideal should be, as Rawls and others do, the type of institutions we

should strive for, or proclaim a type of development that only focuses on increasing income or resource-utility, the project here is to address the flagrant injustices and inequalities. This demands a critical analysis and reflection, and social action which hopefully will lead to some institutional transformation or at least reform. Hence, this study has both theoretical and practical implications. This type of focus allows one to see what the problems are and the obstacles which need to be overcome. This is not intended to denigrate theories of justice such as Rawls', which has been instrumental in guiding the work of global justice theorists such as Pogge and others. Rather it highlights the need to not only rely on this. Vittorio Buffachi says, "a theory of justice sets out to overcome or surmount injustice, which suggests that before a theory of justice can do any work, indeed even before a theory of justice takes form, the nature and meaning of injustice must be understood and explained"(2012,ix).

Iris Marion Young analyses the significance of structural factors in the perpetuation of poverty and other injustices. According to Young, despite distributive issues being essential to conceptions of justice, she argues that we need to go beyond distributive justice and consider other aspects often ignored in contemporary political philosophy, but which can result in the erroneous reduction of social justice to merely distribution. Under these concepts of justice, injustice refers primarily to two forms of disabling constraints, oppression and domination" (1990, 3). Using NTD as an example of both forms of injustice will also enable one to see how conceiving of justice in this way is linked to epistemic injustice. My claim is that there is a strong relationship between global injustice and epistemic injustice.

Overview

Chapter One: An interpretation of global development

In the first chapter I begin with the experience of development as a way to set the context, as a way to understand some of the problems within development practice which need to be revisited and recast. The practice of development involves many actors; I outline a social hierarchy of the development paradigm. I suggest that the many actors can be classified into levels. At the first level are the multilateral

agencies such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and United Nations as well as the foreign aid ministries of governments such as the U.S., England, the European Union and others. At the second level are the international Non-Government Organizations such as Oxfam, Care and many others. The third level is the national governments of the poorer countries like Bolivia and Haiti. The fourth level are national NGOs, most of which are funded by the institutions of the first and second level. The fifth and final level is where the social movements and community based organizations are situated. It is not difficult to see how the diversity of these institutions and organizations becomes very complex and laden with power asymmetries and struggles. One of the major problems of global development can be attributed to the high number and diverse types of institutions and groups implicated in development, since it results in the marginalization of those at the bottom of the social hierarchy, particularly in decision-making processes.

In this chapter I share some of my experiences working in the field – the failed projects, the white elephants and some unanswered questions. I offer the example of cholera, a fatal, infectious disease that should be easy to prevent with adequate water and sanitation systems. Despite, this, cholera continues to kill, as is evident in Haiti today. Cholera can be described as the epitome of a disease directly related to poverty.

Development as we know it today was thrust into the global arena after World War II. However, to be able to grasp how and what this signified, it is also important to delve into periods which preceded World War II. The concept of development is contentious because of its continued association with promoting solutions to global poverty from a western standpoint, and has framed global development policies for decades. Here, I offer an analysis of the events which took place after World War II with the birth of the Bretton Woods Institutions: World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. I also discuss how the concept of development has evolved over the years from being understood in purely economic terms to one, which now does incorporate well-being, functioning's and capabilities of individuals. I consider the normative dimension of development and argue for a non-idealized approach

to development. Thinking about the normative dimension of development means thinking about what development should be. One of the problems with this is that the definition of development becomes enshrined within ideal theory. This type of definition obfuscates the need for a deeper understanding of the structural causes which hinder and become obstacles for development, and even more importantly the notion of under-development as a by-product of development. I use Charles Mills and his work on non-ideal theory to argue that development needs to be understood in this way first and foremost.

From here I take a critical look at development through the lenses of so-called post-development theorists and feminist theorists in an attempt to situate where we are with development today. Unfortunately, critical discourses on development which primarily originate in countries of the periphery – the targets of development, are not assigned adequate credibility or even included in general debates on development. This, according to Arturo Escobar reflects the dominance of one knowledge system over a non-western one. It also dictates the marginalization and disqualification of this knowledge system. For post-development thinkers there is an urgent need for redress and action on economic prosperity, the engine driving development. This is already having dire effects on the environment of our fragile world.

I incorporate feminist thought here to emphasize the importance this holds for any theory and practice of global development. Although many advances have been made in regard to women, such as literacy rates, maternal mortality, too many women still continue to die in childbirth, too many girls are abducted, sold, raped or killed. Also, some development policies claiming to be gender aware end up worsening the plight of women. In this chapter I offer a brief analysis of how development has addressed the issue of gender over the years, but also acknowledge that while a gender focus in development has resulted in a much broader and in-depth recognition of the challenges women face this has not proved sufficient.

Chapter Two: Neglected diseases as a consequence of the failings of development

In the second chapter I analyse the problem of NTD conceived as a problem created by the failing of development as a result of theoretical, social, political, economic and cultural conditions. According to the World Health Organization, NTD are a diverse group of mainly 17 diseases that blight the lives of more than a billion people worldwide. They are found mainly among the poorest populations of the world. Chagas disease is one of them. In Bolivia, Chagas disease mostly affects poor, often illiterate *campesinos* or indigenous peasants who often live in precarious, overcrowded housing and rely on subsistence farming for their existence. These people have not only been marginalized by global institutions but, of more concern, by their own governments. They live without electricity or running water. Moreover, the topography of Bolivia, with huge areas of mountainous land, does not have easy access, especially by road. In some cases it can take up to four hours to travel 35 miles because of the state of the roads.

Often the problem of neglected diseases is considered to be primarily a health problem or one limited to the practices of pharmaceutical companies. Limiting the problem to pharmaceutical companies limits the solution: there is an assumption that investing more money in research or the production of drugs will reduce the global burden of disease. Analyzing Chagas disease shows that this is not enough, in fact, there are other issues lurking here which need to be addressed.

The analysis of NTD in this context raises some important philosophical questions in the context of development ethics. Why is it that so many organizations, international and national, working in development basically ignores large sectors of the population, thus not responding to the fulfillment of human rights demands? Why are some human lives valued over others? The answer to the first question is rather straightforward. Not many people want to sacrifice their own comforts and live in situations where one does not have access to electricity or running water. The conditions are just too difficult for some workers to endure. This is understandable, but it does not justify ignoring these groups of people. If one were to pinpoint on a map of Bolivia where the NGOs are working, it is not surprising to note that

the majority are concentrated in the larger cities and surrounding semi-rural areas. Very few venture out to the most desolate and marginalized areas. This means that large pockets of the population, particularly those in more disadvantageous positions, are left out of the development agenda of many NGOs. The second question is more difficult to answer but has something to do with the silence of the oppressed, their invisibility, and their submissiveness. This does warrant further analysis.

There seem to be two focuses of attention for addressing the problem of Chagas. One is the prevention of the disease and the other is the treatment of those infected with the disease. In both cases there are serious limitations in the way these have been addressed. I explore and critically analyze these limitations and their implications. I also conduct a theoretical analysis of the concept of neglected diseases to expose how this concept has come about. Some of the questions I attempt to answer in this section include the following: How do global institutions such as the World Bank, United Nations and others decide on the policies which ultimately drive global development agendas? What and whose knowledge is used? Could a pluralist form of knowledge be encouraged? What would that mean in practice? One can quickly discover that people who were supposed to be helped were not listened to properly. The experience of other people, such as the policy makers, the decision makers, and the upper level managers, was credited as more authentic than the experience of a poor woman. A poor woman knew what it was like to fetch water every day, what it was like, to nurse her child to health or watch it die and knew what it was like to decide what was more important: to buy bread or buy milk since she only had enough money for one. Such questions emphasize the need for an ethical analysis, but also consider what is ethical development?

In view of this, I discuss the importance of including ethical considerations in any analysis of NTD. Very little has been written about the ethical aspects of NTD and one of the most serious ethical issues of NTD is the neglect of millions of people around world who are suffering from one of the NTD or are at high-risk of becoming infected. In this chapter I pose the question whether there is an epistemic

problem in regard to NTD. I will argue that indeed, knowledge (or a lack of) is a problem and introduce the notion of epistemic injustice which is further analyzed in subsequent chapters.

Chapter Three: The need for ethical development

In the third chapter, I argue for a strong ethical approach in development. I propose a strong ethical approach since I believe that the current perception, understanding, and practice of ethics in development is too weak to have the impact needed to generate truly desirable change. Too many decisions are made and too many policies dominate an international development agenda that are guided by economic forces and national self-interests. While the field of development ethics has attempted to improve this situation, I argue that to date, not enough impact has been made. I will consider how an ethical development approach based on the work of Denis Goulet, Thomas Pogge, Stephen Esquith, Jane Addams, Paul Farmer and others can contribute to addressing this problem. I will do this by first discerning the type of ethical approach required. An abstract form of ethics which is purely theoretical and analytical will not do. The type of ethics which development ethics needs is both critical and practical. Denis Goulet describes it as "Genuine ethics … a kind of praxis which generates critical reflection on the value charge of one's social action" (1997, 1165). The problem of neglected diseases requires this ethical framework, one that provides critical reflection but also can influence public policy. The theory and practice are inextricably linked.

I also analyze the theory and practice divide – a topic which has been discussed repeatedly over the years. However, I think it is still worthwhile and warrants some attention for the significance it holds in global development. Having been a development professional for so long that is, embedded in the practice and now working more on the theoretical side, the divide between the theory and practice appears as very evident. I explore this notion further.

. Thomas Pogge's work is helpful in the way he challenges some analysts in their acceptance that the problem of global poverty is no worse today. He argues that to engage in an accurate description and

explanation of social phenomena requires an institutional moral analysis. Inquiries of this type allow one to explore counterfactual statements that could be made about the operations of institutions. For Pogge, poverty is a human rights violation of the global poor. The extent of global poverty is such that nations and institutions cannot protect the most poor or alleviate their poverty. His human rights approach is based on the negative duties of institutions to do no harm, such as no torture and no rape. He makes this even more specific by basing his argument entirely on those institutional negative duties which address human rights. This analysis shows how the problem of NTDs is neither confined to one nation nor purely attributable to a weak state. In this context Pogge argues that the global institutional order and the national institutional orders are in need of reform if we are serious about addressing neglected tropical diseases. Pogge does limit responsibility and obligations to individuals and institutions in richer countries. Indeed, we must extend this to individuals and institutions in poorer countries as well. I argue that there is an urgent need for those working in development to recognize and understand their political responsibilities.

Stephen Esquith argues for the political responsibilities of those who participate in institutions, but does not limit his targets to those. He also considers that as bystanders we too hold political responsibilities. He claims that to gain some understanding of this requires a process of democratic political education. His work brings forth the value of cultural reenactments and layers of interpretation as a way to prompt individuals to think differently and more critically. Esquith does not believe that cultural reenactment alone will encourage deep self-understanding or empathy. This requires a further step what he calls "a layer of interpretation." I further this notion by suggesting that this interpretative process be ongoing.

I include Jane Addams for her work on social ethics, in contrast to an ethics confined to the individual. This notion is pivotal for an ethical approach to global development. For Addams a social morality develops from our feelings and actions. Two principal tenets to her theory are reciprocity and sympathetic understanding. I think one of the most salient features of Addams' work is her emphasis on

the need to understand the experience of others to be able to work with them. She argues for the importance of walking on the same path together rather than on sequestered byways. This, I will argue, is what is needed in development practice, a greater understanding and acceptance of the experience of "others."

The final thinker I include in this chapter is Paul Farmer, physician and anthropologist who has worked in Haiti for many years. He argues for the need to reveal how the social and economic rights of the poor expressed as the right to a decent quality of life – or the basic right to life -- are being violated. The fulfillment of these rights requires that people have access to running water, food security, adequate housing, etc. When talking about social or poverty related diseases such as cholera, Chagas and tuberculosis, the fulfillment of these rights cannot be ignored because of their causal relations to health and disease. For Farmer, failure to provide these rights to any population is due in large part to structural violence. Structural violence can be defined as a type of violence which is indirect. It differs from physical and psychological forms of violence in that it is not visible. Moreover, often it is difficult to identify the effects of violence, since this form of violence is embedded within the social structure of our society, such as institutions. It amounts to the violation of social and economic rights of the poor. In this context Farmer's work on structural violence helps understand the ethical aspects of neglected diseases in general. He says, "Human rights violations are, rather, symptoms of deeper pathologies of power and linked intimately to the social conditions that so often determine who will suffer abuse and who will be shielded from harm" (Farmer, 2005, 7). Farmer, like the earlier thinkers mentioned, considers poverty and other global problems as multifaceted ones; he realizes the responsibility of multiple actors in addressing these problems.

In this chapter I also include a section on a different worldview of global development deriving from Latin America which is based on what is known as a *cosmovision andina*. This worldview is not new. Its roots can be traced to centuries before the Spanish conquest that began in 1492. By including this section, not only do I show how different cultures have different ontologies and the need to recognize

these, but also how the worldviews of others can enrich our own. From here, I begin to build a strong ethical approach to development bringing together the thoughts and ideas of the preceding thinkers. Some of the salient features of this approach include a practice-driven ethical theory, feminist standpoint theory, political responsibility, epistemic justice, global equity, and pragmatic solidarity. I conclude this chapter with a brief analysis of the theory and practice divide, and argue for the need to use the dialectical tension between the theory and practice to guide both. I also note the value and need for philosophers to critically engage in global development.

The theory and practice divide happens at different levels. It occurs between theorists and practitioners, but it also takes place between disciplines. The International Development Ethics Association prides itself on being an interdisciplinary field which brings together academics from different disciplines and practitioners. I discuss why this has not happened to the extent desired and consider ways in which this can be achieved. Philosophers tend to be poor at working in a collaborative way, and that has been one of the limitations of the interdisciplinary approach. To remedy this tendency I analyze the methodology of philosophical inquiry and propose what "doing helpful philosophy" in the development arena would mean.

Chapter Four: Epistemic injustice in development

In the Western philosophical tradition epistemology has been predominantly rooted in hegemonic, patriarchal conceptual frameworks. In contrast, feminist epistemology looks at the theory of knowledge and knowledge production in a critical and concrete way. As I previously mentioned, one of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice arises from theoretical discussions of knowledge, and how this knowledge is then applied in practice. I have chosen to use feminist epistemology, and particularly the notion of epistemic injustice, to offer an in-depth analysis of the theoretical discussion of knowledge, as well as its practical applications. Using feminist epistemology as a framework, I am here more concerned with the epistemology than with the sociology of knowledge production. I am more interested in the normative role of knowledge production, attempting to

understand both how we should know, and how we can improve our knowledge practices. This is crucial for rethinking the theory and practice of global development.

Since my dissertation looks at the intersection of development ethics with feminist epistemology, I will also ponder the attributions of ethics and politics to epistemology which I consider to be a practice of feminist philosophy in general. Feminist philosophy has played a crucial role in identifying the value of concrete practices rather than relying only on abstract ideals. Feminism has always been a political movement primarily concerned with practical issues that arise from the everyday lives of women. Feminist philosophers have taken this on board in their intellectual work, understanding this to be, in Linda Alcoff's words, "a contribution to the public debate on crucial practical issues" (1993, 2). What this has allowed is the vision that typical areas within philosophy such as epistemology, ethics, and social and political thought actually have porous borders. Rather than thinking that they have separate areas, each with its own dogma and rhetoric, feminist philosophy sees the need to reconfigure these borders. In Alcoff's words, "But this recognition of the political commitments and effects implicit in every philosophical position has sparked a determination to reconstruct epistemology on newer, more self-conscious ground. This reconstruction also promises to reconfigure the borders within epistemology, political philosophy, ethics and other areas of philosophy as we come to see the interrelationships and inseparability of heretofore disparate issues"(1993,3). Miranda Fricker's *Epistemic Injustice* has provided at least the first steps towards the reconfiguration of the borders within epistemology and ethics, although there is still much to do. Her work reveals the ethical dimension of epistemic practice, and more specifically, its just and unjust aspects.

In this chapter I introduce the notion of epistemic injustice and analyze how the theory and practice of global development is epistemically unjust. To help build this analysis I draw on the work of feminist epistemologists and other theorists such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos. Santos introduces the term cognitive justice, and claims that cognitive justice is an essential component of global justice. Cognitive justice for Santos can be likened to epistemic justice in many ways; I consider cognitive justice

and epistemic justice as similar terms, claiming that a more robust account of the epistemic problems with and in development can be found by taking into consideration features of both.

Santos argues that a new epistemology is needed: we can no longer limit our ideas and decisions based on a type of knowledge entrenched within a western paradigm. He argues for the urgent need to supplant the dominant monoculture paradigm in science with an *ecology of knowledges*. The new epistemology Santos is arguing for is one that derives from the south. To build an epistemology of the south incorporates four steps: sociology of absences, sociology of emergences, ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation. I compare Santos' work to analogous projects of feminist epistemology. Both originate from a critical response to dominant paradigms in both science and philosophy. In her work, Fricker introduces two forms of epistemic injustice; these are testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustice. Testimonial injustice takes place when a speaker is given a reduced credibility by a hearer due to prejudice. Hermeneutical injustice will usually take place at an earlier stage by unfairly putting someone at a disadvantage through a division in the interpretative resources available. Hermeneutical injustice emphasizes how power relations and privilege influence interpretations which are socially embedded.

However, a number of social epistemologists including Elizabeth Anderson, Kristie Dotson and Gail Pohlhaus provide challenges to Fricker's ideas arguing for the need to deepen the analysis to identify a more structural problem. Elizabeth Anderson does not completely discount the value of cultivating individual epistemic virtues. However, she attributes causes of testimonial and hermeneutical injustice to be more structural in nature. Kristie Dotson introduces a third type of epistemic injustice which she calls contributory injustice. Fricker talks about the collective hermeneutical resources which assumes a form of homogeneity; whereas Dotson proposes that there are various sets of collective hermeneutical resources such as alternative epistemologies and counter mythologies. A second concern Dotson has is in regard to the dimension of power. According to Dotson, Fricker's hermeneutical marginalization does not emphasize the role power plays in obscuring hermeneutical resources of marginalization. In

contributory justice the epistemic agency of a knower is compromised through situated ignorance. One's situatedness determines the boundaries of both one's knowledge and one's ignorance. Dotson argues that epistemic frameworks both obscure and illuminate epistemic differences. We can recognize these differences, but we don't because of willful hermeneutical ignorance.

I also consider some of the differences between cognitive and epistemic injustice. Santos is aware of the importance of cognitive justice towards the achievement of global justice, whereas the focus of epistemic justice does not yet envision global justice. A second difference is that an account of epistemic injustice provides an in-depth theoretical analysis which is epistemological. A third difference is that Santos' approach is interdisciplinary where feminist attention to epistemic injustice is mainly confined to philosophers.

In the final section of this chapter I consider cognitive/epistemic injustice in the context of global development, arguing that epistemic injustice begins with the concept of development. The concept of development is based on a certain epistemology embedded within a particular social imaginary that excludes other epistemologies. I then offer three examples of development practice which exemplify testimonial, hermeneutic and contributory injustice using Chagas Disease as a case study. I conclude the chapter by offering some thoughts and actions necessary to work towards mitigating epistemic injustice in global development.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

This final chapter brings together themes from all the preceding chapters and offers some discussion on the theoretical and practical applications of a strong ethical approach and envisioning epistemic justice for global development. It highlights some of the most poignant points in my dissertation which include a strong ethical approach and reducing epistemic injustice which could greatly help in understanding the injustices taking place at a global level. I think that an adequate analysis also includes the voices of those who need to be represented, those who are the oppressed, the

dominated, and the marginalized. My goal is to present some distinctive ethical reflections on the current theory and practice of development in the hope that this will contribute to a more effective attention to the needs of the most disadvantaged around the globe.

Chapter One

An Interpretation of Global Development

In this first chapter, I offer one interpretation of global development through the eyes of a development practitioner. I begin from the practice of development, not to undermine the theory but as a way to set the context, and as a way to understand the complexities of practice. I offer a couple of anecdotes to help shape my analysis. However, considering development practice on its own is not enough. One needs to understand the concept of development and how it has been interpreted over the years. I also consider the normative dimension of development and argue for a non-idealized approach. From here I take a critical look at development through the lenses of feminist and post-development theorists in an attempt to situate where we are with regard to development today.

The practice of development

The practice of development is actually very complex, and takes place at different levels. Here I am thinking, broadly speaking, at the level of institutions. The first level are multilateral agencies and bilateral governments; the second level, international non- government organizations (INGOs); the third level, national governments; the fourth level, national non-government organizations (NNGOs) and the fifth level, social movements and community based organizations. I think this complexity also becomes one of the problems for the high number of levels, each of which is comprised of certain, distinct institutions. There are two other levels which could be considered laterally: the private sector and the academy, which I will not be expanding on in this section.

At the first level, the multilateral agencies and bilateral governments I am considering here include the United Nations (UN), World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF) as well as the foreign aid ministries of governments such as United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Department for International Development (DFID) of the British Government, European Union, not to mention the Australian Agency for International Development (AUSAID), Danish International Development Agency (Danida), Spanish Agency for International Development (AECI),

and many others. It is at this level where the global development policies and programs first emanate. At the second level, are the international non-government organizations which easily numbers in the hundreds, such as Oxfam, Doctors without Borders (MSF) and Save the Children. Many of these NGOs, if not all, actually depend on the institutions of the first level for their funding and existence. Their development programs are pre-determined by their funders.

At the third level are national governments, here I am particularly thinking about the national governments of poorer countries – those of which have been the recipients of WB loans, Structural Adjustment Programs by the IMF, UN funding etc. At the fourth level are national NGOs which enjoyed a true boom during the decades of the 80s and 90s.[3] These were predominantly funded by international NGOs but over the years bilateral governments have also directly supported these organizations. At the fifth level exists a plethora of social movements and community based organizations which have arisen all over the globe, some of these include workers union groups, cooperatives of farmers and other small business owners, human rights organizations, feminist groups, LGBT groups, etc. The World Social Forum which takes place in different countries around the globe is one accomplishment of these movements. One could include the Arab Spring which took place in the Middle Eastern region in 2010 and the Occupy Movement which took to the streets a couple of years ago as other forms of resistance to the current form of globalization. An analysis of the power dynamics of all the institutions and organizations which occupy these levels warrants a dissertation on its own. But it's not difficult to see how complex and complicated the situation is. Who is accountable to whom? Do adequate transparency and accountability mechanisms exist? What does the hierarchical structure of these levels produce?

There is a certain dynamic that exists of the relationship between the levels of institutions, as well as among the institutions at a particular level. But one can witness a cascade of power beginning from the first level flowing down to subsequent levels. The United States as one country can also be

[3] Bolivia alone saw the creation of 800-900 national non-government organizations, some that were discovered to be "ghost" NGOs, where they received funding from an external donor but actually did not exist in practice.

considered as an imperial power that has influential force on the WB, IMF and the UN. Most non-profit organizations, if not all, rely on funds from external sources for their operational costs. National NGOs such as the ones I worked with in Bolivia rely purely on external funding which usually comes from funding outside of the country. These NGOs survive by executing projects, so much time is invested in the designing of projects, writing the projects, implementing and evaluating projects. The ideas of themes for the projects usually derive from donor interests. Most NGOs will seek out funding possibilities consistent with their own strategic plan. International NGOs do not behave so differently. They also are predominantly dependent on external funding sources from their own government, multilateral agencies such as the UN, WB and others as well as corporations.[4] Social movements and community organizations at the fifth level are a diverse group. Many will operate purely on a voluntary basis, while others will demand membership fees, donations and so forth. And some will have access to some funding sources.

Some critical observations

As a development practitioner, I worked directly with national NGOs and an International NGOs but collaborated at all other levels. Some of the practical implications of development work include the incessant lack of coordination that occurs on the ground: it is still not unusual to observe two or three NGOs (national and international) working in the same community, doing similar work and not coordinating. What this meant for the members of that community were endless meetings, overlapping resources, and conflicting information. Each NGO had its own strategic plan and vision, thus worked according to that plan. It creates donor overload in some communities (while neglecting others) but also burdens the members and creates confusion. It is still not unusual to see food aid given in the form of substitute potatoes in areas where potato is one of their staple foods and crops. One can still witness 'white elephants,' empty new buildings which are bereft of human resources and funding to carry out their work. Why is it that so many institutions – international and national -- working in development

[4] I haven't worked in the field for seven years so the situation may have changed.

basically ignore large sectors of the population, particularly the poorest and most vulnerable, thus not responding to the fulfillment of basic human rights?

My first assignment as a development worker was as a water and sanitation educator. It was also when I experienced a rude awakening to the reality of development. I was working in a project which consisted of the building of a dam in a small semi-rural town in Bolivia. It was funded by the Canadian Government, channeled through a Canadian Non-Government Organization (NGO) which provided funds to a local Bolivian NGO. The town which was to benefit from this project did not have a continuous, reliable potable water system established throughout the town. Most homes would have one tap outside their homes which provided them with all their water supply. Water supplies were erratic and not consistent. Very often throughout the course of a week, it was not uncommon to find no water coming out of taps. [5]The dam to be built (which displaced families) was to provide drinking water to all inhabitants of the town, and water for irrigation to the outlying communities.

The dam was to use a very basic filtration system that was cost effective and of low maintenance. It consisted of a process which used sand and gravel. The water which entered the dam coming from badly eroded hills was very turbid (the color of mud). This filtration system was inadequate. For this type of water, to be classified "potable" it required a much more sophisticated process of filtering which involved highly qualified technical support and the use of chemicals. This also meant that the costs of maintaining this system would reach exorbitant levels, levels too expensive and therefore, unsustainable for the local government to maintain. The project was more or less deemed a failure because it could not provide potable water to town people. Instead, two large wells were built to provide potable water to the town people and the dam was solely used for irrigation. The general lifespan of the dam was shortened to approximately 10 years due to the level of turbidity of the water - a project which cost millions of dollars to execute. This project was not funded by the World Bank but it is important to note that this particular dam project is not an isolated case. In ninety-two countries the number of large dams funded

[5] I lived in this town for three years.

by the World Bank amounts to more than 500 with a cost of approximately US$50 billion. A review carried out by the Bank, "admits that the vast majority of women, men and children evicted by Bank-funded projects never neither regained their former incomes nor received any direct benefits from the dams for which they were forced to sacrifice their homes and lands" (The Whirled Bank Group, 2012). The building of dams has been considered a significant strategy to ameliorate the lives of so many people, but in fact this is not true in many cases. Many people are not benefitted or are affected in a negative way.

A number of institutional levels in the hierarchy of the development paradigm were engaged in this example: the Bolivian NGO, the Canadian NGO and those working in the international development arm of the Canadian government, local government, as well as the people of the town and rural communities. A strong relationship was forged between the Bolivian NGO and the Association of Irrigation Users which was a grass roots organization. The people in the town and communities were obliged to work as peons – each of them had to work a certain amount of days on the building of the dam, building of roads for access to the dam, etc. Those working in the Bolivian NGO organized this entire system in conjunction with the Canadian NGO but did not "do any of the labour." And the Canadian government oversaw the entire project. There was a very distinct division of labour.

The dam project was designed knowing that the water was very turbid – how it ever got approved is questionable. However, this demonstrates how truth becomes distorted for the benefits of a few, in this case those in the Canadian and Bolivian NGOs. The ultimate beneficiaries, the people who desperately needed a continuous supply of potable water were used solely for the purpose of an elite few who decided that this was going ahead despite the circumstances. It is not certain if an environmental impact study was carried out before this was approved , I think not, or at least I would like to think it could not have been, or its data was manipulated since anyone with technical competency would not have approved this project in the first place. It seems that many projects go ahead in the name of

development but in fact, do not ameliorate people's lives – they stand as white elephants, do not have successful outcomes or just become a set of activities which come and go but have no real impact. [6]

The community was not involved in the initial design and planning process of this project – this was appropriated by the Bolivian NGO. The relationship between the community and the Bolivian NGO was one of submission – it was not an equal relationship but rather one of unequal power and domination. The same could be said for relations between the Bolivian NGO and the Canadian NGO, and once again between the Canadian NGO and the Canadian government. At each level one entity exercised power over the other. In this particular case study the division of labour is marked; at all levels there is a distinct power asymmetry, between the community members and the Bolivian NGO, between the Bolivian NGO and the Canadian NGO, and between the Canadian NGO and the Canadian government. We can talk about a certain social order where there is coordination between different sectors, but it is also where implicitly there is unequal distribution of power struggles.

If we consider Gustavo Esteva and his critique about development and the division between developed nations and underdeveloped nations, the people of the town and communities ceased to be the people they were – they became someone else perceived in someone else's reality, identified as people in "need of water" (1992). This was true; they were in need of water. But would it not have been more productive and efficient if, with these very people the issue of not having water was discussed and solutions worked out together? This project failed because of the way it assumed that because people were in need of water, that the best way was to provide a dam. This was worsened by providing a dam which could not adequately filter the water, so in the end could not even provide water. Another example which demonstrates the complexity but also the negative consequences of development is cholera.

[6] Another project I was aware of during my time in Bolivia was the building of a center for the rehabilitation of malnourished children. A beautiful, brand new center was built in an isolated area, inaccessible by public transport. When I visited, it was empty and not operational.

Cholera in 1854, 1992 and 2013

Cholera is a very infectious, fatal disease that was prevalent in the 1800's in many countries around the world including England. Dr. John Snow a physician, who through his work started the field of epidemiology, discovered that a way to prevent cholera was by securing good supplies of running water and sanitation systems. He was also aware that cholera primarily struck those who lived in poverty. In his seminal work, "On the Mode of Communication of Cholera" he said, "Each epidemic of cholera in London has borne a strict relation to the nature of the water-supply of its different districts, being modified only by poverty and the crowding and want of cleanliness which always attend it" (Snow, 1855, 56-57). He also delineated the following preventative measures, "the measures which can be taken beforehand to provide against cholera and other epidemic diseases: i) to effect good and perfect drainage; ii) to provide an ample supply of water quite free from contamination with the contents of sewers, cesspools, and house-drains, or the refuse of people who navigate the rivers; iii) to provide model lodging –houses for the vagrant class, and sufficient house room for the poor generally" (Snow, 1853, 367-369). In other words, to prevent the incidence and spread of cholera is quite easy: ensuring adequate water and sanitation systems, and adequate housing for all sectors of any population, in any country.

Building and implementing water and sanitation systems within urban and rural structures is neither difficult nor expensive in a relative sense, particularly if one was to compare the costs of this to space research or arms production. But, if this is the case, then why is it that 159 years later in some parts of the world people are still dying from cholera. In 1991 during the first few weeks of my assignment in Bolivia, I was confronted with a sudden increase of people contracting cholera, some fatally. Cholera is a disease which is not only an index of public health and sanitation but of oppression, inequality and more to the point, injustice. As mentioned above, it is easily prevented by basic sanitation measures: washing hands well after using the toilet and before preparing and/or handling food; avoiding raw vegetables and fruit which may be contaminated. These are simple measures, but if one does not have access to water or a toilet or latrine then this proves to be slightly difficult. All the cases which presented in Tarata (which

has a population of approximately 3,500 people) were from outlying communities, where there are few or no sanitation facilities. The same could be said for victims from Cochabamba, the nearby city, the majority were people from outer *barrios* (districts) and shanty towns where sanitation facilities were appalling.

Government officials of the health department acted promptly in advocating strict guidelines to prevent the spread of the disease, but without really considering the implications this may have. First, they condemned the consumption of raw vegetables and fruit which is an effective preventative measure, but the sale of this produce was often the only source of income for a large number of people. Second, market places in Bolivia, as in most Latin American countries are usually the center of attraction of a town – a hive of activity, where vendors sell anything and everything spreading their produce out on the ground where the risk of contamination is high. During the cholera epidemic this practice was criticized and prohibited, however no alternatives or compensation were offered. Third, a plea was made to the people to avoid waste disposal or defecating in the rivers (or river beds during the shortage of rain). Once again, government officials neglected to offer alternatives, so what are people supposed to do when they have no toilet (and no resources to build one), and no provision for the collection of rubbish or its disposal. It is not difficult then, to see how cholera can become rampant in an area where people are using the river for a multitude of purposes: washing, drinking, cooking, laundering, defecating and the disposal of rubbish. Unfortunately, government officials were oblivious to these implications (or chose to ignore them) and failed to recognize the plight of the people living next door to them, fearing only that they or their families would fall victim, which was highly improbable. What became a recurring issue for me during my time in Bolivia was how problems as mundane (but at the same time serious) as 'not having enough water' continue to be problems for a great majority of people in such an affluent world.

Cholera is not classified as a neglected tropical disease but I would definitely classify it as a social disease directly related to poverty. In Haiti, in 2010 cholera also appeared killing thousands (and will continue to do so). Apparently according to records, this is the first time cholera has been found in Haiti.

There is substantial evidence to support the fact that cholera came to Haiti by way of Nepalese soldiers as members of the UN peacekeeping force.[7] Since October, 2010 some 8,000 Haitians have died and 646,000 have become ill due to cholera. The virulence of the disease and the high mortality and morbidity rates has only been aided by the existence of deplorable water and sanitation facilities within those populations where the disease has been found, not least in the UN camps. The UN has rejected any claim of responsibility to offer compensation to victims and their families. Ban Ki Moon, Secretary General of the UN justifies this position for the diplomatic immunity of the UN. Louise C. Ivers, Senior health and policy adviser at Partners in Health says, "The United Nations has a moral, if not legal obligation to help solve a crisis it inadvertently helped start." (2013). If the United Nations can get away with not assuming its responsibility in this situation, demonstrating that it is not accountable to ordinary people, then what hope is there that other institutions, organizations, and so forth will step up to their own responsibilities and levels of accountability. This problem will be further analyzed in subsequent chapters as will the situation of neglected tropical diseases. In the next section, I consider the concept of development from a theoretical perspective.

Pre-World War II

The etymology of the word "development" traces its origin back to 1786, when it is defined as "an unfolding." In 1836 one meaning was "advancement through progressive stages and in 1902, it was also defined as the "the state of economic advancement" (Online Etymology Dictionary). The Oxford Dictionary defines development as gradual unfolding, fuller working out, developing of land, etc.; growth; stage of advancement and others (1976). So in a sense it is a dynamic term connoting progress, moving forward, some type of advancement. The idea of development considers both factual and normative claims as to how a society should be. Perceiving it as such implies change, as a sign of progress or growth so has a measurable outcome, which in the past has predominantly focused on economic growth. The

[7] Chin et al, The Origin of the Haitian Cholera Outbreak Strain, *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 2011, 364: 33-42; Hendriksen RS, et al. 2011. Population genetics of *Vibrio cholerae* from Nepal in 2010: Evidence on the Origin of the Haitian Outbreak. mBio 2(4):e00157-11. doi:10.1128/mBio.00157-11.

progress or growth which is assumed will happen, is recognized as desirable, something which should be strived for. But what happens when this does not take place, when development is rendered impossible due to a number of factors such as authoritarian governments, corruption, the absence of political will or even the global economic order. Development is then perceived as having ameliorative force, where basic conditions, such as water and sanitation, food security and adequate housing which have been unmet can in a way be provided for. It is development in the form of assistance whether in the way of economic or human resources. To perceive development as such derives from the premise that all societies' different from western societies are backward and disadvantaged, so development as a strategy is responding to a problem, not necessarily well understood since the meaning of development is very much entrenched within a western paradigm.

Development as a term cannot be conceived but within a broader context which allows an understanding of the social, political, economic and cultural factors which circumvent it. Thinking about development post World War II requires some understanding of the global situation and relations between countries prior to World War II. For Noam Chomsky, the colonization of various countries was not only brutal and devastating, but only perpetuated the stronghold and power richer European countries, and subsequently the United States had over these countries. He says, "Today's gap between North and South – the rich developed societies and the rest of the world – was largely created by the global conquest. Scholarship and science are beginning to recognize a record that had been concealed by imperial arrogance" (2010, 5).

Other theorists such as Des Gasper discuss how development commenced long before 1949, noting it to be more of an unconscious effort (at times) to improve the general living conditions of populations through growth and progress (2004). Gasper writes about the "three eras of development" which are consistent with development as a historical process. The first one considers development since the presence of man to the formation of modern European states circa the 16th century. Implicit during this era is the progress and growth of cities, the evolution of civilizations, agriculture and so forth.

The second era denotes the ascension of Europe and North America which involves two phases. A first, depicted from the 16th century and continues towards the latter part of the 18th century is recognized for the advances which took place in a socio-economic context. This is where we see the strengthening of capitalism, and the emergence of market systems through its institutions. Colonization is rife together with the forging of global commerce negotiations. A latter phase, the scope of which takes us from the 19th century to the mid-20th century is further pronounced by science and technological advances, inter-state relationships are challenged due to competitive market forces and colonization of major parts of the world by European states is rampant. The third era covers the period from 1945 and more specifically, President Truman's speech. In this era we have seen important political interventions as a result of two world wars. This era will be further discussed in the next section.

Post-World War II

It seems that it is generally accepted among some scholars and professionals that *development* as we know it today emerged from Harry Truman's discourse in his infamous inaugural address back in 1949. That's not to say that *development* was not conceived of prior to this, but marks the stage for the beginning of a process which has become a mega- industry over the span of nearly 65 years. The doctrine which pervades this era is heavily informed by economic growth. It was during this time that we witnessed the birth of the United Nations, and the institutions of Bretton Woods, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Colonization begins to fall away and there is constant antagonism between capitalist and communist models. There is also an increasing awareness of the disparities which exist between countries. Anti-development theorists such as Gustavo Esteva consider that the idea of development has been usurped since it was coined by President Truman in his inaugural address of 1949. Truman describes development as a form of assistance to those in underdeveloped areas however his ideas are based on development as a historical process, in that development comes about through scientific advances and industrial progress. Since some countries have not been able to achieve that (the factors why they haven't is completely ignored) Truman sees the role of the U.S. as one of assistance. His

speech included, "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our 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" (Esteva, 1992, 6).

For Esteva the context in which the term 'underdeveloped' was used dictated the way development was interpreted thereafter. He says, "Since then, development has connoted at least one thing: to escape from the undignified condition called underdevelopment" (1992, 7). He claims that using the term development in the context used by Truman automatically divided the world into developed and underdeveloped societies but exclusively in the eyes of those in so-called 'developed nations.' As he says, "On that day, "two billion people became underdeveloped" (1992, 7). What that also meant was that these two billion people suddenly ceased to be people they were, but became someone else as perceived in someone else's reality, were identified as a group of people in 'need of development' which also connoted issues of identity, belittlement and domination. For Esteva, this type of development was severely entrenched in the economic, the developed and underdeveloped dichotomy was principally based on the haves and haves not. The emphasis is on having rather than being. He calls for political action from the 'new commons' or what he describes as the people themselves, those labeled as the underdeveloped. There are many examples of social movements deriving from community based organizations which work towards solving their own problems, rather than relying on institutions from foreign countries.

Bretton Woods Institutions

In 1944, Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, a conference titled the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference was held, bringing together state representatives from 44 states including the United States, Britain, Canada and the Soviet Union. This happened at a time when the defeat of Germany and Japan was on the horizon and a perceived need for the revitalization of the global economy was deeply felt, particularly that of war-torn Europe. A consequence of this conference was the birth of

the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, today known as the World Bank (Crump, 1998). A principal role of the IMF was to stabilize exchange rates by providing short term financing to iron out the imbalances countries were experiencing. The Bank's role was more long term; it provided much needed capital to those countries in dire need of foreign aid. Originally aimed at countries in Europe, after successful growth became evident, the Bank extended their role to aid developing countries. Zafiris Tzannatos claims that the "overarching goal" of the Bank is the reduction of poverty (2006).

Countries from the peripheries which included many Asian and African countries including China met in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955 to discuss the need for political independence or the achievement of 'political decolonization.' This was a first attempt for these countries to oppose colonialism in a collective way and to seek a more neutral stance between the East and West. These poorer countries were already aware of their vulnerable state as underdeveloped nations and the global hegemonic forces which contributed to their persistent impoverished states. Denis Goulet describes the concept of underdevelopment as the following, "Underdevelopment is not merely the lack of development or a time lag in achieving industrial strength, productive agriculture, or universal schooling. Underdevelopment is an historical by-product of "development" (1973, 38). He also argues that to understand the phenomenon of underdevelopment we need to also include historical happenings and structures. Exclusively blaming nation-states on their inertia or apathy on one hand and blaming richer nations for exploitation and domination on the other hand does not adequately explain underdevelopment.

The first development theories focused on the 'development' of nations assessed by an increase in income, therefore was reduced to economic growth. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was the measure for growth and for more than 40 years the GDP was considered the only indicator worthy as a measurement of development or improvement. The higher the GDP of a country the "less poor" were its people. However, it became obvious that relying on the GDP was insufficient for assessing the impact of

development. The idea of development as such, greatly influenced the *project* of development, how development was then translated into operative plans. Development became synonymous with economic growth so programs and projects reflected this. The focus was to increase income.

It was only 20 years ago that criteria not based on the GDP were introduced for development assessment. In the early 1990s the concepts of Human Development and Sustainable Development became apparent and were widely discussed and analyzed at a global level. These extended the concept of development from one of mere economic growth, to one which incorporates indicators which measure literacy, education, well-being, infant and maternal mortality, nutritional status and others. Subsequently, this also influenced how development was carried out. In the 1990s the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) declared the following concept of development, "Development embraces not only access to goods and services, but also the opportunity to choose a fully satisfying, valuable and valued way of living together, the flourishing of human existence in all its forms and as a whole" (Gasper, 2004, 37).

This conception of development was made popular by Nobel Prize winner economist, Amartya Sen who was instrumental in developing the Human Development model and advocated for a development based on human qualities rather than being limited to economic outputs. His theory is based on the enhancement of individual freedoms. For Sen, the absence of individual freedoms is one of the main obstacles confronting individuals today and hinders their possibility for human flourishing. Development in this sense is the expansion of freedom. As Sen says, "Expansion of freedom is viewed, in this approach, both as the primary end and as the principal means of development. Development consists of the removal of various types of unfreedoms that leave people with little choice and little opportunity of exercising their reasoned agency" (1999, xii). His theory centers around the capabilities of persons, arguing that increased capabilities of people would lead to an enhanced quality of life. This approach as a practical development theory which focuses on the functioning's and capabilities of individuals, rather than the economic gains of societies, is a more reasonable attempt to address global poverty and

disparities. I would argue that, although the capability approach is instrumental and necessary for the enhancement of individual capabilities and freedom, in and of itself it is not sufficient for addressing some of the structural causes of poverty. However, we must also recognize the value that Sen's capability theory has had in emphasizing the normative meaning of development. In the next section I expand more on this.

The normative dimension of development

To make the claim that development has a normative meaning signifies that the orientation of development is directed towards producing some good – it cannot only be limited to the economic. If we think of something as producing some good, then we must also think about what needs to happen for this good to take place. Understanding development from a normative perspective would help in identifying those development actions that cause harm, such as the displacement of persons in the building of dams. However, it is also important to consider development from a normative dimension since isn't that what institutions and policies are aimed at (or supposedly aimed at) through development programs and policies. Before offering a further analysis of this it is somewhat important to consider normativity as a component of ethical theory. Normative concepts in ethical theory are based on idealized approaches which hypothetically assume perfect humans, institutions or the idea of justice. I move away from this approach to a nonidealized one arguing that it is only through such approaches that we can really understand the complexity and depth of issues of development.

Relying on a conception of development like the one espoused by the UNDP above-mentioned fits into an idealized approach. This type of conception obfuscates the need for a deeper understanding of two things: i) the existence of structural factors embedded within historical, economic and political frameworks which hinder any form of progress or positive development if you like and ii) underdevelopment as a by-product of development.

Charles Mills uses nonideal theory in his work and argues that one of its virtues is "reflecting the distinctive experience of the oppressed while avoiding particularism and relativism" (2005, 166). For Mills, a moral perspective of idealization does the following, it "involves the modeling of what people should be like (character), how they should treat each other (right and good actions), and how society should be structured in its basic institutions (justice)" (2005, 168). One of the distinguishing features of ideal theory is the exclusive total reliance on idealization and to a lesser degree the marginalization of what is actual. Mills offers a series of assumptions inextricably linked to ideal theory. These include: an idealized social ontology; idealized capacities; silence on oppression; ideal social institutions; an idealized cognitive sphere and finally strict compliance.

If we take the example of development as ideal theory particularly the conception of development cited above by the UNDP and consider Mills' assumptions the analysis would include the following: a) an idealized social ontology where human flourishing is the ideal, living a life which is fulfilling, satisfying, valued and valuable. This idealized social ontology allows an abstraction away from interrelational issues such as coercion, exploitation, structural domination and oppression; b) idealized capacities attributes unrealistic capacities to both those privileged and the not-so privileged such as agency, freedom or even the capacity to make one's own decisions. In oppressive situations such as poor marginalized communities where opportunities are rare and basic tasks such as fetching water and ensuring adequate supplies of food for your family prove to be challenging, these capacities are diminished; c) silence on oppression; in regard to this, Mills says the following, " Almost by definition, it follows from the focus of ideal theory that little or nothing will be said on actual historic oppression and its legacy in the present, or current ongoing oppression, though these may be gestured at in a vague or promissory way (as something to be dealt with later)" (2005, 168). This is true in current development theory and practice. There is very little awareness and understanding of the pervasiveness of oppression. Another assumption is: d) ideal social institutions, Mills considers the family here and other social structures. Keeping to our analysis of the concept of development as ideal theory one can also talk about the economic structure which includes the institutions as part of this. The ideal are perfect families,

perfect institutions – this only ignores the actual, how, in fact families and other institutions disadvantage in a systematic way certain groups of people such as children, women and disabled people.[8] Another assumption he considers is: e) idealized cognitive sphere this can be likened to epistemic justice for the way it can ignore oppressive structures and therefore misrecognition of the social cognition of those who are oppressed and the oppressors; and the final assumption is: f) strict compliance, for Mills this is reflected in Rawl's endorsement of ideal theory and its demand for strict compliance rather than just a partial one. In the case of development this would refer to the strict compliance of institutions to their programs and policies. This is highly unattainable for the complexities inherent to development.

In view of the above analysis I suggest that a non-idealized approach to development is a more authentic way to understand the obstacles of development, the by-products of development and the failings of development. Once again drawing on Mills work I consider what some of the virtues of non-ideal theory are. It is well known that theory requires abstraction, what is sometimes not clear is that the type of abstraction is equally important. Mills argues that abstraction in ethical theories has generally been of the type that abstracts away from certain situations which he considers are essential for understanding particular contexts. He says, "What one wants are abstractions of the ideal-as-descriptive model kind that capture the essentials of the situation of women and nonwhites, not abstract away from them" (2005, 173).

It cannot be denied that any form of theorizing comes about within an intellectual domain in the shape of concepts, assumptions, norms and others which predominantly reflect the ideas, assumptions and hence implicit biases of those from the dominant and so-called privileged social groups: white men from the western world. Ideal theory only perpetuates and reinforces this way of thinking. In contrast, non-ideal theory which can emerge from a different standpoint: proletariat, feminist, colored and others will portray the actual realities and conditions of those lives not visible in the ideal theories commonly alluded to. The same can be said for development theorists. It is no coincidence that in the last twenty

[8] Further discussion about this will take place in chapter 3.

years we have witnessed a burgeoning of degree and certificate program in development studies deriving mainly from western privileged countries such as the U.S., England and other European countries. Development theories emerge from the richer more privileged sectors of society where as critiques of development emerge from those living in societies which the former are aimed at.

Development should be a non-idealized concept. Development should mean understanding and addressing the inequities and injustices apparent in countries all over the world. This concept of development needs to depart from a standpoint of those to whom development is concerned with: the poor and vulnerable populations marginalized in and among both rich and poor countries. I turn now to the theorists from the south to present a critical assessment of the phenomenon of development.

Development and its discontents

Some theorists, particularly those from the global south talk about the myth of development and how its genesis hails from an ideology of progress according to western democracies. Within this sphere, policy makers, economists and other professionals consider development to be a natural, inevitable process particularly in social and economic terms. However, global south theorists such as Osvaldo De Rivero argue that in the last 50 years 130 countries have been stuck in what he calls "non-development." Only four countries: South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong have been able to demonstrate progress from being basic agrarian societies to technologically advanced industrial societies. For De Rivero, "the main obstacle today is not a lack of financial or technological capacity. It is a lack of an ethic that considers humanity as one single unit" (2001, 155).

Unfortunately critical discourses on development emanating from the countries of the periphery are often ignored or at least not given the adequate credibility or the inclusion in critical debates on development. Arturo Escobar in regard to this says the following, "Development has relied exclusively on one knowledge system, namely the modern Western one. The dominance of this knowledge system has dictated the marginalization and disqualification of non-Western knowledge systems" (2007, 279). As I

will discuss in further chapters, a dimension of development theory and practice which is often overlooked is epistemological.[9] According to Walter Mignolo there is a need for the historicity of epistemology to become geographical; it cannot be confined to a linearity which travels from the Ancient Greek to contemporary North Atlantic knowledge. "Epistemology is not ahistorical. But not only that, it cannot be reduced to the linear history from Greek to contemporary North Atlantic knowledge production. It has to be geographical in its historicity by bringing the colonial difference into the game" (2008, 234). He goes on to say, "It is crucial for the ethics, politics and epistemology of the future to recognize that the totality of Western epistemology from either the Right or the Left is no longer valid for the entire planet. The colonial difference is becoming unavoidable" (2008, 252). As a response to the hegemonic forces of a western epistemology Boaventura de Sousa Santos argues for an epistemology of the south, an ecology of knowledges which would supplant the dominant monocultural scientific paradigm.[10]

For post-development thinkers, the fragile state of the world in relation to climate change and economic prosperity requires urgent action and redress. Despite the economic advancement of a number of previously classified "third world countries" such as China, India, Brazil and others, this economic heyday has come about at the expense of the environment and the poorest of these societies. This is no longer sustainable – for all in the globe to aspire to a western way of life. Despite the desire for equity being claimed as a mantra for development entrenched within a development-as- growth mindset, this cannot continue. As Wolfgang Sachs, post development theorist says, "Linking the desire for equity to economic growth has been the conceptual cornerstone of the development age. Delinking the desire for equity from economic growth and relinking it to community and culture-based notions of wellbeing will be the cornerstone of the post-development age" (2010, xii).

[9] This is one of two areas I have decided to focus on in my dissertation.
[10] This is further discussed in Chapter 4

Feminist post-development thought

Analyzing the development and post-development discourse from a feminist perspective brings forth the need to push forward a notion of gender equity and to concede (with difficulty) that although we have come a long a way, there is still much to do before we can speak about gender equity at a global level. Still today, too many women die in childbirth, too many girls are sold, raped and killed. Although development (or misdevelopment) has in some cases ameliorated the situation of women, it has also worsened it. Any struggle within a framework of global justice necessarily needs to incorporate feminism and by feminism I am particularly thinking about an idea consistent with Drucille Baker, who says, "feminism understood as the dismantling of gender norms and gender privileges" (2006, 212). Women were absent from the development debate until the 1970s despite girls and women expressing the most deplorable and appalling human development indicators such as infant mortality, maternal mortality, levels of extreme poverty and illiteracy. It wasn't until Esther Boserup wrote "Women's Role in Economic Development" that institutions such as the World Bank began to take notice. Zafiris Tzannatos, advisor to the World Bank Institute in writing about the WB and gender equality says, "Indeed the Bank has been relatively slow in addressing the role women and broader gender issues in the economic development process" (2006, 21). It wasn't until the 80s that the Bank started to pay more attention to the issue of gender.

The welfare approach was the first attempt to highlight the needs of women within development. Welfarism became an extension of western liberal ideologies of charity and relief. This was later criticized for the way it perpetuated existing gender norms and practices, and promoted dependence on the state via its paternalistic nature. Women in Development (WID) followed this which attempted to address the plight of women, particularly those living in poorer countries. This movement coincided with the general feminist movement of the 1970s against patriarchal domination and oppression. Boserup's work paved the way toward the realization that development wasn't the panacea it was made out to be, that women were actually disadvantaged and negatively affected by what then

were thought as pro-growth effective development strategies. The assumption that the positive outcomes of development would trickle down to poor women was challenged. Boserup was able to show that in fact, development projects worsened the situation of women.

Another theoretical approach to development that became popular during the 1970s was the Basic Needs Approach in an attempt to move the focus away from development as economic growth. (Rai, 2011). The impetus was the satisfaction of basic needs to fulfill a basic standard of living. This included both physical needs such as water, nutrition, shelter, access to healthcare but did also consider more intangible aspects such as level of participation, empowerment and agency. The Basic Needs approach did propose the need for a more participatory type of development and incorporated the notion of basic human rights as a way towards the attainment of basic needs. Although the Basic Needs approach was lauded as a positive step in the right direction, it was still embedded within a paradigm that neglected to address the issue of gender inequity, or unpack the dimensions of power and oppression within the social structures of society, which included families, communities, institutions and so forth. This approach provided the foreground for the capabilities approach espoused by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, which did address gender inequalities and did so in a more profound way. Although the capabilities approach comes across as more promising for the way its focus is on qualitative aspects of people's lives, and highlights the need for people to exercise their agency, it is still embedded within a western liberal ideology, therefore is constrained in the extent it could transform social structures.

What became clear during the decade of the 90s was the need to consider the situation of women in the context of development from a pluralist perspective. Feminists from so-called developing countries criticized Western feminist critiques for the way they homogenized the problem of women, but also assumed certain positions and ideas which in fact were not in accordance with the viewpoints of other feminists from around the globe. Chandra Mohanty in her influential piece, *Under Western Eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse*, argues that much of the literature written on women in development

during this time, particularly by western feminists erroneously assumes women as a homogenous category. That is, that women in Kenya, Mali, India, Bolivia or Vietnam all share the same beliefs; suffer the same oppressions, etc. The analysis is redolent of a form of cultural reductionism (1991).

One of her main criticisms is the way many feminists made universal claims about the reproductive lives, the subordination, concepts such as marriage, family and others which ignored specific historical and local cultural contexts. For Mohanty, "the crux of the problem lies in that initial assumption of women as a homogenous group or category ("the oppressed"), a familiar assumption in Western radical and liberal feminisms" (1991, 351). In a second article written in 2002 revisiting her first piece, Mohanty emphasizes the need for a feminist pluralism. She says, "And this is why a feminism without and beyond borders is necessary to address the injustices of global capitalism" (2002, 514).

The evolution of WID proceeded to Women and Development (WAD) and then, Gender and Development (GAD). WAD is seen as a contestation to the claim of exclusion of women in the WID approach. The need to move to a WAD approach signifies the limitations of a WID approach. It tends to preclude an analysis which encompasses the social realities of women within a structural context. The evolution of the notion of gender and development has come about from a realization that the problem of gender equity cannot be analyzed within a context that only includes women. To be able to address and understand gender inequities, it is necessary to understand the social, political and cultural implications of the global capitalist framework.

While WAD is recognized for underscoring the inequitable gender relations inherent to global capitalism, it also claims cognizance about the way the dynamics of globalist forces is also hostile to men in poorer countries. The progression to GAD comes about from a critique of the WAD approach based on the non-recognition of class division and other dimensions of gender relations. However, according to Shirin Rai, "the GAD framework has not been able to influence development planning" (2006, 32). So, while the evolution of a gender focus in development has resulted in a much broader and in-depth recognition of class and other social categories this has not proved sufficient to make a substantial

reduction in the undeserved suffering of girls and women around the globe. And this is where I encourage a strong ethical approach and epistemic justice which I discuss in further chapters arguing that these are essential for addressing these problems.

More critical observations

Working for an INGO in Bolivia, gender mainstreaming was an important focus of our work. But of course, the gender ideology we were working from was based on our own – a Western one. Although we were well aware of cultural differences, our plans and strategies were very much entrenched within a western feminist discourse. "The figure of the poor woman in the South is well suited to a victimology narrative that rationalizes the planned management and liberation of women in the South by Westernized professionals in the development apparatus" (Saunders, 2002, 14).We were working within a framework that has been described as "developmentalist feminism" by Frederique Apffel- Menglin and Loyda Sanchez (2002). According to these two authors developmentalist feminism is an institutionalized form of feminism that is anthropocentric in nature, it only focuses on the human and does not consider the inter-relationality and inter-dependence of the non-human world. It is also individualistic and thus characterized as Eurocentric and neo-colonial. This feminist ideology is quite distinct to the cosmovision of the Andean world.[11] As I have mentioned elsewhere, as development practitioners we get so caught up in the activism that little (or no) time is spent on reflecting on some of these very important issues. What is probably of more concern is that as workers within development organizations we did not discuss or analyze these inconsistencies, nor challenge them – or at least adequately or sufficiently to generate a critical discourse.

Development beyond 2015

As we near the target of the Millennium Development Goals, there is currently much discussion about the post-2015 development agenda. A number of networks and coalitions among the organizations

[11] I delve further into the idiosyncratic nature of the Andean cosmovision in Chapter 3.

which frame development have been formed to offer a space to ponder this idea. However, I would add that this is taking place in the absence of a rigorous critique and understanding of the situation of development today. The Post-2015 Development Agenda as set up by the United Nations has carried out an impressive consultative process whereby 5000 civil society organizations in 120 countries in every region; 250 companies in 30 countries, thematic, regional and country consultations all over the world and survey results from over half a million individuals on priorities for the future constituted this process. (High Level Panel Report, 2014). The High Level Panel of Eminent Persons based on these consultations claim as their primary goal the following, "Our vision and our responsibility are to end extreme poverty in all its forms in the context of sustainable development and to have in place the building blocks of sustained prosperity for all" (High Level Panel Report). The Post-2015 Development Agenda is no different to the Millennium Development Goals Declaration which is no different to the Health for All by the 2000 Declaration and many other Declarations made by the UN and other multilateral agencies.

Beyond 2015 is another coalition comprising of more than 1000 civil society groups from all over the globe. These organizations range from International and National NGOs, community based organizations, academics and trade unions (High Level Panel Report). The aim of this campaign is, "pushing for a strong and legitimate successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals" (High Level Panel Report). I can't help but cringe at this; it's as if we have learnt nothing over the last sixty years. Rather than think that development needs to be dismantled the same system is being perpetuated. In the next three chapters my analysis will contribute to this sorely needed debate in an attempt to make visible some hidden biases and assumptions. At the core of the post-2015 debate is sustainable development, another reason for cringing. Sustainable development has been a buzzword since the Brundtland Commission in the 1980s. The term sustainable is as contentious as the term development.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented one (my own) interpretation of global development primarily based on my experience in the practice. Global development is grounded in the practice so the theory of global development necessarily needs to be grounded in the practice and not the other way around. The practice of development is by no means straightforward - it is very complex. This complexity also demands a complex solution.

Chapter Two

Neglected diseases as a consequence of the failings of development

In this second chapter I offer an in-depth analysis of neglected tropical diseases (NTD) within a socio-cultural and political context. I use the example of neglected tropical diseases to argue how the notion of neglected diseases, beginning from its definition, reflects the failings of development. Too often the problem of neglected diseases is considered to be primarily a health problem or one limited to the pharmaceutical companies. In my analysis the problem of neglected diseases is conceived of as a problem and failing of development entrenched in social, political, economic and cultural conditions. Chagas disease is highly prevalent and endemic in South America; I focus on it because of my direct experience with the existence of the disease. However my analysis and discussion will be applicable to other NTD such as visceral leishmianisis and sleeping sickness found in different parts of the world. I begin by defining the term neglected tropical diseases, but also describe the actual situation of NTD. I then provide an analysis of the socio-cultural and political implications of NTD. From there I discuss NTD within the development paradigm. I then identify ethical considerations of NTD, arguing that the persistence and level of incidence of these NTD is indicative of a moral failing on the part of multilateral institutions, bilateral governments and others working in global development and health. It is also indicative of weak governance and poor political will on part of the national governments. Finally I introduce the notion of epistemic domination to diseases and how knowledge is validated and entrenched within relationships of dominance and power.

The situation of neglected diseases

The World Health Organization defines neglected tropical diseases as the following, "Despite their medical diversity, neglected tropical diseases form a group characterized by their association with poverty and their proliferation in tropical environments where multiple infections in a single individual are common" (2013,1). This group comprises 17 diseases that blight the lives of more than a billion people

worldwide. Peter Hotez, a well-recognized global health clinician and investigator of NTD says that many of the neglected diseases have been around for thousands of years. These are ancient illnesses. Their existence can be traced back to early writings in the Bible, Talmud, Vedas and writings of Hippocrates, and medical papyri found in Egypt (Hotez, 2008). According to the Saving lives and Creating Impact: EU investment in poverty-related neglected diseases report, "Each year Poverty Related Neglected Diseases cause 13.7 million deaths and the loss of 377 million years of health and productive life worldwide" (2012, 9). NTD are found mainly among the poorest populations of the world. The countries in which most of these neglected diseases are endemic are the poorest, and the regions within these countries where the diseases are endemic are predominantly the most inaccessible.

The term neglected tropical diseases was coined due to the fact that despite the long duree and existence of these infectious tropical diseases very little financial support and investment has been available for the diagnosis, and treatment of these as well as research and development. Hotez talks about eight common features of NTD. These are: their high prevalence; the link between NTD and rural poverty; they are chronic conditions; they cause disability and disfigurement; have a high disease burden but low mortality; are stigmatizing and have poverty-promoting features. The causes of these 17 NTD include a series of different pathogens. Viruses cause dengue and rabies; bacteria causes Buruli ulcer, leprosy, trachoma and yaws; protozoa cause Chagas disease, human African trypanosomiasis and leishmaniasis, and helminthes cause cysticercosis, dracunaliasis, schistomiasis and others. I limit my discussion to the NTD caused by protozoa, namely Chagas disease, human African trypanosomiasis and leishmaniasis the three diseases that Medecins Sans Frontier (MSF) classifies as the Tri-Tryps. These Tri-Tryps are also considered to be the most neglected of the NTD.[12]

For people who live on less than $2/day, the Try-Tryps of kinetoplastoids are the most common infections affecting many thousands of people on four continents. Human African trypanosomiasis or sleeping sickness and visceral leishmaniasis (VL), if not detected, are both fatal, and Chagas Disease leads

[12] Although I limit my discussion to only one group of NTD, I would like to think that my analysis would also be applicable to other NTD.

to complications which are fatal if left undetected and untreated. Even though these particular NTD affect millions of people and kill many thousands, the attention from pharmaceutical companies or even policy makers is disproportionate to the health impact and burden they cause at a global level. Sleeping sickness is found in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Central African Republic and South Sudan – countries that are also experiencing political instability. Sleeping sickness has been reemerging due to political conflict and the displacement of peoples. Visceral leishmianisis can be found in parts of India, it is mainly concentrated in the state of Bihar, one of the poorest in the country and East Africa where the incidence is the highest among the displaced and migrant populations found in Ethiopia and South Sudan. It is endemic in 76 countries. In Latin America, Chagas disease places its highest burden in countries such as Bolivia and Paraguay.

Over the last 25 years MSF has been the vanguard organization in bringing to light the urgent need to address NTD and in particular the Tri-Tryps. The Gates Foundation and some governments have recently agreed to provide funding for the treatment and control of NTD in general, however much more is needed for any positive effect, particularly in the case of Tri-Trpys which is not included in the above funding programs. Sleeping sickness, VL and Chagas have been classified as a sub-category of NTD labeled "tool deficient" due to their limited and antiquated diagnostic procedures and treatments but also for the need of especially trained health workers and good logistical support. Diagnostic tools and drugs are urgently needed to address these particular NTD. Many of the available tools are very limited, outdated and potentially life-threatening, such as the lumbar puncture which is currently the only accurate diagnostic tool available for sleeping sickness. A study carried out by MSF showed that between 1975 and 2004, 1,556 new drugs were developed. Of these only 18 were for tropical diseases, mostly malaria. Funding in research and development (R&D) for the Tri-Tryps saw a decrease of nearly 10% in 2010, most of this coming from philanthropic and public donors. According to MSF, "In the same year, the pharmaceutical industry reported a total investment of less than US$12 million for the three diseases. As a comparison, the reported R&D spending of Novartis, the Swiss giant pharmaceutical company exceeds US$8 billion" (2012, 22).

Visceral leishmaniasis

VL acts very differently in the regions where it is endemic. In East Africa, VL arises in epidemic form amid the displacement of mass populations, but also in the presence of a very weak health infrastructure at a national level. South Sudan is currently experiencing an epidemic predominantly due to the unstable political situation which has caused conflict but also serious health problems such as malnutrition. Fragile states and fragile bodies result in surprisingly high mortality rates due to VL. People with HIV/AIDS are more susceptible to developing VL, and although in most endemic areas the co-existence of people infected with HIV/AIDs and VL is low, in Ethiopia from 20-41% of patients with VL are also infected with HIV/AIDs. This group of patients is mainly comprised of male migrant workers from other parts of Ethiopia who have come to work on farms. Not surprisingly, treating VL in HIV positive people is much more difficult. Further research on high-dose combination treatments is urgently needed for the high mortality rates from existing treatments. (MSF, 2012, 34).

VL in South Asia presents itself in a milder form but with a higher sensitivity to drugs than in East Africa. An ambitious plan to eliminate the disease by 2015 has been in place since 2005. This was put together by the governments of these countries (Bangladesh, India and Nepal) with the support of the World Health Organization. To be able to achieve this goal requires an improved diagnostic tool and enhanced drugs which are highly effective and safe. Current medications have included one that is recognized as having toxic effects and is contra-indicated in the case of pregnant women and to be used with caution in women of child-bearing age. It needs to be taken simultaneously with contraceptive therapy or methods; otherwise it is deemed unusable for this group of women. One of the problems of current medication is the level of adherence, since it requires medication on a daily basis for at least a month, some via painful intramuscular or intravenous injections. The elimination of this disease also requires strict vector control and the political will to actively do something about it.

Chagas disease

It is estimated that there are 8 to 10 million people infected with Chagas disease in Latin America. Fifty thousand people die from this illness in Latin America every year. Chagas disease is a fatal disease caused by the bite of a beetle. An article in The New York Times written in May 2012 based on an editorial from a medical journal declares Chagas, 'The New Aids of the Americas.' The authors "argue that the dangerous spread of Chagas through this hemisphere somewhat resembles the early spread of H.I.V." (2012). A disease which has been around for centuries is here compared to HIV/AIDS. The disease has an insidious onset which often means that people do not realize Chagas as the cause of death but rather think it due to a heart attack or other cause. According to Gurtler et al, "Ten to 14 million people are infected by *Trypanosoma cruzi* and 40-120 million people are at risk of infection" (2007, 16194). Bolivia has the highest incidence of infection in the region, the majority of who live in poverty-stricken areas. In the rural areas of Bolivia and Paraguay access to health care which provides diagnostic support and treatment is minimal. MSF has been pivotal in garnering more attention from the national governments and international agencies such as the WHO to invest in improved patient access. In Bolivia, Chagas disease mostly affects poor, illiterate *campesinos* or indigenous peasants who often live in precarious, overcrowded housing and rely on subsistence farming for their existence. These people have not only been marginalized by global institutions but, of more concern, by their own governments. They live without electricity or running water. The topography of Bolivia with huge areas of mountainous land does not have easy access, especially by road.

Chagas has also been referred to as the ´forgotten disease´ or the ´silent killer´; since very little research is carried out to find a cure or a vaccine, and it is often absent from the development agendas of many bilateral and international agencies. It is also known as the "silent killer" since the disease can be asymptomatic for years. Many people will not realize or even think they have Chagas until they are

afflicted with the complications which often lead to death.[13] In a document which describes the high incidence of Chagas MSF say, "In the developed western world, these figures would have long ago motivated pharmaceutical companies to develop a cure – or at least an effective treatment or vaccine. But Chagas is also known as a ´disease of the poor´ and this is the reason why, for 30 years now, there has only been one treatment, already obsolete: and still the side effects, resistance or incompatibilities are not yet known" (2005). For the pharmaceutical companies, developing drugs for NTD provides no market incentive since the diseases primarily affects poor people in poor countries. It is more profitable for them to focus on products for diseases such as cancer, diabetes, or even depression in dogs.

The year 2009 marked the centenary of this disease discovered by a Brazilian doctor, Carlos Chagas. A century later, this silent disease is still rampant, emerging in non-typical areas and re-emerging in endemic areas previously controlled due to the lack of adequate treatment and access for its sufferers (MSF, 2009). Chagas disease reflects the social disparities in Bolivia since it really only affects poorer sectors of the society, often those living in rural areas. The *vinchucas*[14] live in the cracks of mud brick homes – primarily, dwellings of the poor. As parasites they will also be found on animals such as guinea-pigs and chickens, which are often not kept in separate enclosures on the farms of campesinos, rather these animals are left to ramble through the backyard and often inside the homes. This close proximity is also a contributing factor.

There have only ever been two drugs to combat the disease: benznidazole and nifurtimax. According to MSF, "both were developed 35 years ago and in investigations not specifically aimed at Chagas Disease" (2009, 2). A World Health Organization (WHO) resolution for the elimination of Chagas by the year 2010 was obviously unachievable. Instead, the disease has proliferated in some areas and is disseminating into regions such as Europe and the United States due to the increasing rates in the mobility of people (2008). The resolution called for the "availability of diagnostic and treatment for

[13] It is not uncommon to hear about young males in their 20s dropping dead on the football pitch.
[14] A *vinchuca* is a beetle and the carrier of the disease.

Chagas diseases patients in primary health care settings in all endemic countries" (WHO, 2008). Current research is taking place to work out more efficient and less expensive diagnostic tools. The recent impetus for funding and interest in NTD has allowed for research in this field to actually happen.

The drug, Benznidazole, had been under the monopoly of Roche pharmaceuticals, however in 2003 the pharmaceutical company transferred the necessary technology to produce the drug to a public laboratory LAFEPE in Brazil mandated by the Ministry of Health. LAFEPE became once again a sole producer of this medicine. MSF says that due to an increasing awareness of Chagas in 2006 has also increased the numbers of people being diagnosed with Chagas and subsequently their treatment creating a higher demand for benznidazole. LAFEPE created a global shortage of the drug due to the inability and ultimately the mismanagement of the laboratory to keep up with the demand. In 2011, an Argentinian private pharmaceutical company began to produce benznidazole. They stated that their production was limited for use within Argentina however that in the future they would consider selling it to other countries. So not only is there a need for research to develop new drugs for Chagas but there is also a need to guarantee that current drugs are continuously available at accessible prices for patients.

Socio-cultural and political implications of neglected diseases

Limiting the problem to pharmaceutical companies emphasizes how it could also limit the solution. There is an assumption that by investing more money in research or the production of drugs, that this alone will reduce the global burden of disease. The NTD discussed here show that this is not enough, in fact there are other issues lurking here which need to be addressed. In much of the literature on NTD there is reference to the fact that neglected diseases primarily affect poor people in poor countries. However the analysis goes no further, particularly when it comes to discussion about the treatment and prevention. Much emphasis is given to the need for more investment on the part of pharmaceutical companies and global institutions which I do not deny is important, but should not some consideration be given to the fact that the NTD are also poverty related diseases. To be able to address NTD effectively we must also address poverty? To understand the persistence of NTD requires a deeper

analysis of the existence of poverty. The 'neglect' in the term NTD goes beyond the disease process. We need to begin to talk about neglected people.

Neglected diseases are rarely found in the working populations and their families living in the cities of these poor countries. They are not found in government ministers and politicians or other professionals for that matter. It is very easy to ignore the realities of others if the latter are neither visible nor heard. Poverty is a very complex condition which also requires a complex solution. To be able to address poverty some thought and analysis needs to take place to understand the causal reasons for poverty. This leads one to consider both internal and external factors. Internal factors which contribute to poverty include weak governance, oligarchic rule, corruption, civil war, political conflict and the absence of a welfare state. External factors such as trade agreements, colonial legacies, the global economic order which favors richer countries, and structural adjustment programs imposed by the IMF are all influential in perpetuating the poverty trap that poorer countries are in. To address both internal and external factors is a long, difficult process which necessarily requires political will but also structural transformation of current global policies.

For Thomas Pogge, poverty is a human rights violation of the global poor. The extent of global poverty is such that the global institutional order cannot protect the most poor or alleviate some of their poverty. Pogge's human rights approach is based on negative duties. He makes this even more specific by basing his argument entirely on institutional negative duties, which are correlative to human rights. He says, "I contend that most of the vast human-rights deficits regularly persisting in today's world can be traced back to institutional factors – to the national institutional arrangements in many so-called less developed countries, for which their political and economic elites bear primary responsibility, as well as to present global institutional arrangements, for which the governments and citizens of the affluent countries bear primary responsibility"(2010, 30). Thomas Pogge is helpful in the way he challenges those who claim that the problem of global poverty is no worse today.

According to Thomas Pogge, the fact that the level of global poverty is so high – that the basic human rights of so many people are not fulfilled -- calls for an urgent moral response. He attributes the causes and extent of global poverty to the global institutional order. The problem is structural but avoidable. He argues that to engage in an accurate description and explanation of social phenomena requires an institutional moral analysis. Inquiries of this type allow one to explore counterfactual statements that could be made about the operations of institutions. In this context Pogge argues that the global institutional order, together with the national institutional order is in need of reform. He highlights three facts which make the extent and perpetuation of global poverty a moral problem. First, he talks about the degree of global affluence and the disparities this produces. He says, "In 2000 the bottom half of the world's adults together owned 1.1 percent of global wealth, with the bottom 10 percent having only 0.03 percent, while the top 10 percent had 85.1 percent and the top 1 percent had 39.9 percent"(2010, 13). Second, in the presence of global affluence, global inequality is increasing since the global poor have a less proportionate participation - although exist in higher numbers - in economic growth on a global scale. Third, increasing global inequality and the persistence of extreme poverty is greatly influenced by the interactions of governments and institutions at a global level. Those who are involved in devising and determining the treaties, agreements and conventions which shape these interactions are morally implicated. Therefore, if global poverty can be attributed to the global institutional order, broadly speaking then one can conclude that the persistence of NTD which exist in the presence of poverty are also attributable to the global institutional order. This does not mean that individual nations do not have a role here, but that the problem of NTD is not confined to one nation nor is it purely attributable to a weak state.

Another way of looking at poverty is as a form of structural violence. Structural violence can be defined as a type of violence which is indirect since it differs from physical and psychological forms of violence in that it is not visible and often it is difficult to attribute its effects to violence; it is embedded within the social structure of our society. It reflects how violence engrained in the social structure of our institutions is tantamount to the violation of social and economic rights of the poor. Paul Farmer,

physician and anthropologist who has worked in Haiti for many years, argues for the need to reveal how the social and economic rights of the poor, expressed as the right to a decent quality of life – or the basic right to life -- are being violated(2005). The fulfillment of these rights requires that people have access to running water, food security, adequate housing, etc. When talking about social or poverty related diseases such as cholera, tuberculosis and NTD, the fulfillment of these rights cannot be ignored for their direct and causal relation to health or in this case disease. For Farmer, failure to provide these rights to any population is due in large part to structural violence. In this context Farmer's work on structural violence is very applicable to the understanding of neglected diseases in general. He says, "Human rights violations are, rather, symptoms of deeper pathologies of power and linked intimately to the social conditions that so often determine who will suffer abuse and who will be shielded from harm"(2005, 7).

Johan Galtung introduced the term structural violence to describe a form of violence which is chronic, a form of violence redolent of oppressive global political economical frameworks. It breeds social inequalities, disparities and desperation (Farmer, 2005). The effects of structural violence can be interpreted in the high levels of infant mortality and morbidity evident in some countries, high levels of malnutrition, and of course people who have suffered and died as a result of NTD. Paul Farmer offers three reasons for why structural violence is often ignored. The first one is that we are more often moved by what happens to people around us rather than those who have been distanced for any reason: geography, race, culture, gender and others. Secondly, the sheer burden of suffering in the face of seemingly helplessness renders the ability to do anything more difficult. And thirdly, "the dynamics and distribution of suffering are still poorly understood" (Farmer, 2004, 286). The understanding that NTD persist as a result of global social political forces is not only difficult to explain, but also difficult to swallow. This only emphasizes the need to extend the analysis of NTD to incorporate their breadth and depth within this context.

Thinking about poverty as a form of structural violence can be likened to Iris Marion Young's work on justice. She analyses the significance of structural factors in the perpetuation of poverty and

other injustices. According to Young, despite distributive issues being essential to conceptions of justice, she argues that we need to go beyond the distributive paradigm and consider other aspects often ignored in contemporary political philosophy, but which can result in the erroneous reduction of social justice to merely distribution. In Young's words, "Justice should refer not only to distribution but also to the institutional conditions necessary for the development and exercise of individual capacities and collective communication and cooperation. Under these concepts of justice, injustice refers primarily to two forms of disabling constraints, oppression and domination"(1990, 3). Young does stipulate that her discussion is situated in Western capitalist societies like the United States. I argue that in developing countries such as Bolivia the allocation of material resources is markedly unequal and inequitable, which is primarily attributable to more profound and often embedded traits such as oppression and domination. This can occur within the country between the highly indigenous population and mestizos, as well as between Bolivia and wealthier nations.

Young talks about the five faces of oppression: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. According to Young, "marginalization is perhaps the most dangerous form of oppression" where entire groups of people are excluded from any participation but are also subjected to desolate and deprived living conditions (1990,53). In Bolivia, poor indigenous communities some of which are endemic with Chagas have been marginalized by global institutions but of more concern by their own governments. Young's description of powerlessness considers, "those who lack authority or power, those over whom power is exercised without their exercising it"(1990,56). This notion of powerlessness is also very evident within the impoverished indigenous communities, particularly among women where decisions are made for them. The majority of these women did not complete primary education and are most likely to be illiterate. They have low self-esteem and lack self-confidence witnessed by their submissive stance in labor union meetings. This does not infer that they are neither strong nor resilient, but it does infer that they are powerless.

The *vinchucas* are prolific in the mud-brick homes of indigenous farmers because the walls or ceilings are not finished, so the *vinchucas* live happily within the cracks of these homes. One of the most effective and simple preventative measures for Chagas is improved housing. Finishing walls and ceilings is the best way to keep these bugs out. But many of the families cannot afford to do this. There are also cultural implications attached to NTD. In the case of Chagas many people could not relate the bite of a beetle to a death since the illness has an insidious onset, so years could pass by between being bitten and ultimately dying as a result of that bite. The disease is asymptomatic for many years and people usually die from complications many years later. Also, one must be aware of the idiosyncratic nature of different cultures in regard to conceptions of health and disease. One of the stories I was told about Chagas was that the number of *vinchucas* you had in your home was a good indicator of the level of fertility of your livestock. The greater the numbers of *vinchucas*, the more fertile were your animals. Putting cultural relativism aside, it is important to note that some understanding of the cultural knowledge that surrounds Chagas and other NTD is necessary to then consider the best way to address these issues. But if these are not even considered, then how can they be addressed?

World Trade Organization and other multilateral organizations

Another way the path has been thwarted for NTD has been the role of multilateral organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO). In 1994, the WTO initiated the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement. This establishes minimum standards for the regulation of the various forms of intellectual property such as copyrights, rights of singers, visual and sound producers, patents and so forth. The Agreement also details enforcement procedures, remedies and conflict resolution processes. The topic of essential medicines has been the most controversial part of this agreement since it has the potential to deny access to millions of people to basic medicines. In 2001, due to a recognized need to reform trade policies, the WTO launched the Doha Round with the intention to address economic and social exclusion through existing agreements.(CRS Report for Congress, 2006).

A briefing paper by Oxfam entitled "Empty Promises" asks the question, "Why eight years have passed without any agreement in sight?"(Oxfam International, 2009, 2). It seems that continued negotiations have once again only favored developed nations and frustrated developing nations. TRIPS and public health were included in the Declaration and it was hopeful that concerns for public health would be addressed through the protection of intellectual property. However, it appears that although it has permitted the import of cheaper generic drugs in some areas, overall the results are dismal. Pharmaceutical companies express disinterest when it comes to research and development for neglected diseases. There are no profitable gains in monetary terms to provide drugs for the poor. Pharmaceutical companies which are profit-driven will not invest money into projects which will in the long run cost more than the potential of benefits gained. As Bakan says in his critique of corporations, "Developing drugs to deal with personality disorders in family pets seem to have a higher priority than controlling diseases that kill millions of human beings each year" (2004, 49). Pharmaceutical companies are key actors in a world economy buttressed by trade agreements and policies stipulated by the WTO in their favor which often leave governments of poorer countries in vulnerable and weaker positions. However, Oxfam also considers that we are now in an excellent position for real reform and not just empty promises because of the current global economic crisis.

Global Development Policies such as those issued from the World Bank and the IMF have driven development agendas and often form the basis for global strategic plans for many bilateral agencies. Global Development Policies are written within a context ruled by the global economic order. They often are written in favor of economic policies that help developed nations rather than those countries like Bolivia that struggle for economic autonomy and are usually caught in a 'poverty trap 'ruled by hegemonic powers and policies. In many of his discussions Thomas Pogge considers that the current global economic order will only further inequalities and perpetuate abysmal conditions amongst the poorest (2010). International Development Agencies and national NGOs feel compelled to devise their plans to comply with donors' strategies, tending to ignore any ethical issues such as social justice which would necessarily emphasize the priority to address the needs of the world's poor, as well as to analyze

the causes of poverty. A Director from a National Non-Government Organization (NGO) in Bolivia said the following, "We have to see what funding opportunities are available, rather than keep to our Strategic Plan and we are seeing this in a majority of NGOs" (Malavisi, 2010, 49).

According to Oxfam, "multilateralism is central to the global effort to overcome poverty and inequality" (2009, 2). However, multilateralism as it stands now is firmly entrenched within a global economic order not propitious for overcoming poverty and inequality which is in itself a rather tall order. Chagas disease and other NTD are concrete examples of the failings of a development paradigm in which multilateral institutions attempt to contribute to poverty reduction. Their policies, programs and ideology are obstacles in addressing the real needs of millions of people around the globe. This will be further discussed in the next section.

Neglected diseases within the current development paradigm

As I argued in the first chapter, because the concept of development is derived from ideal theory and thus aspires to what development should be, it tends to ignore the flagrant injustices and inequalities which exist, one of these being the gross neglect of a particular group of infectious tropical diseases and more importantly people. The sixth Millennium Development Goal is to Combat HIV/AIDs, malaria and other diseases. It is assumed that NTD belong to the group "other diseases." However what this also means that these other diseases have not received the adequate attention in funding or programs warranted. Peter J. Hotez says the following, " the flurry of global health advocacy and resource mobilization occurring over the past few years has largely bypassed the third, "other diseases," component of MDG 6" (2008, 3). The current development paradigm responds to the Millennium Declaration, or rather the Millennium Declaration drives the current development paradigm. Either way, the results are obvious: the gross neglect of a series of diseases and more importantly, people. In the first years of the 21st century large and generous amounts of funding were available for HIV/AIDS programs for all countries, Bolivia included. At that time in Bolivia, AIDS affected 0.10% of the population and Chagas,

was estimated to affect 50%of the population.[15] Many of the NGOs, both international and national began to work in HIV/AIDS prevention programs since it was a way of securing funding for their own existence. While I do not want to denigrate the importance of HIV/AIDs prevention programs, it is important to emphasize that the way development is structured forces its participants to enter blindly into situations without thinking critically or reflexively.

In regards to addressing the problem of Chagas disease there seems to be two levels of attention. One level is the prevention of the disease and the second level is the treatment of those infected with the disease. At both levels there are serious limitations. In regard to the first level, one of the main problems I saw with the dominant solutions is that they did not take into account the 'bigger picture', the social, political and cultural factors. The Department of Health addressed Chagas disease in the form of a band aid measure, rather than thinking about the problem from a more holistic perspective which could offer a more sustainable, long term solution. Their response was the annual fumigation of homes with an insecticide (which I'm sure was prohibited in the U.S.) to which, it turned out, the *vinchucas* were immune. Fumigation in a sense was useless. Even if it had worked, it was only a temporary measure since the *vinchucas* would return to live in the cracks in the walls and ceilings of the houses. Spaces between bricks and open ceilings are propitious locations for the *vinchucas*. There were some NGOs who were providing improved housing projects in some areas. This comprised finishing walls and ceilings, which was an excellent way to reduce the quantity of *vinchucas*, yet improving houses on its own was not enough.

At the second level of attention, that is treatment, there was no established screening procedure. Actual statistics about the number of people infected with Chagas disease did not exist. Most people in the rural communities did not know whether they had Chagas disease or not. This meant that women could easily transmit Chagas disease to their children during pregnancy. Medication was expensive and it needed to be taken for a certain length of time, so there were problems with non-compliance. MSF has

[15] No accurate figures were available since no data was collected.

done an excellent job over the years in improving diagnostic tools, screening populations and providing treatment and follow-up, but even this help is not enough.

Other limitations to consider are the lack of coordination between NGOs and the educational processes used in both government and non-government entities. NGOs will often talk about coordination, but in the practice it is not uncommon to find two or three organizations working on the same topic but not coordinating activities. I'm sure collaborative efforts have a greater effect and are more efficient. Many organizations also pride themselves on providing health education and training, this often consisted of purely 'information giving' which, I would argue, is not enough to change people's behavior and attitudes. This is especially the case if cultural factors exist, such as the symbolic notion of a *vinchuca* as fertility, and when many of these people live in abject poverty. The knowledge and expertise of those to whom the health education was aimed was often denigrated or not even considered. Educational processes demand a more participatory approach where people themselves come to the understanding of their situation and plight. This type of teaching is based on Paolo Freire's work, which is quite prominent throughout Latin America but is not taken up everywhere.

Health campaigns were often futile, when they consisted of 'telling' people that Chagas disease was caused by a *vinchuca* and that they needed to get rid of them. People were treated as objects rather than subjects. A sense of agency did not pervade among these people; they were oppressed, marginalized and ignored. Fumigation campaigns only reinforced this type of approach. Telling them that they had to improve their housing was also futile if they couldn't afford it, and not least if they believed in the symbolism of *vinchucas*. It is a complex problem, so it requires a complex solution - but one that is not utopian. The prevention of Chagas disease requires a much more integrated approach than just research and development for the cure and treatment for Chagas, and other NTD for that matter. Addressing NTD demands an approach which addresses poverty.

Ethical considerations of neglected diseases

In much of the literature very little is written on the ethical aspects of NTD. The most important ethical issue is the gross neglect of millions of people around the globe predisposed to being infected with NTD, not to mention the millions who have already died and suffered with these diseases. As was mentioned earlier on, these are ancient diseases, they are not emerging ones. They have been around for thousands of years. In a way it seems incomprehensible that in 2013 when some are talking about space travel as a vacation others are wanting for a water tap in their homes.

The analysis of neglected diseases in this context raises some important philosophical questions in the context of development ethics. Why is it that so many organizations working in development, international and national, basically ignore large sectors of the population, thus not responding to the fulfillment of certain human rights? Why are some human lives valued over others? The answer to the first question is rather straightforward. Not many people want to sacrifice their own comforts and live in situations where one does not have access to electricity, running water, etc. The conditions are just too harsh for people to endure, which is understandable but does not justify why these groups of people should be ignored. If one were to pinpoint on a map of Bolivia where the NGOs (national and international) are working, it is not surprising to note that the majority are concentrated in the larger cities and surrounding semi-rural areas. Very few venture out to the most desolate and marginalized areas. This means that large pockets of the population, particularly those considered being in more disadvantageous positions, are left out of the development agenda of many NGOs. Organizations do not necessarily target populations with the most needs, rather they are selected for other reasons such as geographical regions or donor interests. In my experience, decisions about where we would work usually took place at the management level and not necessarily in the country of interest. Inter-organizational discussions never took place about geographical focus as a way to ensure that all populations were to some degree included in the strategic plans of at least one organization.

The second question is more difficult but has something to do with the silence of the oppressed, their invisibility, and their submissiveness: this does warrant further analysis. The analysis of neglect within NTD has to begin with the neglect of large proportions of the global population. Henry Shue talks about the "holocaust of neglect." He is referring to millions dying from starvation in Asia at the same time that Jews were being killed during the Holocaust. He says, " One of the unwritten chapters of 20th century history concerns what might be called the Holocaust of Neglect in Asia. While 6 million Jews were being executed in Europe, well over 6 million Asians were being allowed to starve in Asia. Why the Holocaust of Neglect was also allowed to happen (for example, the relative importance of the World War) and why these appalling tragedies have gone virtually unnoticed in the North Atlantic scholarly community, would make a fascinating but sobering tale, I think " (1980, 207). The same question should be asked about NTD: Why a holocaust of neglect has been allowed to happen and why these appalling tragedies and prolonged, undeserved suffering have gone virtually unnoticed in the global development (health included) community. As Shue, Sen and others have noted, a famine is a social disaster, not a natural disaster. NTD are also social disasters since they afflict so many people around the globe and receive very little attention.

Shue considers the right to subsistence as a basic right. And by subsistence Shue means, "to have available for consumption what is needed for a decent chance at a reasonably healthy and active life of more or less normal length"(1980, 23). For minimal subsistence one would need clean water, sufficient food, enough clothing, adequate shelter and a minimum level of preventative health care. For those with and predisposed to NTD, their subsistence as a basic right is being violated. For Shue, "when death and serious illness could be prevented by different social policies regarding the essentials of life, the protection of any human right involves avoidance of fatal or debilitating deficiencies in these essential commodities. And this means fulfilling subsistence rights as basic rights"(1980,25). The unfullfillment of the right to subsistence for millions of people around the world is an ethical issue since it contributes to the persistence of NTD in the face of global affluence and competent institutions. One cannot confine the analysis of NTD without taking into account the violation of basic rights; doing so is an injustice to these

people. There is an urgent need for a deeper understanding of the ethical issues surrounding NTD by policymakers and development professionals, particularly those working in health issues. It seems also that to better understand the problem of NTD requires consideration of epistemic issues, which are discussed in the next section.

An epistemic problem?

In considering the problem of neglected diseases it seems that an attempt to understand what is known, but also what is not known, is essential for an accurate analysis. From my own analysis, which also draws on my experience, I venture to argue that one of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice is grounded in the limitations of theoretical discussions of knowledge and how this knowledge is then applied in the practice. Development depends on knowledge. Understanding what development is relies on knowledge; decisions about development policies and programs are made based on a certain knowledge; often the knowledge of some can be deemed to have a higher epistemic authority and hence, credibility than the knowledge of others. Epistemic issues related to NTD and development in general will be further discussed in a later chapter. In this chapter I want to introduce the notion of knowledge as a problem, and particularly epistemic injustice.

Development ethicists are critical about the type of knowledge produced within global institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, often revered as the only source for expert knowledge on development. Their claim is premised on the notion that experts within these institutions regard their certainty of truth to be based on neo-liberal and capitalist foundations entrenched in patriarchal hegemonies. As Asuncion St. Clair says, "The World Bank is one of the dominant sources of knowledge for development and poverty reduction. Its research capacities, the leading influence that the Bank has in developing countries, and the support it draws from the United States and global financial actors, endow approaches and ideas endorsed by the Bank with a unique power and influence"(2007,145). The consequences of this are many: the production of knowledge is confined to the professionals of these institutions but also to their peers, other powerful and dominant

economists. The type of knowledge evident that is credited and legitimized by each one of them, however, is completely divorced from the reality of poorer people in less advantaged countries. As Ellerman correctly argues, "Academic economists and global development bureaucrats have little contact with local realities and thus they tend to be driven by such simplified cartoon models. Exiles who have not participated in the give and take of politics in a country for years if not decades also tend to have cartoon models. It is the combination of power and highly simplified models of complex and social realities that is particularly lethal"(St. Clair, 2007, 151). The type of knowledge required for development is consistent with what feminist epistemologists claim is knowledge; the scope of knowledge needs to be expanded to include not only propositional knowledge, *knowing that*, but also other forms of knowledge such as experiential knowledge and *know how*. It lies in the notion that just as theory cannot be separated from practice, knowledge cannot be separated from values. Intrinsic to knowledge in this context is experience – what one has lived, is living and so forth. How many global development policies are designed from the schema of propositional knowledge, "*S* knows that *p*," and how many times is this form of knowledge inappropriate and inaccurate?

The problem of neglected diseases is crucial in affirming that a critical standpoint, such as starting from the everyday lives of those most vulnerable, is essential to understanding how then to address the problem. *Knowing that* the *vinchuca* is the vehicle through which this disease is transmitted, or knowing *that* a certain drug is needed to cure it, is not enough. What is also essential here is to *know how* to extend the treatment of Chagas so that it not only addresses the microbiological features but considers Chagas as a poverty-related disease. Another salient feature is understanding what those populations most vulnerable to Chagas know about the disease, and what the cultural connotations are. Second, and probably more importantly, it exposes the dialectical relationship between the theory and practice, and the tension that this poses. The problem of neglected diseases highlights the need to carefully think through what the theory means in practice, particularly when it comes to knowledge.

In the context of neglected diseases, epistemic injustice happens when what the poor indigenous people say is not listened to or is not credited as knowledge by the dominant knowers, such as those working in the national health system, national NGOs and international NGOs. I think it is also worthwhile pointing out that epistemic injustice can occur at different levels: between those in authoritative positions such as doctors, nurses and community members; between those working in national NGOs and those working in international NGOs. Referring once again to the study I conducted in Bolivia, "In relation to the strengths and weaknesses of NNGOs[16] as perceived by the SNGOs,[17] these comments included, 'they come here without really knowing the context and we have to comply with their requirements'. One respondent said, 'a type of north–south confrontation takes place: those who control and those who depend; they give the funds but maintain their distance creating a power relation. This force generates an attitude of superiority and arrogance where decisions are made for SNGOs by NNGOs when it doesn't really correspond to them.' She went on to say that the development paradigms NNGOs advocate are from the north; 'we could have different conceptions of development but they do not even ask us' "(Malavisi, 2010, 49). I think these are examples of epistemic injustice.

According to Miranda Fricker, there are two forms of epistemic injustice. These are testimonial and hermeneutical.(2007). Testimonial injustice is when a speaker is given less credibility by the hearer. Hermeneutical injustice is a structural notion. It is defined as "the injustice of having some significant area of one's social experience obscured from collective understanding owing to a structural identity prejudice in the collective hermeneutical resource" (Fricker, 2007, 155). The social experience of those living in rural, marginalized communities of Bolivia is obscured from the collective understanding of governments, NGOs, agencies and others. According to McCollum, "Such obscured understanding and hindrance of expression results in a collective hermeneutical lacuna which undermines the ability of dominated agents to make claims and even to understand their own experiences as wrongful. This inability to understand the wrongs done to underprivileged groups is an essential aspect of

[16] Northern Non-government Organizations
[17] Southern Non-government Organizations

hermeneutical injustice" (2012, 191). He argues how institutions and organizations working in development, hence entrenched within a certain paradigm, are responsible for committing hermeneutical injustice and marginalization. He says, "Marginalized persons' lives are structured by this lack of understanding in a way that ultimately leaves some of their problems off the books entirely while advantaging social scientists and bureaucrats by creating simple and easily applied metrics." (2012, 196). NTD presents an excellent example of epistemic domination within development. But what this also does is expose a deep-seated problem which urgently needs to be addressed.

Conclusion

As I have discussed in this chapter, the analysis of NTD cannot be limited to the need for research and development. Although R & D is a necessary condition for the demise and (hopefully) elimination of NTD, it is not a sufficient one. To be able to address the grave situation of NTD in a way which will reduce the number of people already suffering from these diseases, but also those who have not yet succumbed to it but who are known to be in situation of risk, requires a more complex response. First, the analysis needs to consider the neglect of millions of people; therefore, it becomes an ethical issue. Second, since NTD can be demonstrated to be a consequence of a failing development paradigm, then a paradigm shift is urgently needed. Another dimension introduced in the analysis is an epistemic one; the importance of justice within knowledge production, knowledge sources, and knowledge credibility.

Chapter Three

The need for ethical development

In chapter one I brought to light some of the problems that occur within development, and in Chapter two, in greater detail I analyzed how neglected tropical diseases reflect a failing within the current development paradigm. What I hope to do in this chapter, with the help of a number of philosophers and others is emphasize the need for ethical development but also argue for a "strong" ethical approach in development. I propose a "strong" ethical approach since I believe that the current perception, understanding and practice of ethics in development are too weak a stance to have the sufficient impact needed to generate change.[18] Too many decisions are made and too many policies dominate an international development agenda that are guided by economic forces and national self-interests. Although development ethics has attempted to breakthrough this situation, it has not had the impact that is needed. I will consider how an ethical development approach based on the work of Denis Goulet, Thomas Pogge, Stephen Esquith, Jane Addams, Paul Farmer and others can contribute to addressing this problem. In this chapter I also analyze the theory and practice divide – a topic which has been discussed repeatedly over the years. However, I think it is still worthwhile and warrants some attention for the significance it holds in development. Having worked for many years in the practice of development, and now jumped the fence to theory, the disconnect between development ethicists and development practitioners has become evident. I explore this notion further.

It is worthwhile mentioning that the need for ethics primarily arises at two levels. First, at the level of institutions, where policy and program decision-making or what we can identify as the ethics of development; and second, at the level of everyday working practices of those working in development, whether it be in the offices of the World Bank in Washington, or in the fields of Bolivia, identified as ethics and development. Both levels warrant attention. This chapter is primarily aimed at those working

[18] Sandra Harding coined the term "strong objectivity" to explain the need for a more effective form of objectivity. I am using "strong" in the same sense when I say that a "strong ethical approach" is needed. A more effective form of development ethics is needed.

in the theory and practice of development. I argue that this group of people have a particular political responsibility for the nature of their work. Just as doctors assume and exercise a specific and special responsibility for the lives of others, so do development professionals. [19]

In an ideal situation, I would argue for the rejection of the concept of development as we know it today translated in the global policies and programs regurgitated from agencies such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the United Nations; the strategic plans of major international NGOs such as Care, Oxfam, Save the Children among others as well as the national NGOs all over the world. Development today is embedded within a global order that perpetuates injustices, disparities and misery for millions of people. But alas, rejecting the concept will not allow for a critical reflection and analysis of the actual situation as a way to understanding why these gross injustices and disparities persist. Therefore, I opt to be a critic within the realm of development theory and practice, so as to provoke and challenge certain ideas and assumptions to generate critical dialogue.

A cruel choice

For some, development is perceived as not the best choice to improve the lives of those in precarious situations. Denis Goulet, who can be considered one of, if not the pioneer of development ethics strongly contended the defective images of development which prevailed, and the erroneous view of the appropriate means and goals of development Development for Goulet was empty of an evaluative framework. He argued that development policies and programs espoused by the UN and other multilateral agencies demanded certain evaluative principles such as the reduction of suffering, a better life, enhancing freedoms, and others but in fact, the "supply" has been unable to fulfill these. In his seminal book, *The Cruel Choice*, written back in the 1970s, he says, ""development" needs to be redefined, demystified, and thrust into the arena of moral debate"(1977, xix). Forty years later and we can ask the

[19] By this, I do not intend that the level of responsibility is the same between a doctor and a development professional, but that some level of responsibility is deemed necessary if we take the concept of development to mean addressing injustices and inequalities among the global population which is directly related to the action taken in development.

same question. Goulet was both a social theorist and a practitioner. He worked alongside the poor in the favelas in Brazil, Algeria and Lebanon. And this comes through in his work, borne from this experience is a rich analysis of the importance of a practice-driven theory and an ethical approach which can be considered a form of critical reflexivity.

For Goulet, an abstract form of ethics which is purely theoretical and analytical would not do. The type of ethics which development ethics needs is both critical and practical. He describes it as "Genuine ethics … a kind of praxis which generates critical reflection on the value charge of one's social action" (1997, 1165). The theory and practice are inextricably linked. According to Goulet, "Development ethics is useless unless it can be translated into public action. By public action is meant action taken by public authority, as well as action taken by private agents by having important consequences for the life of the public community" (1973, 335). Development ethics is evaluative as it provides a critical analysis of development processes but also offers a critical awareness of value-laden judgments and prevailing power relations inherent in development. However, for Goulet, one of the main problems of development is the absence of an evaluative aspect which would spur a critical analysis and reflection of the process, but also how that process is travelled.

Goulet also discusses the existence of cultural paternalism among development scholars and practitioners which disables them to fully understand the context and more explicitly the suffering of others. Extreme poverty, squalor, endemic disease and undeserved suffering are not good things. For those living under these conditions feelings of helplessness and hopelessness prevail. Those who work for the betterment of these people cannot really understand the plight of these people merely by observation. As Goulet says, "Chronic poverty is a cruel kind of hell; and one cannot understand how cruel that hell is merely gazing upon poverty as an object" (1973, 24). Development professionals must be able to understand what Goulet calls, the shock of underdevelopment to really understand the lives of others. "They need to discover – by experiencing impotence and vulnerability – that what appears normal is abnormal, and that what appears aberrant is the lot of the common man. They must also learn that

weakness is not something others have and strength something they have. They must discover that developed and underdeveloped men alike are imbued with strength and weakness" (1973, 24).

If we consider development as an art rather than a science, this may help in considering how important decisions are in prescribing the practice. Development cannot rely on only scientific data and fact – that has proven a failure in many ways. That's not to say that no achievements have taken place which could be argued are scientific – such as increased infant and maternal mortality rates, disease prevention, improved agricultural systems and others. However, the principal obstacles for development are not based on scientific fact or evidence. They are attributable to a gross abandonment and ignorance of other factors such as: national interests, power and domination, skewed values, attitudes, among others. And since these occur at the structural level as much as the individual level it will be very difficult to budge or if you like transform these structures. However, if we do not at least bring them to the surface and make them visible, then we go nowhere.

David Crocker, a contemporary development ethicist agrees with Goulet in the importance of an ethical reflection which is constituted in the practice. However, he also argues for the consideration of abstract ethical principles. This for Crocker raises a metaethical issue: should development ethics "engage in reflection on general abstract ethical principles or rather should restrict itself to critical reflection on development goals and critique"(2008, 86). It seems that Crocker believes that both are necessary, He says, "Goulet is correct in affirming that one's abstract ethical principles are often revealed through the means one adopts to realize them. But from that point it does not follow that there is no independent role for such principles. Sometimes we are clearer about more abstract principles than we are about more concrete norms or practical judgments: consequently the former sometimes guide us when we decide on the latter. Abstract principles can enable us to perceive in a way and direct us to challenge accepted practices, especially those constraints that policymakers dogmatically view as given"(2008, 87). Although I agree with Crocker in the importance of abstract principles enabling us to challenge accepted practices and so forth, what I think is equally important is ensuring that this actually

happens within development and is not only confined to the academic realms of some philosophers. In my experience this did not happen, A dialectical tension between the theory and practice is necessary, but we must also take advantage of this tension and generate spaces among all actors implicated in development – this also includes those who the development programs and projects are aimed at.

Crocker is well aware that philosophers in general have not been very good at grounding their ethical principles in the programming and policy-making that goes on in development but also the everyday practices of development professionals. He says, "ethical reflection will come to grips with the "day-to –day" debates about international development only if applied philosophers as well as other ethicists do development ethics – however abstractly or concretely – in the context of the scientific and practical components of development theory-practice"(2008, 88). For an authentic type of development ethics, philosophers need to engage their abstract thoughts in the practice. In other words, it is not enough just to theorize about the ethical issues that arise as a result of, and within development. The idea is to consider these concrete ethical issues together with abstract theories. It is also the case that by relegating the sub-discipline of development ethics to only development professionals who are primarily social scientists, there is a risk that ethics in this context is not only succumbed to a lessened intellectual rigor, but also a diluted, reductionist view is given to it.[20] I will focus more on this issue further on in the chapter. Stephen Toulmin wrote how the field of bioethics in fact saved ethics by shifting the primary locus from the study to the bedside. His piece on the recovery of practical philosophy argues that in areas such as medicine and criminal justice, specialists such as psychiatrists, lawyers and judges, in addressing general philosophical problems usually do so incompetently. Hence, "there is important work for philosophers to do in conjunction with such specialists"(Toulmin, 1988,349). Hence, the importance of philosophers to actively engage in development ethics.

[20] I feel I have a certain authority to say this since I was a development professional for 16 years coming from a health/social science background. Pursuing a PhD in philosophy has only emphasized the value of philosophy in addressing such convoluted areas such as development.

In his work Crocker uses the example of food aid to show how reducing the problem of food aid to only the provision of food, without taking into consideration more complex issues such as hunger and poverty commits what Alfred Whitehead called "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness." He named this fallacy to show how science is infected by this fallacy for the way abstractions are treated as real in a concrete way. Crocker criticizes Singer for this, who has argued for many years about the moral obligations individuals have in helping those in more disadvantaged situations. Crocker says, "These thinkers paid scant attention to food aid policies of rich countries or development policies in poor countries. And they mostly neglected the efforts of poor countries to feed and develop their own people." (2008, 256). Having taken a critical look and understood the food aid policies of the 1970s, Singer would have discovered that these were problematic in a moral sense, and desperately needed reform. "Philosophers, policymakers, and citizens still abstract one part- food aid – from the whole complex of hunger, poverty, and bad development, and proceed to consider that part in isolation from other dimensions." (Crocker, 2008, 258). This was also my central argument in the previous chapter in my analysis of neglected tropical diseases. Abstracting NTD as one part without considering other dimensions such as poverty, power, and domination is morally reprehensible.

Structural injustice

Thomas Pogge, another prominent thinker who I introduced in the second chapter is very important in the analysis of the ethics of development, namely at the structural level. Inquiries of this type allow one to explore counterfactual statements that could be made about the operations of institutions. His analysis shows how serious problems such as that of neglected tropical diseases, is not confined to one nation and is not purely attributable to a weak state. In this context, Pogge argues that the global institutional order, together with the national institutional order is in need of reform. Pogge does limit responsibility and obligations to individuals and institutions in richer countries; I argue that we must extend this to individuals and institutions in poorer countries as well.

A principal claim that Pogge argues for in *Politics as Usual* is that those in rich countries have a strong moral obligation and political responsibility toward the global poor (2010). For Pogge, the fact that the level of global poverty is so high – that the basic human rights of so many people are not fulfilled calls for an urgent moral response. He attributes the causes and extent of global poverty to the global institutional order which requires both individual and collective responsibility. Peter Singer also argues that each of us has the moral obligation to do something about the problem of global poverty, but limits this 'something' to giving, giving at least 5% of one's salary (Singer, 2010). Although Pogge agrees with Singer about the moral obligation, he differs in respect to what that moral obligation entails, but also considers the problem to be more of a structural type. His argument is based on the notion that global poverty is avoidable. Pogge, like Crocker demands a more integrated and hence multi-dimensional approach to global poverty, which would allow for a better understanding of the complexity of the factors which are attributable to human misery at a global level.

It has only been during the last 40 years that some philosophers and other thinkers have realized that "world poverty has overtaken war as the greatest source of avoidable human misery. Many more people – some 360 million – have died from hunger and remediable diseases in peacetime in the 20 years since the end of the Cold War than perished from wars, civil wars, and government repression over the entire twentieth century"(Pogge, 2010, 11). In the context of a globally affluent world, this for Pogge signifies a moral failing on part of the citizens of rich countries. This is only supported by the evidence that inequalities at a global level continue to grow. Pogge draws on the work of Branko Milanovic a leading economist and researcher at the World Bank, who has found that despite increasing global per capita income, the real incomes of the poorest sectors of the global population have decreased. So, the current situation of global poverty is deplorable, despite the overall material and economic richness of our world.

Pogge uses the notion of human rights as the fundamental principle guiding his ethical theory. He particularly focuses on the human rights of the global poor since he claims that the "human rights

deficits persisting today are heavily concentrated among them"(Pogge, 2010, 28). Pogge differentiates between positive and negative duties which derive from the human rights discourse, however limits his argument to negative duties since he claims that this is where our obligations and responsibilities lie. Positive duties, those which provide and protect individuals pose a weak moral stance, whereas correlative negative duties which consist of doing no harm, that is, to not torture, to not cause grievous harm or injury and so forth, pose a much stronger moral stance. It is much easier for one to say they are fulfilling their positive duties, than accept that they are violators of their negative duties.

For Pogge, the persistence and perpetuation of severe poverty is attributable to institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization. He claims that the way these organizations have been designed sees them as systematic contributors. In saying this, it does not mean that Pogge does not consider individuals as also playing a part. As individuals, who are part of the system, we are also contributors to the persistence and perpetuation of severe poverty. It is within our capacity and abilities to challenge the way these institutions operate – whether we choose to do so or not is not the issue – the fact is that we are able to and that we should. As one student in my class said, "There will always be rich and poor people in the world." I think she is right, it seems that a necessary tension between dichotomous categories is evident, as there is between male and female; black and white; religious and secular, etc. But that is not the entire issue, what is, is the severity of poverty, in that some people live in sub-human conditions, deprived of many basic needs such as water, food and shelter. By severe poverty it is understood as not being able to satisfy your basic needs in order to survive. And when there is such affluence, over-consumption, unnecessary waste and the adequacy of natural resources to provide for all, then this is deplorable.

Globalization has increased the need for a deeper analysis of global institutional arrangements, which can be understood as the laws, agreements and practices which exist between countries. The emergence of free trade agreements between countries and regions is often purported and justified as a means to enhance economic growth of all participants in the agreement, which is often not the case in

the practice. Pogge considers how the global institutional order can be harmful in two ways, directly and indirectly. Individuals are indirectly affected by the way international privileges are accorded to corrupt leaders – often in charge of poor, but resource-rich countries which can result in the accumulation of wealth for certain people, while the majority of the population is excluded from the resource benefits. Trade rules and agreements directly affect individuals, since the markets of richer countries are protected by tariffs imposed on poorer countries, as well as receiving subsidies, and other protectionist mechanisms often absent in poorer countries. Furthermore, the powerful countries which make up the G8 are dominant players in how the global institutional order is designed and implemented. It is not surprising then to realize that the shape this has taken, predominantly favors the domestic interests of those particular countries, while placing insignificant attention to the interest and needs of poorer and more vulnerable governments and countries.

Richard Miller argues strongly for the unmet responsibilities developed countries like the U.S. have towards those in developing countries. He does not completely reject Pogge's claim that global poverty is primarily attributable to the global economic order but argues that the problem cannot be understood in terms of economic interdependencies only. Miller considers that the duties and obligations of those in developed countries go beyond commercial actions. He argues for a global justice which emphasizes the duties citizens of countries such as the U.S. have towards the extremely poor in distant countries. For Miller, our duties extend from the point of advantage. If laws and policies between countries allow those in poorer countries to be taken advantage of by those in richer countries and who also benefit from this advantage while maintaining the other's weakness, we are engaging in unmet responsibilities. He says, "People in developed countries take advantage of people in developing countries by deriving benefits from bargaining weakness due to their desperate neediness. To express appreciation of their equal worth and respect for their autonomy, people in developed countries must be willing to use the benefits to relieve the destitution that underlies the weakness" (2009, 160). The unmet transnational responsibilities which contribute to global poverty are inter-relational, interdependent and very political.

For Miller, the U.S. has steered development through its own foreign policies but also through those of institutions like the WB and IMF. He extends these unmet responsibilities to citizens as well (2010). Miller talks about a transnational bullying that takes place by strong countries such as the U.S. towards poorer countries through trade policies and agreements. But also by the way the "U.S. shapes the course of conduct of international institutions" (2009, 170). This course of conduct determines the lives of millions of people in poorer countries based on terms and conditions set by the U.S. and others.[21] While Pogge and Miller mainly concentrate their discussion on the role of governments and big institutions such as the WB, IMF and UN, I would like to bring the analysis down to the level of both international and national NGOs.

Structural injustice and development organizations

Many NGOs would like to think that they provide, a more distinct, egalitarian perspective than those of their governments however, the fact that they work within the same global economic order and actually receive funds from these more powerful bodies, then we can consider that these organizations also form a part of this failing system. The relationship between NGOs and their funders is just another link in the chain of power. By claiming their non-profit status NGOs are not exempt from thinking that they are not participants of a system which perpetuates structural injustice. They are, and it happens in two ways. First, by the strategic vision of the organization and second, by the funding agreements established through grants and other means. By strategic vision, I am thinking about the goals of the organization, their mission, vision and so forth. Some NGOs are funded through the AID program of the U.S. Government via surplus stocks of wheat. This can be considered complicitous to maintaining structural injustice for the repercussions this has on local markets of poorer countries.

[21] Richard Miller particularly stresses how the U.S. expresses an imperial power but does recognize that other countries from the so-called developed world such as the UK, Germany, France, Canada, Australia and others also play a significant role in this. I would like to emphasize the point that other rich countries are also implicated in a substantial way.

For international NGOs, although most have a certain liberty to decide on what and how they will work, usually this is heavily influenced by their principal donors. In the particular international NGO I worked in, the British Government was the principal funder and it was the British Government who more or less dictated the "areas" or "themes" we were to work on. Our strategic plan reflected the overall plan of the British Government. For national NGOs who primarily depended on governments or NGOs external to their own, this was only accentuated. For example in the case of HIV/AIDs many NGOs began to work on HIV/AIDS programs and projects because of the availability of funds from most donors if not all.

Something I think is worth mentioning, although I will not delve into it in a deep way (but needs to be) here, is accountability and how this is exercised. While working for the international NGO it was apparent that we were accountable to our donors. We demonstrated this via periodic reports, both financial and descriptive, narratives, etc. There was only evidence of an upward form of accountability. Never did we demonstrate levels of accountability with those we worked alongside with. I can't help but think that we should also be accountable to those to whom we are serving, l*a razon de ser* of our existence. The organizations with whom we partnered and the communities with whom we worked. This would help to generate some critical dialogue and would begin to challenge these relationships riddled with power and control. The same could be said for the national NGOs. They are obliged to demonstrate accountability to their donors only, but not to the communities they were working with.

Structural injustice can be further analyzed by considering how the rise of NGOs came about from the need to fill the gap that the state was unable to do. In the case of Bolivia, many NGOs are dedicated to providing primary health care services to people in marginalized communities because these people had no services. However, with widespread corruption, political agendas, inefficient state and local governments, NGOs come to wield a certain amount of power which also has negative effects. In an article about Malian NGOs and political responsibilities in a current, fragile political situation Stephen Esquith says the following, " The more marginal and ineffective the Malian state (including the military

and the educational system) becomes, the more necessary do these NGOs and their donors become. As a result, instead of putting themselves out of a job by empowering Malians to meet their own basic needs, many humanitarian as well as development NGOs entrench themselves in the Malian political economy and redirect the political loyalties of Malians away from their own government and toward the NGOs" (2013, 380). I think this situation is not confined only to Mali and would argue that it is a widespread problem.

Moral and political responsibility

According to Pogge there lies an untruth, which is quite pervasive among cultures and between countries, individuals or institutions: "that we are moral people, who care about our moral responsibilities"(2010,3). Often, this notion of moral beings is used to justify certain actions and decisions. However, as Pogge describes in his book through examples such as the abortion battle and global poverty; and the Rwandan case, this notion of morality is in fact very weak. This requires redress. Pogge particularly emphasizes the moral obligations of those in richer countries, since it is where the organizations which direct the global institutional order are based. I tend to agree with Pogge here, and is a principal reason for why I argue for a strong ethical approach to development.

It is very tempting and easy to exculpate ourselves from our obligations and responsibilities. Our interest in morality goes as far as it only serves our use. If what is required is a modification to our own behavior or even our governments, then this level of commitment is not often present. Also, there is an assumption among many of the following type, "what can I do, as one person?" or "it's the government's responsibility." Pogge in contrast will refute these claims. He argues that we have a moral obligation to do something whether that means to stand up and speak out; write a letter to a member of Congress, join an activist group, etc. As Pogge says, "And then we arrive at the absurd conclusion that a large majority of citizens are cleared of responsibility for their government's foreign policies because they were unable to affect these policies. This conclusion is absurd because it is obviously possible for a large majority of

citizens to affect, very fundamentally, both the foreign policies prosecuted by their government and also the way their country's political process is structured"(2010,7).

An objection to Pogge's argument is that the causes of poverty are domestic. Pogge does not reject the idea that domestic factors are important, but what he does reject is that domestic factors alone are the reasons why some countries are trapped in poverty. A vanguard in the theory of global justice, Pogge, argues how undergoing a moral analysis will distinguish between two ways of viewing the situation but also provide differing explanations. It is useful for attempting to understand the complexities of our globalized world. He describes these as interactional and institutional. An interactional moral analysis is concerned with looking at the actions and their effects on individuals, but also those of collective agents. If we consider a child who is malnourished and begin to analyze the situation by looking at the conduct of the mother/child and trying to see whether, if she would have acted differently would the situation have been the same. This form of inquiry also involves the use of counterfactual statements to decide what other actions could have resulted in a better outcome. Through this type of analysis it permits one to understand the different factors that could result in the malnourished child or the death of a woman from childbirth. The second type of analysis, an institutional one allows one to identify the structural causes which impede food security such as food aid policies, or employment opportunities for women – are there affirmative action policies in place?

Historical happenings such as colonialism, genocide and war which have left many countries caught in a poverty trap only highlight the way individual countries are only cogs within a bigger wheel. Pogge uses the analogy of teaching students in a class to show how 'local' factors, in this case the students, cannot completely describe their levels of performance. There are other 'global' factors such as the teacher's capacity to engage students, the type of language she uses, whether it is sexist or racist, etc., that can influence and ultimately impact on their level of learning. For Pogge, the entire phenomena of globalization has resulted in a very complex and complicated situation, but also reflects an inadequate response to such complexities and complications. He says, "It ignores the rising importance of

transnational actors other than states as well as the increasingly profound effects international rules, practices, and actors have on the domestic life of national societies"(2010,17).

Although Pogge's argument can be likened to Singer's who claims that those in richer countries have a strong obligation to give a percentage of their salary towards the global poor, upon further analysis enables one to see the differences between their arguments. Singer's argument is problematic. Not for the moral imperative it demands, but for limiting his focus on the obligations of an individual in the face of such a complex problem as global poverty.[22] Ignoring an analysis (which Singer does) that would include understanding the causes and complexities of global poverty, offers a very narrow and reductionist approach to global poverty. Singer justifies his argument by saying that he is not, "arguing against a governmental role in reducing global poverty" but rather only convincing each of us that we have an obligation to give money (2010, 28). I understand his focus is on the moral argument but there are other ways of fulfilling our moral obligations. I am more concerned with the fact that he limits our moral obligations to giving. Giving money alone, will not eradicate severe poverty for myriad reasons Pogge discusses in his analysis: international rules and practices; trade agreements; corrupt regimes; national self-interest; hegemonic and power dynamics and others. As Elizabeth Anderson says, structural problems require structural solutions (2012). Giving money is not a structural solution.

One weakness I see in Pogge's argument is limiting the notion of moral obligations and political responsibilities to people in richer countries. David Miller is also critical of this but for reasons which differ from mine (Miller, 2007). He claims that arguing the assigning of responsibility for global poverty to individuals of affluent countries is not plausible. He is cognizant that the extent of global poverty is complex, but cannot confer that responsibility to individuals; rather he talks about a national responsibility, that is, of the state. For my part, I think if we are really serious about reducing the extent of global poverty, then the notion of moral obligations and political responsibilities needs to extend to those who are most affected – the poor, but also those in more affluent positions in the poorer countries.

[22] I do not have a problem with the notion of giving money *per se*.

Focusing only on people in richer countries can be considered analogous to focusing only on women in a gender approach. This is an obvious failure. Another weakness in Pogge's argument lies in the need to be more explicit about what the moral obligations and political responsibilities of one may look like. He alludes to the need to get involved in political activism, to reflect and understand the situation. He questions the way morality is lightly esteemed to in everyday life and calls for a heightened awareness and practice of morality, but how do we actually do this?

For Pogge, "Being serious about morality requires that we reflect carefully about our moral priorities and support the cause that matters most" (2010,5). Being serious about morality also requires a certain level of understanding about the description and explanation of these moral priorities, which is why I argue that extending Pogge's argument to the people in the poorer countries as well, (this would include the rich within those countries, but also the poor) may be necessary to address the problem of global poverty. Pogge does consider that those living in affluent countries have a "special" responsibility since they participate and allow the global institutional order to persist, despite the injustices and violations of negative duties. Firstly, I'm not sure my neighbor who is more concerned with whether MSU won the football game or not would totally agree. And this is not to say he is not concerned with the problem of global poverty, but maybe he does not fully understand the problem, so is not fully aware that in fact, he is a participant in its persistence and perpetuation.

Secondly, I argue that those living in poorer countries also have a responsibility to challenge global institutions, but also their own national governments and resultant national policies. Pogge claims that people in rich countries are all participants (as opposed to non-participants) in the persistence and perpetuation of global poverty, because the institutions which drive the global economic order are here. But reiterating what I said above, my neighbor who happens to be African American and a single parent struggles on a daily basis to provide and protect his children. What sense of moral obligation and political responsibility he perceives can be debated. That he holds them is not easily disputed, but whether he thinks he has, is another issue. According to Amartya Sen, we have an individual

responsibility to do what we can to help those in more disadvantaged situations than our own. However, our sense of responsibility comes from our level of freedom, that is, "the ability to lead responsible lives" is "contingent on having certain basic freedoms. Responsibility requires freedom"(Sen, 1999, 284).

At this point, it is also worthwhile paying some attention to Pogge's idea of political responsibility. He uses the example of the abortion battle to demonstrate that if people feel a sense of responsibility towards abortion: whether pro-life or pro-choice then one should also feel a sense of responsibility to do something about global poverty. In the abortion battle, one is concerned with the intrinsic human value of existence, which can be violated. The same can be said for children and their subsequent deaths as a result of global poverty. In this particular discussion Pogge makes the distinction between participants and non-participants, and their subsequent responsibilities. He relates the following argument: we are participants insofar as laws in our state/country permit the deaths of those as a result of abortion since they are our compatriots. But we are not participants in the deaths of those which take place in a foreign country from such causes as severe poverty. Where Pogge values the significance of the distinction is particularly where individuals participate in institutions, therefore bear a heavier responsibility. If the institution commits grave injustices, and participants of those institutions do nothing about it, then they violate both their positive and negative duties. But he also argues that, "if our global institutional scheme is indeed unjust on account of its foreseeable distributional effects, then the developed countries and their more affluent citizens – being the most advantaged participants of this scheme – bear a special responsibility for this injustice"(2010, 128). Therefore Pogge considers people in affluent societies to be participants and not just 'uninvolved bystanders.'

There is an urgent need for those working within development agencies to recognize and understand their political responsibilities. Stephen Esquith, in his book, *The Political Responsibilities of Everyday Bystanders*, also talks about the political responsibilities of those who participate in institutions but takes the analysis somewhat further. In his words, "Sometimes institutional everyday bystanders and their members are based in poor countries. They live side by side with those who suffer, and it is not hard

for them to see how their lives are connected to the lives of these victims.....but are only dimly aware of how the lives they lead depend on this suffering and how their acquiescence to state and other institutions legitimates it"(2010,45). Those working in institutions, or individuals like my neighbor, the African American single parent may not be so aware of their rights and duties, nor the benefits they receive as a result of the injustices of others. How then do we cultivate this critical awareness? For someone like me who has worked in development for many years, this was something I was not aware of, nor I am sure were my colleagues.[23] Do those who work within development hold special responsibilities? Yes, I think they do, particularly since they benefit from the injustices of others. Let's face it; the jobs of many are reliant on the injustices of others. The responsibilities not only lies in the benefits one obtains, but if the actions one is involved in such as the projects and programs of the NGOs which directly and indirectly have harmful consequences, such as the displacement of peoples, the neglect of diseases, even the disrespect for their autonomy then this calls for a critical evaluation of the responsibilities of our actions..

Esquith suggests that certain types of reenactments can be useful for prompting individuals into thinking more critically about the whole notion of political responsibilities. Simulations of severe violence are presented as a way to fulfill this role, however Esquith considers that these are inadequate for encouraging a deep self-understanding or empathy. He claims that for everyday bystanders to understand their role as complicit in regard to global poverty will require a 'process of democratic political education"(2010,45). For Esquith this involves two stages. The first stage is the critical reenactment and the second stage is "another layer of interpretation." (2010,13). This second layer of reinterpretation is carried out by what Esquith has named citizen-teacher. A citizen-teacher is not limited to academics. Citizen-teachers can be activists, writers, journalists, members of clergy and others. According to Esquith a characteristic of a citizen-teacher is "they are capable of thinking about their own past and future critically and of teaching other bystanders to do the same" (2010,22). The challenge they have is to enable others who are not in oppressive situations to recognize how in the face of suffering and

[23] Stephen Esquith helped me come to this realization through his role as a citizen teacher.

oppression of others they have only benefitted. Esquith claims that philosophical theories may help one recognize one's sense of responsibility towards the suffering of others and even prompt action to do something about it. But, in his words, "As yet, this has not happened" (2010, 82). More discussion and analysis needs to take place in respect to "the obstacles to recognition" (2010, 82).

So, where particular development theories such as the capabilities approach can be useful, they do not provide us with any practical knowledge on the process required for democratic political education. How do we cultivate a critical awareness among those working in development organizations about their moral obligations and political responsibilities, which would also need to include overcoming obstacles that hinder their ability to recognize such obligations and responsibilities? I agree with Esquith that a 'process of democratic political education' needs to take place but would like to propose two further ideas. The first idea is this. The two-stage process Esquith talks about cannot only happen once, this needs to be continuous. I'm not so sure how successful a second layer of interpretation will be after only one time. To be successful this may require several critical reenactments together with their second layer of interpretation. This entire process needs to be ongoing. The second one is that although under and post graduate education is an optimal place for this process to take place, we must also consider those currently working in development organizations who may have been exposed to these ideas during their education but also may not have. I am also thinking about those who Esquith says, "are indifferent to collective benefits they enjoy" (2012, 384).This poses a different challenge. This requires the generation of spaces for critical dialogue and reflexivity within these development organizations among all stakeholders and is also where I think philosophers will be most helpful. These spaces must become permanent within the practice of these organizations. These spaces are where critical reenactments can take place and where another layer of interpretation can follow. But, they must be ongoing.

Many practitioners will object to this notion claiming that they do not have time for this. I am well aware of the time constraints development professionals work with together with ensuing deadlines

and so forth. However, if we are really serious and concerned about the consequences of our actions, which I claim we should be, then the time allocated for this activity is time well invested. For Esquith, "the most defining characteristic of a critical reenactment is its purpose: to raise difficult questions about the shared political responsibilities of bystanders who are neither perpetrators nor victims of severe violence, and to raise these questions in a voice that can motivate these bystanders to reconsider their institutional roles, not just their personal moral duties" (2010, 11). Many development practitioners will argue that their actions are not violent. Their actions may not be forms of direct violence, but if their actions result in the displacement of people, the perpetuation of poverty and hunger for some by way of unjust food aid policies then they are culpable of contributing to structural violence.

In his discussion about addressing global injustices Miller argues that there exist certain virtues such as transnational respect, autonomy, the promotion and value of self-reliance within the governments and peoples of poorer countries. He is also critical of the ongoing flow of aid for the inefficacy this has produced which he says needs to be interrupted. "The multiplicity of aid flows creates enduring problems of coordination, a notorious source of waste, missed opportunities and diversion of limited capacities of local bureaucracies" (2010, 228). To counteract this he says that those working towards addressing global injustices would benefit from "a shared understanding of global priorities in their task. The right understanding is quasi-cosmopolitanism" (2010,228). I think a shared understanding is crucial which needs to be extended to include a shared understanding of the epistemic injustices that occur.

Social ethics

I include Jane Addams here for the significance her work holds for understanding the importance of a social ethics, in contrast to an ethics confined to the individual. It begins with an awareness of the inter-dependency we have with each other in society, and the importance of mutual cooperation and responsibility within a notion of morality which by nature is social. According to Addams this social morality is only developed through the sentiments of feeling and one's activity. Other tenets of her

theory include reciprocity and sympathetic understanding, reciprocity being considered as sympathetic understanding in practice. Charlene Siegfried Haddock claims that Addams's notion of sympathetic understanding forms part of a pragmatist feminist interpretative framework which is based on the value of past experience. It combines moral perception and intellectual acumen which enables one to discover new ways to address the needs of others, with others, and fosters a consensus of all involved, however difficult and prolonged the process can take. Addams through her work expounded the unity of theory and practice, an essential feature of pragmatist thought. I can't help think that if Addams had been writing today, a hundred years later, she may not have necessarily used the term sympathetic but probably "empathetic." The word "sympathetic" has negative connotations, in that it could be seen as offering pity rather than "being with others" which is what I believe Addams is really getting at. It seems that what Addams is alluding to is more akin to empathy rather than sympathy. Addams is very cognizant of how interactions between those of very different and unequal social positions can be distorted by relations of power.

Addams could not emphasize enough the importance of trying to understand the experience of "others" to be able to then work with them. She claimed that, "The present lack of understanding of simple people and the dearth of the illumination which knowledge of them would give, can be traced not only in the social and political maladjustment of the immigrant in municipal centers but is felt in so-called "practical affairs" of national magnitude"(1907, 65). This, I will argue is what is needed in development practice, a greater understanding and acceptance of the experience of "others." Addams considers how fallible human understanding can be and advocates for the need to constantly reflect upon and even revise our own beliefs and values and their limitations – not to impose our own assumptions, values or even experiences and unequivocally assume they are the same. The depth of misunderstanding cannot be emphasized enough.

As a social ethicist and social activist, Addams claimed that to truly be able to understand the realities of others, one needed to walk and work alongside the poor. We work not for them, but with

them. In her writings Addams talks about the charity visitor – someone who has studied but who also goes into the homes with certain assumptions and ideas, which can be likened to a development professional today. It is only after a number of months of talking with those with whom she is working that she witnesses and becomes aware of other realities. Addams says, "She does not realize what a cruel advantage the person who distributes charity has, when she gives advice"(2002, 22). Moral failings for Addams "stem from excessive self-regard based on a feeling of exceptionalism that is extended to others similar to ourselves" (2002, xix). Addams is critical of charity efforts arguing that the dismal effort to alleviate the burdens of the poor can be attributed to the "unexamined ethnocentrism and classism" that pervades and distorts charity work (2002, xxvi). I would say the same happens today within the many institutions and organizations working in development.

Some may object to using Addams's work by claiming that things have changed so much since Addams's time that it is unlikely her ideas could still be applicable. Yes, much change has happened in 100 years and we have witnessed drastic technological changes. However, despite these changes, severe social problems such as poverty, hunger and inequality persist. If anything, her stance on social ethics in contrast to an ethic based in the individual may help to counter such problems. Furthermore, philosopher Graham Priest states that reading philosophers of the past can generate new ideas and fosters the doing of philosophy. He says, "Great philosophical writings have such depth and profundity that each generation can go back and read them with new eyes, see new things in them, apply them in different ways. So we study the history of philosophy that we may do philosophy (2014).

Others may object by saying that Addams' writings are not applicable to global development as we know it today. Her experience was limited to immigrants in Chicago but she travelled widely. The strengths of Addams' writings come from her experiences at Hull House, working with women from a different cultural perspective and worldview. Her account of Devil Baby resonated so much with my own experience with women in Bolivia and their cultural and spiritual beliefs. I argue that much of Addams' writing fills a void in the theory and practice literature of global development today.

Feminist thought

Following on from Addams who is also recognized as a feminist pragmatist, I consider feminist standpoint theory as an essential component of a strong ethical approach. In Chapter One I highlighted how gender approaches in development have not proved sufficient to address the gross levels of undeserved suffering of girls and women all over. Because of this, any new approach or proposal necessarily needs to be a feminist one. Standpoint theory is not only considered a theory but (one of its virtues) it also provides a methodology – how to go about bringing the theory into practice which is particularly useful in the context of development. The feminist standpoint theory argues for the need to "start off thought and research from women's experiences, lives and activities (or labor) and from the emerging collective feminist discourses" (Harding, 2004, 6).However, for standpoint theorists and their critics, this does raise some important questions. How do we account for differences among women? And men, for that matter. Does the focus on the lives and experiences of women forego the importance of epistemological concepts such as truth and objectivity?

If we consider what Nancy Hartsock calls the nature of a standpoint, this may help in understanding its importance. It is not simply just another position to take. It carries the potential to have liberatory force for oppressed groups. "A standpoint, however, carries with the contention that there are some perspectives on society from which, however well-intentioned one may be, the real relations of humans with each other and with the natural world are not visible" (Hartsock, 2004, 37). A feminist standpoint does not lessen the strength of objectivity rather as Sandra Harding argues, can actually "generate stronger standards for objectivity" (2004, 127). A feminist standpoint reveals certain truths about social relations and perverse ideologies which normally obscure the everyday lives and experiences of women. It is more than just another epistemology, "a standpoint is an achievement that requires political struggle as well as empirical inquiry" (Harding, 2004, 17). A strong ethical approach needs to depart from a feminist standpoint.

A new malaise

The final thinker I include here is Paul Farmer, whom I introduced in the second chapter. I include him because his work is helpful in thinking through a more robust account of what a strong ethical approach to development would demand. Farmer is generally disappointed and disillusioned with medical ethics, which although is different from development ethics, many of his criticisms can also be applied to the field of development ethics. Although it has been claimed by Crocker and others that the field of development ethics has had a certain impact, I think there is potential and a need to do a great deal more. Farmer discusses four reasons why bioethics has failed the poor. The first reason is that ethics deriving from the discipline of philosophy does not encourage ethical debates based on experience; it originates in the abstraction and so is not very useful. The second reason he notes is that the field of bioethics has been largely a phenomenon limited to industrialized countries. "This has facilitated the process of erasing the poor, since most of them live elsewhere" (2005, 204). It also influences the type of ethical dilemmas discussed. Global health inequities and inequalities, probably the most serious global ethical dilemmas are not prevalent on the agendas of medical ethics teams. A third reason, is that the field has been dominated by experts – giving little voice to those who are mostly affected. The last reason which Farmer claims is unavoidable, particularly in hospitals, is the focus on the individual.

In regard to development ethics, I would like to raise three parallel issues based on Farmer's analysis. I use his analysis to help in the construction of a strong development ethic. The first one, is the abstraction of ethics, as I have discussed earlier on in the chapter, particularly Goulet's work on this. The type of ethical approach crucial for development is one grounded in practice. The second one is that although we can talk about some development ethics taking place by thinkers in the south, it remains predominantly a phenomenon of the richer countries. The third issue is that it continues to be dominated by experts such as philosophers. Not only does this exclude the poor and unrepresented but it also excludes development practitioners. This does not happen intentionally, since I believe that most development ethicists would defend the claim that development ethics is an interdisciplinary field where

scholars and practitioners meet. But good intentions are not enough, and more work needs to be done to bring different fields and people together. This is just another feature of the dialectical tension between the theory and practice.

Farmer talks about the need for a broader vision of medical ethics - one that encompasses social and economic rights, as well as civil and political rights. He argues for the need to include global health equity as an essential component of medical ethics. Global equity should be an essential component of development ethics. And he believes this can happen through 'pragmatic solidarity'. Pragmatic solidarity for Farmer is, "linked to the broader goals of equality and justice for the poor" (2005, 227). And this can only happen by travelling on the same path with the poor. "Close allegiance with suffering communities reminds us that it is not possible to merely study human rights abuses. But part of pragmatic solidarity is bringing to light the real story" (2005, 229). This resonates very much with the thoughts of Jane Addams. I argue that two essential features of development ethics are striving towards global equity and pragmatic solidarity. What this means in the practice will be further discussed below. However, before doing so, I would like to offer some objections and bring in an alternative vision which derives from the people living in the poorer countries of the south.

An objection to this view could be that medical ethics is only meant to focus on the individual so the emphasis is on biomedical principles such as autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence and others. Unfortunately, this has been the trajectory of bioethics for years but there is an increasing awareness that this needs to change. The focus of bioethics must include principles such as autonomy, beneficence and nonmaleficence but it should also include global health equity, health disparities, social and political factors and more. A second objection is the need for ethical theory to remain just that, a theory. Many philosophers will argue this point, however, as I have discussed elsewhere in this dissertation supported by development ethicists such as Goulet and Crocker, the importance of ethical reflection constituted in the practice. Global development is an application of a theory to the practice. This needs to change to a practice-driven theory and this will only happen when an expanded view of bioethics is taken up.

Another vision: Latin America and "Buen Vivir"

As a critical response to western dominated concepts of development, Latin American countries such as Ecuador and Bolivia have reformulated their political constitutions and adopted the strategy of *buen vivir* or the good life. *Buen vivir* arises from dissatisfaction and questioning of the contemporary ideas of development, particularly those confined to economic growth. The concept of *buen vivir* which is still in the process of being constructed is organic in nature since it was borne from within those countries whose economies are not only fragile within a global context but which have also suffered as a result of the colonial legacy (Gudynas, 2011). The concept itself may be new but the underpinning principles of this idea originate in the cosmovision of indigenous peoples in Latin America, more popularly known as the "*cosmovision andina*" (Andean cosmovision). This ontology has been around for centuries – before the Spanish conquest in 1492 – in the Incan, Aztec and other indigenous cultures.

Understanding the *cosmovision andina* permits one to see the fundamental principles of this culture, which gives rise to a different ontology, a different way of life for the peoples born into this culture. Embedded in this rich philosophy is an understanding of humans as being part of a larger system in which reciprocity, solidarity and harmony are natural. The reciprocity between humans and animals, humans and the mountains, humans and the sun and moon, humans and the plants, trees and other living beings. This reciprocal relationship fosters respect and care for others – it does not allow abuse and exploitation of the other. There is a strong feeling of nurturing which is not confined to the bringing up of children but is extended to all parts of the ecosystem. Eduardo Grillo Fernandez, a late Peruvian agronomist said the following, "In the Andean world there are neither powerful nor self-sufficient beings; everyone needs everyone else to live. In the Andes the world does not exist as an integral whole different and distinct from its components; here there do not exist 'wholes' and 'parts' – these are only abstractions. In the Andean world there is symbiosis which is immediate to life – a symbiosis lived in the Andes in the form of mutual nurturance" (1998, 221).

Walking with the *campesinos* (indigenous farmers) in the *altiplano* (high plain) of Bolivia, one can begin to understand this harmony with nature and reverence towards the *Pachamama* (mother earth). It really is a strong ontological presence that is imminent in all aspects of the lives of these people. This goes beyond a mother taking her sick child to see a *yatiri* (traditional doctor) rather than a medical doctor. Once again, Grillo captures this well, "Each one of the beings who inhabit this living Andean world is equivalent to everyone else that is, every one (be it man, tree, stone) is a person, complete and indispensable, with its own and inalienable way of being, with its definite personality, its own name, with its specific responsibility in the keeping of the harmony of the world" (1998, 224).

After many years of repressive regimes and oligarchic rule, and as a challenge to a western concept of development, new indigenous leaders of Ecuador and Bolivia in the 21st century have allowed for the resurgence, rediscovery and re-valuing of these fundamental principles of the *cosmovision andina*, so much so that this has resulted in new constitutions in both countries, and an alternative to development. In coherence with indigenous traditions, the concept of *buen vivir* "embraces the broad notion of well-being and cohabitation with others and Nature"(Gudynas, 2011b, 441). Eduardo Gudynas, Uruguayan researcher argues that b*uen vivir* offers a new path to an alternative to development. For him, "the paradox that development can be declared defunct and yet in the next step promoted as the only way forward is deeply embedded in modern culture"(2011b, 442). This truly is a paradox because as he says there are enough critiques of development that render it a failure, however at the same time, it continues. One cannot ignore the pretentiousness of global institutions and NGOs that not only promote development but continue to invest millions of dollars in the name of development. There really is a sense of false consciousness among Western organizations about the entire concept of development.

The incorporation of *buen vivir* took place in 2009 in Bolivia after a participatory political process.[24] The understanding of b*uen vivir* is multicultural in that it combines the Aymaran concept of *suma qamana*, but also the Guarani interpretations of harmonious living and a good life. It is presented as an ethical principle tied to the state. The understanding of the Aymaran concept of *suma qamana* can be expressed as a harmonious tension between the material and the spiritual within a social context, or a community. Gudynas considers that the idea of *buen vivir* not only is a re-valuation of traditional indigenous thought but is also indicative of a cultural innovation. He says, "Buen Vivir expressed a process, that is now underway which offers new answers to post development questions, while reinforcing cultural identity and promoting alternatives to Western Modernity" (2011b, 444).

Some concerns about *Buen Vivir*

As a theoretical alternative to western development, the idea of *Buen Vivir* seems to be a plausible option. However, it also portrays a very romanticized and idealized version of Andean life. Hidden within this concept is a strong patriarchal presence, a dangerous homophobia and heteronormativity that renders those individuals who do not fit into these social norms as outcasts. They are marginalized. Gloria Anzaldua the prominent Chicana feminist expresses this in her book Borderlands, "As a mestiza, I have no country, my homeland cast me out, yet all countries are mine because I am every woman's sister or potential lover. (As a lesbian I have no race, my own people disclaim me, but I am all races because there is the queer of me in all races.) I am cultureless because as a feminist, I challenge the collective cultural/religious male-derived beliefs of Indo-Hispanics and Anglos; " (2007, 102).

So, although the idea of *Buen Vivir* as a national political strategy is commendable, it does highlight the need for some caution in ensuring that all sectors of the population are represented but also that critical aspects such as gender equity, sexual orientation and others are not ignored.

[24] I limit my discussion to Buen Vivir in the Bolivian constitution since my personal experience took place in Bolivia.

What is a strong ethical approach?

In this section I present what a strong ethical approach to development entails, which is based on a melding of the thoughts of the previous thinkers mentioned in this chapter: Goulet, Pogge, Esquith, Miller, Addams and Farmer. A strong ethical approach to development would include the following components. First and foremost, it needs to depart from a feminist standpoint. We need to begin from the everyday lives of those who are marginalized. Second, although a consideration of abstract ethical principles is needed, what is more important is an ethical praxis which is practice driven. This needs to begin from the problems on the ground. There needs to be an evaluative aspect which provides a critical analysis of the development process which needs to take place at different levels: global institutions, governments, international and national NGOS, community based organizations. A third component is the political responsibilities of those working in development. And a final component is reducing epistemic injustice which will be discussed in the following chapter. I argue for a greater understanding of epistemic issues in the form of epistemic injustice and oppression evident in the theory and practice of development.

Other tenets of this practice driven theory include a social ethics with empathetic understanding and reciprocity as underlying principles; pragmatic solidarity which entails working towards global equity. For individuals working in development in any type of organization requires them to go through the "shock of underdevelopment" which only comes about through challenging some of our own beliefs, and assumptions. This can raise some uncomfortable and difficult questions, but I would argue that if we don't openly do this, then we only pay lip service to this idea. This process can by facilitated by adopting the two-staged process of democratic political education Esquith talks about but would demand that institutions and organizations working in development create the space and time, for critical reenactments but also layers of interpretation. A strong ethical approach will not be easy to propose, or to put in action. This is where I see the role of the philosopher which I discuss in the following section.

Doing helpful philosophy[25]

For a strong ethical approach to be successful, this will necessarily require the active involvement of philosophers. Goulet has written about the need of philosophers to be added to the development team. I agree with him. It is not enough that philosophical thinking be instilled into development but philosophers need to become engaged in the theory and practice of development. [26] Jonathan Wolff , a philosopher who has worked extensively in the area of ethics and public policy says the following, "Public policy needs philosophers more than it needs philosophy" (2011, 202). However, philosophers/development ethicists need to be careful not to appear as the "moralists" and patronizing or isolate the field. As St. Clair succinctly says, "Many in the field of applied ethics have become aware of the need to avoid the mistakes of other fields, where ethical reflection has run parallel and often totally dissociated from the world of action, and from the world of policy" (2007, 147). To mitigate this risk I would argue that an ethics such as that expounded by Addams would be instrumental here. An ethics which is geared towards social morality and not individual morality, esteemed in reciprocity, cooperation and responsibility would avoid development ethicists running parallel to and dissociated from the action and the "real" world.

Michael Nelson, an environmental philosopher considers that for philosophers to succeed in doing helpful philosophy two conditions need to be met. First, in the case of environmental issues, "philosophers need to continue to convince ecologists (and others) of the relevance of philosophical and ethical discourse" (2008, 612). In the case of development, just making known the ethical dimensions of problems in development "is not, in and of itself, sufficient" (2008,612). Although many development professionals are aware of the major problems in their work – some will not perceive them as ethical problems or consider ethics to be important. As Nelson says, "Relevance, helpfulness and interdisciplinarity are not obtained merely by exposing the philosophical dimensions and dilemmas of a

[25] Thanks to Michael Nelson for this subtitle. It comes from his article titled: On Doing Helpful Philosophy
[26] That's not to say that all philosophers should do this. I respect those philosophers who desire to work in the realms of pure theory and abstraction. But I do consider that there is another role for philosophers.

given discipline. It is, unfortunately more difficult than that" (2008, 612). The second condition Nelson claims necessary is the need for philosophers to work with (in this particular case) social scientists, policy-makers and other development practitioners. "Working with is hugely different than working on."

The methodology that philosophers use will be important in achieving the above two conditions. In Chapter One I discussed the normative dimension of development and the importance of approaching development from non-ideal theory. It is essential for philosophers working in engaged philosophy such as the philosophy of development to approach the theory and practice of development from a non-ideal theoretical perspective. This not only helps philosophers uncover their own implicit biases - and we do have them, but will also aid in understanding the social and political implications of our world. Lisa Schwartzman argues "If the stereotypes and biases held by individuals are ever going to change, the deeply rooted systems of power that give rise to them will need to be understood and fundamentally altered. Thus, philosophers must make critical social analysis an integral part of their theorizing" (2012, 312).

During my experience as a development professional I stumbled on development ethics – through my own dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the way development was headed. Ethical issues and problems were hardly ever discussed in meetings, or workshops I participated within my own organization or in other organizations or networks I participated in. [27]It seems that there are two other things that can be considered here. One, motivating the exercising of our moral responsibilities and obligations. Two, increasing levels of understanding through political education processes such as cultural reenactments. It seems that what is crucial here is what Paolo Freire called *conscientizacion*, which happens when one undergoes a process of critical analysis and reflection, even a self-introspection, if you like which leads to a better understanding of one's situation, the context in which one is part of, and so forth. This can happen through literacy classes as Freire did, but it can also happen through the generation of spaces of critical dialogue and reflexivity. One of the ongoing problems of the application of

[27] In conversation with my manager, he said, "there is no ethics in development."

any theory-practice dichotomy is the dialectical tension between the theory and practice, this is inevitable. But it is also something that needs to be taken into account. This will be discussed in the next section.

The theory and practice divide

David Crocker argues that development ethics, "Should not be an exclusively academic inquiry, rather it should bridge the gap between theory and practice and does so with interaction in both directions" (2008,37). Having worked in the praxis for many years, I bore witness to the evident gap between the theory and practice of development and development ethics, but also to the paucity in reflective thinking within organizations whether national, international, bilateral or multilateral. Development practitioners spend most of their time on the practice of their work which primarily consists in designing, implementing and evaluating projects. Very little time is spent reflecting upon actions or consulting theories or theorists to help them understand the theoretical aspects which underpin the work they are engaged in. Economists and policy makers on the other hand rely too heavily on ideas and theories based on neo-liberal, capitalist and patriarchal hegemonies. Paolo Freire taught that the rhetoric and the praxis needed to go together. Pure activism brought chaos together with poor planning and therefore poor results. Pure rhetoric on the other hand brought abstract theorizations, nebulous hypotheses and likewise poor results which are what we are witnessing today about what development is achieving (Freire, 1974). I would consider the unity of theory and practice to be an essential component of development ethics but what does that mean in the practice? The role of the development ethicist is to interact with the experts from global institutions, practitioners from development agencies but also with the people on the ground. Being knowledgeable about "value conscious ways of thinking and choosing alternative paths and destinations" is indispensable for development ethicists (St. Clair, 2007, 149).

Global development is very much a practical application so how does development theory fare in the practice? In regard to what Pogge considers the role of philosophy, that is, a greater understanding of

everyday problems and illuminating what really matters. I think this is our ultimate goal and is also consistent with Richard Bernstein who writes about the praxis of philosophers. He says, "Our first task is to try to understand and to understand in such a way that we can highlight what is important and sound"(1971, 8). I will argue that philosophers have a moral obligation and responsibility to contribute to the problems of global development, but in a way which is helpful.

Philosophers, at least traditional ones are not very good at working in a collaborative way. That has been one of the obstacles to carrying out an interdisciplinary approach. To help elucidate this, I will analyze the methodology of philosophical inquiry from a feminist perspective, in an endeavor to propose what "doing helpful philosophy" would entail. Lorraine Code argues for the need to meet asserted epistemic demands which would allow for effective knowing across different landscapes such as race, gender, situations, location and so forth (2008a). According to Code, the possibility of knowledge can only take place within a situation that fosters advocacy and the negotiations that accompany this. She argues that for knowledge to be understood as *knowing well*, it needs to be relocated to an inquiry which is 'on the ground' and takes into account social, political, cultural and other aspects of the knower (2006). She uses the example of a health project in Tanzania to demonstrate that the way an organization decided to implement a certain strategy resulted in the attainment of this level of knowledge. However, I argue that although informed advocacy may be necessary for *knowing well*, the project in Tanzania as described by Code does not fully reflect this. Rather, what it does highlight is the ease in which something is deemed as good in the practice, because it seems to reflect a certain theoretical assumption. However, in the reality this is not so. It is necessary to take care in lauding projects as successful, when in fact they perpetuate failing paradigms and can be epistemically stifling. I am sure Code did not intend this, her theoretical approach to ecological thinking is commendable as it obliges us to go beyond traditional epistemological frameworks, however, what it does emphasize is the difficulty in translating theory into practice. What the project aimed to do according to Code, was break with the traditional form of knowing which is in fact a practice more of unknowing. It also differentiates

between people regarded as "sources of information and those regarded as "epistemic informants." That is, people regarded as sources of information are observed without acknowledgement or recognition of their epistemic agency. The project Code discussed consisted of interviewing bereaved relatives of those recently deceased and regarded those relatives as *epistemic informants* rather than *sources of information.*

Kristie Dotson's main claim in her response to Code's piece is that the absence of Tanzanian voices in the article by Code may actually suggest a form of epistemic injustice. For Dotson, the Tanzanians cannot be considered as epistemic informants, they were used as sources of information. Her central focus is the move from effective epistemic practices to just epistemic practices. She claims that effective epistemic practices do not in fact guarantee just epistemic practices. She argues that, "In this case, Tanzanian peoples were treated as sources of information, where, a la Fricker, as sources of information they were observed "without taking their epistemic agency into account, [and thereby] failing or neglecting to include them in the group of 'trusted informants"(2008, 57). She also claims that the Tanzanians were subjected to both testimonial and hermeneutical injustice: they were excluded from testifying to local situations and were denied credibility; they were recognized as having no ability to contribute to the topic of interpreting illness within their particular area. She says, "Simply being afforded the means to speak does not necessarily, in itself, remove such injustice," nor can we assume that the relationship between interviewers and interviewees is one which engenders reciprocal epistemic informant status (2008, 60). Dotson's analysis is closely related to the underlying idea that although the theory may be strong and plausible, the practice will not necessarily reflect this. This example is evident of the tension that exists in the dialectical relationship between the theory and practice.

To avoid this type of theoretical limitation requires the need for philosophers to be careful when applying their theories in the practice, especially if we are talking about abstract theories and principles and an area of practice grounded in action. This is not so straightforward and demands a deeper understanding of the issues one is writing about. This is not an impossible venture; it just requires some

professional humility and willingness to explore further, going beyond our own thoughts and knowledge.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued for the need of ethics in development, but also proposed that what is needed is a "strong" ethical approach to development. We need to be more forceful in our approach to ethics in development. And by "we" I am referring to philosophers but also other development ethicists who may not be necessarily be philosophers. A strong ethical approach departing from the practice, which strives for global equity and pragmatic solidarity is called for, to challenge the current development theory and practice. This strong ethical approach also needs to consider alternative paradigms such as the *Buen Vivir* model recently implemented in Bolivian and Ecuadorian political constitutions, so as to understand different conceptions of development but also different conceptions of being.

Chapter Four

Epistemic injustice in global development

In this chapter, I argue that understanding epistemic injustice is crucial for rethinking the theory and practice of global development. Understanding epistemic injustice can alter the way we think about global development, and will thus guide us in how gross injustices such as extreme poverty can and should be addressed. I begin by discussing the importance of knowledge as a virtue in and of itself. From my own analysis which also draws on my experience as a development professional for many years in Latin America, I argue that one of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice is grounded in the limitations in the theoretical discussions of knowledge, and how this knowledge is then applied in the practice.

Second, I introduce the notion of epistemic injustice and analyze how the theory and practice of global development is epistemically unjust. To help build this analysis I predominantly draw on the work of feminist epistemologists. Boaventura de Sousa Santos introduces the term cognitive justice and claims that cognitive justice is an essential component of global justice. Cognitive justice for Santos can be likened to epistemic justice in many ways.[28] I begin with cognitive justice and then move to Miranda Fricker's concept of epistemic injustice, I continue the analysis through the work of feminist epistemologists such as Elizabeth Anderson, Kristie Dotson and Gail Pohlhaus. I present a couple of examples of development practice which portray epistemic injustice in development and I finish by offering some thoughts on what needs to happen to mitigate epistemic injustice in global development.

The pursuit of knowledge is a fundamental feature of being human. Throughout all our lives one of the principal ventures many of us are engaged in is the pursuit of knowledge, whether it be through formal systems such as schools, colleges and universities or informal ones such as self-learning, experiential learning and group-learning. According to Aristotle, "All human beings by nature desire to

[28] For the purposes of this dissertation, I am using the terms cognitive and epistemic interchangeably. Although there may be some semantic differences between these two words, I think in the context that Santos uses 'cognitive' and feminist epistemologists use 'epistemic' these terms can be considered to have the same meaning: pertaining to the process of knowledge production.

know" (Irwin, 1995, 221). Knowledge can be considered to have instrumental value but it is also of intrinsic value, just having knowledge is a good (Coady, 2012, 2). However, what also needs to be taken into consideration are the sources of knowledge, how we acquire knowledge, and the types of knowledge we rely on. Do we credit some forms of knowledge over others? How do social, political and cultural factors influence our acquisition of knowledge? How does power and domination play out in knowledge? These are just some of the questions that feminist epistemologists have been asking over the last forty years in contesting the conservative and abstract framework of traditional epistemologists. There is an increasing awareness that the persistence of certain types of knowledge can actually lead to harm and injustice. Sandra Harding in her discussion on standpoint theory says the following: " Knowledge claims are always socially situated and the failure by dominant groups critically and systematically to interrogate their advantaged social situation and the effect of such advantages on their beliefs leaves their social situation a scientifically and epistemologically disadvantaged one for generating knowledge.(2004,54).

In this chapter I am more concerned with the epistemology of knowledge production, which differs from the sociology of knowledge. I am interested in what Frederick Schmitt claims, "is the conceptual and normative study of the relevance of social relations, roles, interests, and institutions to knowledge"(1994, 1). This is different from a sociology of knowledge which empirically studies how social conditions affect knowledge production. The epistemology of knowledge production emphasizes the normative role, "seeking not only to describe our current social practices of knowledge production, but also to understand how we ought to know and how we can improve our knowledge practices" (Grasswick, 2013).

The need for another type of epistemology

Boaventura de Sousa Santos, in his critique of western thought, argues that what has happened over the years as a result of the dominant science paradigm can be considered, among other things, a suppression of knowledge which he calls, "a form of epistemicide" (2008, xx). This is a dimension to the

foundational problem that is often missed or blatantly ignored, due to the epistemological way the global north has imposed a capitalist and imperial order on the global south. The way forward for Santos is to insist on global cognitive justice as an essential component of global justice. He argues for the urgent need to supplant the dominant monocultural paradigm in science with an *ecology of knowledges*. In his words, "The ecology of knowledges is an invitation to the promotion of non-relativistic dialogues among knowledges, granting 'equality of opportunities' to the different kinds of knowledge engaged in ever broader epistemological disputes aimed both at maximizing their respective contributions to build a more democratic and just society and at decolonizing knowledge and power"(2008, x). But he also does not want to completely reject western thought. He says, "Such an epistemology in no way suggests that North-centric critical thinking and left policies must be discarded and thrown into the dustbin of history. Its past is in many respects an honorable past and has significantly contributed to the liberation of the global south"(2008, 258).

Current scientific knowledge presents a specific worldview, yet it has been conceived as representing a universal reality and explanation. This eliminates any possibility of an alternative or even complementary articulation of knowledges. For Santos, this is redolent of colonialism and relations of inequality. The extent of social injustice evident in our world today can be partially attributed to the narrow production, reproduction and legitimization of imperialist features of the conception of modern science. The type of knowledge inherent to modern science is supposedly rational and highly rigorous. Science today continues to put forward this form of knowledge as the only true, reliable and accurate one. In contrast, common sense knowledge, which can be classified as, "the knowledge that we, as individual or collective subjects, create and use to give meaning to our practices, but which science insists on considering irrelevant, illusory and false, " is not even taken into account (Santos, 2007, 15). Even knowledge deriving from the humanities is also minimized, and knowledge such as experience is classified as non-scientific; it is outside the limits of a rigid scientific framework.

Epistemologies of the south

The new epistemology Santos is arguing for is one that derives from the south.[29]There are two underlying premises of an epistemology of the south. The first is that a western understanding of the world is not broad enough. The second is based on the notion that the diversity witnessed in the world, such as diversity in being, thinking, feeling and knowing is in fact infinite. How we perceive time, life, existence and death throughout the world is not accommodated by just one epistemology, nor other theories developed in the north. Epistemologies from the north, therefore, limit, undermine and blatantly ignore other ways of seeing, thinking and knowing. For Santos, there are four steps to build an epistemology of the south. These are: a sociology of absences, sociology of emergences, ecology of knowledges and intercultural translation.

The sociology of absences is referring to the non-existence of certain entities which are "discredited and considered invisible; non-intelligible or discardable." Basically, what Santos is referring to here is the way a monoculture of knowledge based on western scientific paradigms pervade global theorizing. This tends to produce the lack of what should be other valuable forms of knowledge. The sociology of emergences, the second core idea of an epistemology of the south, is concerned with the existence of concrete possibilities. Where the sociology of absences emphasizes the production of non-existences, the sociology of emergences emphasizes the production of possibilities. The idea is not to get caught up with only reality and necessity. We must also consider possibilities in order to seize opportunities, albeit with some degree of risk or danger. According to Santos, "The sociology of emergences is the inquiry into the alternatives that are contained in the horizon of concrete possibilities" (2012, 56). This is based on the hope for a better world, the possibility that we can do better if only we broaden our horizons and consider possible alternatives.

[29] The use of the term south is metaphorical, so is not limited to its geographical definition; although many of the populations living in disadvantaged countries are situated in countries of the south. These marginalized populations also exist in countries situated in the north.

The ecology of knowledges, the third core idea is based on the assumption that gaining knowledge about something is at the expense of the ignorance of something. "Every kind of ignorance ignores a certain kind of knowledge and every kind of knowledge triumphs over a particular kind of ignorance" (2012, 57). With the ecology of knowledges the idea is to grasp and learn other knowledges but without the obliteration of one's own. For Santos, the prevailing scientific knowledge pervading our world does not encourage the consideration of non-scientific knowledges. Although cognitive injustice is grounded in social injustice, it is not enough to believe that cognitive justice will come about solely through a more balanced distribution of scientific knowledge. The problem goes deeper. Redistribution is not enough for the limitations reliance on scientific knowledge produces. The idea is also not to discredit scientific knowledge but to use it in a counter-hegemonic way. This for Santos consists, "on the one hand, in exploring alternative scientific practices made visible through plural epistemologies of scientific practices and, on the other, in promoting interdependence between scientific and non-scientific knowledges" (2012, 57).

Intercultural translation is the final core idea of what an epistemology of the south is. It is a procedure by which mutual intelligibility of distinct world experiences is allowed. Understood in this sense the work of translation requires two things: the deconstruction of ideas and concepts inherited from colonialism; the reconstruction and revitalization of cultural certainties and possibilities of Latin America, Africa, Asian and others which have been interrupted by the forces of colonialism, neo-colonialism and globalization. The work of translation makes possible the ecology of knowledges and it does so through what Santos describes as 'diatopical hermeneutics.' According to Santos, "'diatopical hermeneutics' consists in interpreting two or more cultures, aiming to identify isomorphic concerns among them and the different answers they provide" (2012, 59). He uses the example of understanding productive life within Western capitalist societies expressed as development with *swadeshi* and Sumak *Kawsay*, both indigenous interpretations grounded in the ideas of sustainability and reciprocity.

What Santos attempts to do here is to argue that all cultures are incomplete and that their enrichment can come about through engaging in dialogue with other cultures. He does not promote relativism or universalism. Rather he talks about a 'negative universalism' (2012, 60). "Diatopical hermeneutics presupposes what I call negative universalism, the idea of the impossibility of cultural completeness"(2012, 60). The type of translation this requires takes place at two levels. At the level of knowledges, but also of practices which would include the agents: such as the translation of practices between an international NGO and a national one, organization principles, strategic objectives, action plans and so forth. Translation of this type promotes a greater understanding of the vast differences between organizations and social movements. It also allows for the deciphering of which practices produce more counter-hegemonic force. All organizations, social movements, etc. are embedded within particular cultural and knowledge contexts. The task of translation is then to make visible this array of difference. Feminist standpoint theorists have emphasized this through the need to depart from the everyday lives of the marginalized and the oppressed. Their emphasis is not on the fact that we need different knowledges but more objective ones. (Harding 2006, Pohlhaus, 2011).

Cognitive and epistemic injustice

Santos work can be compared to the analogous projects of feminist epistemology. Santos talks about cognitive justice, and feminist epistemologists talk about epistemic justice. Both originate from a critical response to an unsatisfactory and undesirable condition: dominant paradigms in both science and philosophy. In his plea for an epistemology of the south, although Santos is cognizant of the need for a pluralist form of knowledge, he does tend to present all knowledge from the south as worthy, which is a romanticized view to say the least. What he fails to identify are the discrepancies, power differentials and marginalization that also occurs within the heterogeneity of the south. This is where epistemic injustice can be helpful.

Feminist philosophy is rooted in theory which is contextual, hence the importance of feminist standpoint theory and its maxim: start from the everyday lives of women. Feminist epistemologists have

extended this notion to include the status of knowers. Linda Alcoff says the following, "The history of feminist epistemology itself is the history of the clash between the feminist commitment to the struggles of women to have their understandings of the world legitimated and the commitment of traditional philosophy to various accounts of knowledge – positivist, post positivist, and others-that have consistently undermined women's claim to know"(1993, 2). This can be likened to Santos's theory of the epistemologies of the south and the importance of an ecology of knowledges by taking into consideration different knowledges; the lives and experiences of those often marginalized and excluded.

The dominant science paradigm excludes or at least undervalues the knowledge of ordinary people: those who participate in the social movements. Traditional epistemology is primarily concerned with propositional knowledge. In its abstractness it tends to ignore the status of knowers or their capacity as situated knowers. An extensive body of knowledge is available but due to the existing dominant forces much of this knowledge is ignored, marginalized and undervalued. The translation of this becomes the trade policies between countries, foreign aid agendas and global health policies. The burgeoning and increasing breadth of feminist epistemology is testimony to the need to challenge and question traditional epistemologies but also to expand and offer new thoughts on the theory of knowledge. Therefore, feminist epistemology moves beyond a critical analysis, it is instrumental in reframing the puzzling aspects of knowledge within a different framework.

The concept of cognitive justice as explained by Santos is based on, "the fact that the social injustice that is rampant in the world today is in part the result of the cognitive injustice that a narrow and imperial conception of modern science has produced and legitimized"(2007,2). To address these injustices social movements all over the world have arisen which challenge and contest neoliberal globalization. They confront the situation demanding alternative forms of globalization, which will consider and accept alternative paradigms of epistemic authority. Social movements are actual producers of knowledge, a common sense form of knowledge essential for the transformation of current paradigmatic versions of knowledge which dominate our current spheres of knowledge. However, even

within social movements one can witness forms of epistemic injustice. This is discussed in the following section.

Fricker's epistemic injustice

Epistemic justice is a relatively new (but growing) sub-area within feminist epistemology. Miranda Fricker in her timely book, *Epistemic Injustice* approaches the idea of epistemic justice from its inverse, injustice (2007). By analyzing the epistemic injustices it enables us to understand what these injustices are, how these are produced, what the obstacles are and how we can move forward. Fricker's aim is to expose some of our moral and epistemic assumptions (which of course have socio-cultural and political implications) which influence how we constitute what is knowledge. Her analysis focuses on the situatedness of knowers, and many critics of Fricker's work have offered other insights crucial for understanding epistemic justice.

In her book, Fricker is loyal to the search for better ways of knowing. The impetus for Fricker is the impoverishment of epistemology by the absence of a theoretical framework, "conducive to revealing the ethical and political aspects of our epistemic conduct" (2007, 2). Her work reveals the ethical dimension of epistemic practice and more specifically the justice and injustice. According to Fricker, "The world is "structured" by the powerful to the detriment of the powerless, there is another species of oppression at work, one that has not been registered in mainstream epistemology: epistemic oppression" (1999, 191). Oppression can be understood in various ways: political, economic, social, sexual and others. Here, I am particularly concerned with oppression as a result of epistemic domination and marginalization. Fricker not only considers the situatedness of knowers but also their cognitive status. She begins her work with the notion of social power, which she says can be active or passive. In other words power does not necessarily need to occur within an action, it can also occur in the absence of an action. It has an existential role.

Fricker also differentiates between agential power and power that occurs structurally. She offers the following definition of social power: "a practically socially situated capacity to control others' actions, where this capacity may be exercised (actively or passively) by particular social agents, or alternatively, it may operate purely structurally" (2007,13). The above conception of power relies on a form of social coordination, and Fricker furthers her analysis to include a dimension which highlights that another form of social coordination is also present, that of social imagination. She argues that collective imaginative conceptions exist that can dictate our understanding of what it means to be American or Australian for that matter. She recognizes this as *identity power*. Nationality can be a form of *identity power*, as can gender, race, class, etc.

Jose Medina considers that we should be talking about a social imaginary rather than social imagination. He introduces the role of the social imaginary to elucidate how epistemic injustices are established and sustained. This differs from Fricker's notion of social imagination. It is the social imaginary not the social imagination which explains more efficiently the structural-systemic foundations of our beliefs, prejudices, attitudes which includes imagery (Medina, 2011). The notion of the social imaginary derives from Cornelius Castoriadis and Michele Le Doueff and is a much better way to understand the power dynamics and socio-political forces within a contextual analysis which is broader than limiting it to individualism circumscribed by the social imagination. Lorraine Code, in her own work and in a book review on Fricker's book also makes reference to the social imaginary (2008).

Fricker introduces two forms of epistemic injustice, testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustice. According to Fricker, testimonial injustice, "occurs when prejudice causes a hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker's word"(2007, 1). In some cases the level of credibility can be excessive, when a speaker earns more credibility such as in the case of a white, male teacher (Medina, 2011, 22). Hence the dysfunction based on prejudice can be of two types. It can be a credibility excess when the speaker earns more credibility or credibility deficit when the speaker earns less credibility. It can be argued that both types of credibility are cases of testimonial injustice, however Fricker upholds

that in situations where credibility deficit is mostly recognized results in being more disadvantageous for the speaker. A significant characteristic of testimonial injustice, which Fricker claims is the most pernicious, is that it is systematic. It is coined as systematic since it is not produced by a single form of prejudice, but rather is embedded within the diverse dimensions of a social structure. Therefore testimonial injustice has political, economic, cultural and social connotations. This systematic testimonial injustice is upheld by a prejudice closely linked to social identity which Fricker calls *identity prejudice.*

The second form of epistemic injustice is hermeneutical injustice. Hermeneutical injustice provides a description of how power relations and privilege influence interpretations and understandings which are socially embedded. It is defined as "the injustice of having some significant area of one's social experience obscured from collective understanding owing to a structural identity prejudice in the collective hermeneutical resource" (Fricker, 2007, 155). As a collective occurrence of social understanding, disadvantaged groups are hermeneutically marginalized often without the awareness of the individual. Fricker uses the example of Carmita Woods, and the genesis of the term sexual harassment to illustrate this form of epistemic injustice. Carmita Woods quit her job after years of having been sexually harassed in the workplace. In the period in which this occurred, the term sexual harassment was not yet conceived as such. It came about after this, resultant of women coming together, sharing their experiences and coming to the realization that a wrong was being committed – being unduly sexually harassed by male colleagues which called for some response. As Susan Brownmiller describes in her memoir on the history of women's liberation, "We realized that to a person, every one of us – the women on staff, Carmita, the students –had had an experience like this at some point you know? And none of us had ever told anyone before.....we were referring to it as "sexual intimidation," "sexual coercion," "sexual exploitation on the job." None of those names seemed quite right. We wanted something that embraced a whole range of subtle and unsubtle persistent behaviors. Somebody came up with "harassment." Sexual harassment! Instantly we agreed. That's what it was" (Fricker, 2007, 150).

Fricker describes this as hermeneutical injustice, as it also reflected the pervasive misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the situation of women within society. As Fricker says, "Women's position at the time of second wave feminism was still one of marked social powerlessness in relation to men; and specifically, the unequal relations of power prevented women from participating on equal terms with men in those practices by which collective social meanings are generated"(2007, 152). Hermeneutical injustice is reflective of the social situation of individuals and groups within society. Groups based on gender, race and other minority groups. It is difficult (but not impossible) to detect. However, since hidden within this social context is the way efforts of interpretation are usually based on our own interests –"we try hardest to understand those things it serves us to understand" (2007, 152). Thus, what we see happening is how hegemonic and dominant forces oppress the social experience of many resulting in a hermeneutical marginalization which indicates the "subordination and exclusion from some practice that would have value for the participant" (2007, 153).

From her analysis of epistemic injustice, and as a way to mitigate or prevent testimonial and hermeneutical injustice, Fricker offers the virtues of justice which rely on the need for a type of epistemic conduct. Fricker differentiates between two forms of virtues: intellectual and ethical, and claims that in thinking about epistemic justice, and in particular both testimonial and hermeneutical we need to consider the nature of intellectual and ethical virtues as a hybrid form. Although Fricker acknowledges that the problem of epistemic injustice is structural in nature, her solution to address epistemic injustice in the way of intellectual virtues is individual. In regard to testimonial justice, there is a need for credibility judgments which incorporates the responsibilities we have as hearers on the need to cultivate a testimonial sensibility. What this requires is a critical openness, but also critical reflexiveness. Of course, when the socially situated context lends itself to credibility excess and credibility deficit, how then, can we begin to break down these social constructs? And this is where Fricker's account does not completely respond to this conundrum. With the help of Elizabeth Anderson and Kristie Dotson I will endeavor to show why this is so.

Challenges to Fricker's epistemic injustice

Elizabeth Anderson in her article, "Epistemic Justice as a Virtue of Social Institutions," offers a challenge to Fricker's account of epistemic virtues. Where Fricker emphasizes the need for individual epistemic virtues, Anderson says that this is not enough, since epistemic injustice is primarily a structural problem. According to Anderson, "Structural injustices call for structural remedies"(2012, 171). Anderson does not completely discount the value of cultivating individual epistemic virtues, however, considering that the extent of testimonial and hermeneutical injustices which primarily can be attributed to structural causes, relying on individuals may be necessary but not sufficient. It is structural for the way epistemic injustice is embedded in the social institutions and social structures of society such as communities and families. She argues that just as Rawls claims that a virtue of social institutions is distributive justice, the same could be said for epistemic justice. It needs to take place at the level of institutions. She calls for a type of epistemic democracy.

The second challenge is concerned with forms of testimonial injustice which are structural. For Anderson, "Testimonial exclusion becomes structural when institutions are set up to exclude people without anyone having to decide to do so" (2012, 166). This happens all the time within development institutions. According to Anderson, "structural forms of testimonial injustice are more pervasive than acknowledged in Fricker's work"(2012, 169). Anderson discusses how in the field of social psychology cognitive biases are understood as a form of prejudice. "Cognitive biases tend to be deeply entrenched in our minds, and operate automatically, unconsciously, and more rapidly than conscious thought" (2012, 167). Even people with the best intentions of avoiding discriminatory thoughts or conduct, being aware of their views cannot easily control them. Therefore, in thinking about how to counteract these it is not enough to only consider prejudice as the only way that credibility can be denied. Anderson considers three causes, all structural in nature that poses the same threat as prejudice but is group-based. These are the differential access to markers of credibility; ethnocentrism and the "shared reality bias"(2012, 169), The use of credibility markers is commonplace, for example in situations where educated judgments are

required, the level of education and certain expertise of groups will account as credible markers. However, for those groups who are deprived the access to a decent standard of education, they cannot even enter into the picture. This, according to Anderson must also be considered as a testimonial injustice.

The second structural cause is ethnocentrism, where the testimonial account of some groups is discounted primarily due to the bias towards groups to which one is a member. A higher level of credence can be given to an in-group member over someone outside the group. Hence, credibility excess can also be considered a testimonial injustice. The third cause is the shared reality bias. This, Anderson says is the way groups who interact on a regular basis have a convergence of perspectives and share judgments. This, is not always pernicious, rather can build solidarity and cooperation. However, as Anderson poignantly says, "the shared reality bias will tend to insulate members of advantaged groups from the perspectives of the systematically disadvantaged" (2012, 170). All three causes demonstrate the way structural injustices play a significant role in the realization of testimonial and hermeneutical injustice, the causes of which cannot be limited to only prejudice and will not be resolved by individual epistemic virtues.

Kristie Dotson introduces a third type of epistemic injustice which she calls contributory injustice (2012, 24). But she begins her piece with a caution. Her caution is related to epistemic oppression and how through its analysis can also lead to its perpetuation. Dotson describes epistemic oppression as the following, "Epistemic oppression, here, refers to epistemic exclusions afforded positions and communities that produce deficiencies in social knowledge" (2012,24). In using Fricker's book as a paradigmatic case, she is claiming that Fricker perpetuates epistemic oppression, primarily through the way she conceptually uses a closed structure. She does this by limiting her concept of epistemic injustice to testimonial and hermeneutical injustice and relegates anything else which does not fit into these two categories as epistemic bad luck. As Dotson, says, "A catchall theory of epistemic injustice is an unrealistic expectation. Epistemic oppression is simply too pervasive." (2012,41). Avoiding

epistemic oppression is difficult (but not impossible). And where it may be impossible to completely eliminate epistemic oppression, there is a need to work towards mitigating it.

Dotson defines contributory injustice as being "caused by an epistemic agent's situated ignorance, in the form of willful hermeneutical ignorance, in maintaining and utilizing structurally prejudiced hermeneutical resources that result in epistemic harm to the epistemic agency of a knower" (2012, 28). For Dotson, any unwarranted compromise to epistemic agency, "damages not only individual knowers but also the state of social knowledge and shared epistemic resources" (2012,24). Gail Pohlhaus argues that Fricker's notion of epistemic injustice excludes a form of injustice which she also calls, "willful hermeneutical ignorance." Pohlhaus considers that her version of willful hermeneutical ignorance can possibly fit into the broader category of contributory injustice. It is contributory for the way that knowers in dominant positions do not acknowledge contributions by marginalized knowers as significant – they willfully ignore them. For Pohlhaus, "willful hermeneutical ignorance describes instances where marginally situated knowers actively resist epistemic domination through interaction with other resistant knowers while dominantly situated knowers nonetheless continue to misunderstand and misinterpret the world" (2011, 2).

In her analysis of the three types of epistemic injustice Dotson uses the order-of-change model borrowed from the theory of organizational development as a heuristic tool. Using this model allows one to see the distinction between each one, but also to identify what changes are needed as a minimum to achieve justice. Testimonial injustice is a first–order epistemic injustice, hermeneutical is second order and contributory is third-order. A first–order change will require intervening at the level of problem-solving to improve functions. Second and third–order change requires change to take place at the structural level. For change to take place at second–order, "one must seek out the socio-epistemic conditions that foster hermeneutical injustice" (2012, 28). According to Fricker, epistemic virtues will address the reduction of hermeneutical injustice, but for Dotson and others, hermeneutical injustice is structural so will require a structural solution. Contributory injustice as a third-order epistemic injustice

differs from hermeneutical injustice in two ways. Fricker talks about the collective hermeneutical resources which assume a form of homogeneity. Whereas, Dotson considers that there are various sets of collective hermeneutical resources such as alternative epistemologies and counter mythologies. "We do not all depend on the same hermeneutical resources" (2012,28).And by hermeneutical resources we are talking about those resources we depend on for knowing, such as language and concepts. As Pohlhaus says, " Knowing requires resources of the mind, such as language to formulate propositions , concepts to make sense of experience, procedures to approach the world, and standards to judge particular accounts of experience" (2011,4). These epistemic resources are socially situated transcending the individual.

According to Dotson, Fricker's hermeneutical marginalization does not emphasize the role power plays in obscuring hermeneutical resources of marginalization. In contributory injustice, the epistemic agency of a knower is compromised through situated ignorance. The situatedness of one determines both epistemic boundaries and those of ignorance. Dotson argues that epistemic frameworks both obscure and illuminate epistemic differences. We can recognize these differences but we don't due to willful hermeneutical ignorance. So where contributory injustice not only has a structural feature there is also an aspect of it which resides in the willfulness of an epistemic agent. A change at this level requires not only being aware of a set of differing hermeneutical resources, but being able to 'shift' them. This does not happen easily but is facilitated in the presence of trust. Dotson explains that this "requires a kind of embodied engagement that extends beyond conversation and dialogue"(2012, 30). Dotson argues that Fricker's analysis on epistemic injustice expresses a closed conceptual structure. Her borders and delimitations float within a framework of epistemic injustice or epistemic bad luck. For Dotson this will not mitigate epistemic oppression.

An open conceptual structure is required and Dotson by putting forth three forms of epistemic injustice attempts to render justice to this. Any account of epistemic injustice is just that, one account. And where it is important to "acknowledge the strengths and limitations" of any one position, it is equally important to move forward and consider other theoretical notions of epistemic injustice. So, if we

are really serious in reducing epistemic oppression Dotson offers a quick, solution which may be partial but it works: changing "the" to "a." She says, "An indefinite article and the conceptual structures required to make its deployment appropriate can offer positions that signify without absolute foreclosure, but it is up to the author who deploys indefinite articles and the audience who relies upon them to maintain the openness inherent in the structure." (2012,42). In the next section I discuss some differences between cognitive justice and epistemic justice.

Differences

There are some differences between Santos's project and that of feminist epistemologists. For the present, I wish to concentrate on three of these. Understanding these differences is helpful in understanding why a synthesis of cognitive justice and epistemic justice will make it a more robust account of epistemic injustice at an epistemic level, but also shed some light on how best to address cognitive/epistemic injustice. First, Santos's project has a much broader impact in that his discussion is considerate of social movements all over the world and one that would mean a pluralistic interpretation of the need to talk about the ecology of knowledges. In Santos's work there is awareness towards global justice and the role cognitive justice plays toward the achievement of global justice. In contrast, the focus of feminist epistemology does not yet have that reach.

Second, feminist epistemology delves into the theoretical depths of epistemology and provides an intellectually rigorous challenge. One of the main threads we have seen from the work of feminist epistemologists is calling for a strong objectivity. Sandra Harding is best recognized for this since this notion stems from her work on standpoint epistemology, and the importance of starting from the everyday lives of people to achieve objectivity. Her claims on standpoint methodology have challenged scientists and science to break with sexist and androcentric assumptions and provoked much discussion among those not so eager to listen (Harding, 1993). Another notable aspect is the importance of understanding where knowers are situated in the world. A standpoint from the dominant paradigm

Santos talks about will result in a weak form of objectivity since "the standpoint of this group is epistemically limited with respect to the standpoint of various marginalized groups." (Alcoff, 1993,6).

Another thread is Lorraine Code's work on subjectivity and the need to take subjectivity into account. She argues that knowledge seen through the eyes of traditional epistemology is in fact not representative of knowledge deemed general or human. The analysis of knowledge by epistemologists excludes crucial aspects which are concrete and unique of our physical and social worlds. With this in view, Code attempts to remap the terrain by including subjectivity, she says, "it asserts the political investedness of most knowledge –producing activity and insists upon the accountability – the epistemic responsibilities – of knowing subjects to the community, not just to the evidence"(1993,20). It seems that the knowledge base that feminist epistemology offers is more specific of epistemic issues than Santos's work on cognitive justice. In the next sections I apply an understanding of epistemic injustice to the theory and practice of global development.

Epistemic justice as an essential component of global justice[30]

Thomas Pogge, the pioneering political philosopher behind the term 'global justice' considers global justice as an approach to address the appalling levels of extreme global poverty, hunger and inequalities that exist across the globe. The emphasis of global justice is its embeddedness in the structural formation of our world, the global economic order, international laws, treaties and agreements; multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the United Nations. For Pogge, "the term justice is now predominant in the moral assessment of social rules (laws, practices, social conventions and institutions) and used only rarely in the moral assessment of the conduct and character of individual and collective agents" (2010, 16). To work towards global justice means to address the injustices which pervade our societies.[31] Vittorio Buffachi says, "a theory of justice sets out to overcome or surmount injustice, which suggests that before a theory of justice can do any work, indeed

[30] This topic warrants a dissertation/paper on its own: here I am merely introducing the notion
[31] In this dissertation I am not concerned with the possible relationship between distributive, procedural and cognitive justice.

even before a theory of justice takes form, the nature and meaning of injustice must be understood and explained"(2012, ix).

Although Santos lauds the importance of cognitive justice as an essential component of global justice he falls short in adequately theorizing what this actually means. He discusses the need to consider other epistemologies, intercultural translation, and so forth but this will require more foundational work –exploring some of the epistemological reasons why cognitive/epistemic injustice exists in the first place. This is primarily where I argue the work of feminist epistemologists can help Santos' account and is my main concern.

Is global development epistemically unjust? Theoretical issues

The epistemic injustice in global development begins with its concept. Development as we know it today emerged from Harry Truman in his infamous inaugural address back in 1949. That's not to say that development was not conceived of prior to this, but marks the stage for the beginning of a process which has become a mega- industry over the span of nearly 65 years.

. The first development theories assessed the 'development' of nations in terms of an increase in national income. Therefore development was conceptualized only as economic growth. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was the measure for growth, and for more than 40 years the GDP was considered the only indicator worthy as a measurement of development. The higher the GDP of a country, the "less poor" were its people. However, it became obvious that relying on the GDP was insufficient for assessing the impact of development. Understanding development as economic growth greatly influenced the *project* of development, how development was then translated into operative plans. Development became synonymous with economic growth so programs and projects reflected this.

Thinking about development began to change with the introduction of human development by

the late Mahbub ul Haq, who in 1990, as special advisor to the United Nations Development Programme published the first Human Development Report (Baru & Haq, 1998). His friend and ally, economist Amartya Sen took the notion further to found the capabilities approach. His theory centers around the capabilities of persons, arguing that increased capabilities of people would lead to an enhanced quality of life. This approach is a more reasonable attempt to address global poverty and disparities. However, I would argue that this is still entrenched within a knowledge paradigm dominated by western thought and ideology. Walter Mignolo claims that Sen can be criticized for his support of a neoliberal agenda. For Mignolo colonialism may be considered something of the past but coloniality is "alive and well"(2008). Coloniality, "refers to the darker side of modernity, the miseries that the discourse of modernity has to hide (and often ignore out of blindness or of bad consciousness) in order to celebrate its splendors" (Mignolo, 2008, 379). Mignolo, like Santos, argues for cognitive justice or a more prudent form of knowledge, one which renders western epistemologies in practice, as obsolete.

A principal way global development is epistemically unjust is conceptually. It is based on a certain epistemology embedded within a particular social imaginary that excludes other epistemologies, such as those from poorer countries or of those living in less advantaged situations. The dimension of power within an epistemic landscape is not often discussed, but it could be argued that this is where the power begins: who has credibility excess, who has credibility deficit, etc. The ethical aspects of epistemic conduct are also rarely considered. And this is one of the main repercussions of epistemic injustice. Global development programs and policies devised within large multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, UN and others are epistemically dependent on types of knowledge which has led to injustices. As I wrote in Chapter Two the production of knowledge is confined to the professionals of these institutions but also to their peers, other powerful and dominant economists. The type of knowledge evident that is credited and legitimized by each one of them, however, is completely divorced

from the reality of poorer people in less advantaged countries. Consider the displacement of millions as a result of dam building.[32] The decisions to build dams in the presence of other viable alternatives are indicative of a process whereby decisions are made based on a certain type of knowledge. This type of knowledge has proven to be inadequate and inappropriate. Of course, there are also social and political issues which also come into effect here. But this only highlights the need to broaden the way we think about global development today. In the next section I offer three examples of epistemic injustice in the practice of development, particularly in regard to NTD.

Practical issues: an example

The practice of development incorporates many stakeholders: multilateral agencies, national governments, corporations, international and national Non-Government organizations and community based organizations. Epistemic injustice occurs at different levels: between multilateral agencies and national governments in the case of structural adjustment programs; national governments as bilateral donors to other governments or NGOs; between international NGOs and national NGOs and between any of these former entities and community-based organizations. Of course, one can talk about different degrees of epistemic injustice. It happens as testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory injustice and using the case of Chagas Disease, I offer three examples to exemplify this.

The first is testimonial injustice which is pervasive in development. It happens all the time in the field and in the offices of national and international development organizations. Testimonial injustice as described by Fricker is concerned with the practice of testimony, so involves the speaker but also the individual spoken to. Anderson extends this notion of injustice to one which is more group based. I discuss both. Testimonial injustice happens in the field between community members and NGO

[32]A review carried out by the World Bank, "admits that the vast majority of women, men and children evicted by Bank-funded projects never regained their former incomes nor received any direct benefit from the dams for which they were forced to sacrifice." http://www.whirledbank.org/environment/dams.html. Retrieved, March 31, 2014

workers. Credibility deficit, that is when the speaker earns less credibility occurs between indigenous communities and local and international NGOs. Poor, illiterate indigenous women are credited less than development professionals working within a national or international NGO. On the other hand, credibility excess is showered on those working in international NGOs, especially if they are foreigners. It also happens when the knowledge of indigenous peoples is not credited or valued (but mostly ignored) by corporations or international agencies but does not end there. Prejudicial stereotypes are a significant cause of testimonial injustice.

Testimonial injustice in the form of credibility excess also happens when development professionals visit poorer countries for a few days and believe they 'understand' the situation of the other, and therefore base their decisions on this experience. Nancy Tuana says the following, "Loving ignorance, like loving perception involves the realization that although much experience can be shared there will always be experiences that cannot. Alterity is not something we attempt to remove; difference is not something that we can arrogate" (2006,16). So, rather than development professionals believing they know what it is like for a mother whose children go to bed hungry every night, or who has to walk miles every day to fetch two pails of water; or even bury her children due to malnutrition, would it not be better to accept that there are some experiences we will never know?

Testimonial injustice is systematic, it is not produced by a single form of prejudice but is embedded within the social structure. So, the fact that you a poor, illiterate, indigenous woman from a rural community in Bolivia greatly heightens your propensity to suffer from testimonial injustice. I use the example of NTD as a form of testimonial injustice more akin to Anderson's understanding of testimonial injustice for its structural nature. However, testimonial injustice as a result of prejudicial stereotypes is also a problem. In Bolivia, there is no absence of racism, it is more implicit but it does exist.

Rural indigenous people are marginalized incessantly and negative terms are often used to describe them by other Bolivians.[33]

The three causes Anderson discusses are: credibility markers; ethnocentrism and the shared reality bias. Credibility markers in the case of Chagas designate credible knowers as the scientists who research Chagas and the pharmaceutical companies which produce and distribute the drugs for the treatment of the disease. First, this provides only one type of knowledge and second, provides a very narrow understanding of the problem of Chagas Disease. As I discussed in Chapter Two a principal cause which has contributed to the perpetuation of NTD is the way it has been confined to a medical problem, ignoring the social, political, economic and cultural factors. Only the expertise of these researchers is sought. The second cause is ethnocentrism. It is of no coincidence that NTD are primarily found in the poorer countries in the world, yet, most decisions about the global health programs are made in the richer countries. Decisions which are based on the perspectives and knowledge of those in richer countries about the lives and problems of those in different cultures. This not only happens in the large multilateral institutions such as the UN, WHO, etc. but also within International NGOs. The third cause is the shared reality bias, where the perspectives of a certain group such as the international community are insulated from those who are systematically disadvantaged. This, as Anderson says need not be pernicious, in some cases it can foster solidarity and cooperation. But in this case it is pernicious – it become evident at congresses, conferences, meetings, and forth. It is where international players such as those who work for multilateral and bilateral agencies, international NGOs and others share their perspectives and biases converge.

The way that Chagas is understood primarily as a health problem shows how it has been misunderstood and misinterpreted over the years. One of my main criticisms in regard to Chagas is the inadequate and insufficient response to the disease by the international community. This is a form of hermeneutical injustice. Chagas Disease belongs to a group of 17 diseases classified as NTD that blight

[33] Bolivia now has an Aymaran president so this situation may have improved over the years (I hope so!).

the lives of more than a billion people worldwide. Many of these NTD have been around for thousands of years. Not surprisingly, NTD are found in poor countries, among the poorer and most vulnerable sectors of that country. The fact that the poorer sectors are mainly affected by Chagas makes their social position 'one of unequal hermeneutical participation' (Fricker, 2007,152).

This is a form of hermeneutical injustice for the way NTD have been neglected over and over again within debates of global development. The problem of NTD is the persistent way in which these diseases have been ignored over the years. They are left off the research agendas of pharmaceutical companies. They do not fit into the social imaginary of those in privileged positions. NTD is an example of hermeneutical injustice for the way it provides a description of how power relations and privilege such as those exercised by large multilateral agencies such as the WB, UN and the WHO dictate global health problems. The social experience of the *campesinos* living with Chagas is obscured from the collective understanding of those making the decisions.

NTD are also a form of contributory injustice, for the way a willful hermeneutical ignorance is apparent on the part of those working in the development sector about the whole existence of Chagas and other NTD. Their causes, the way these diseases are perceived, how they are addressed and so forth. An active ignorance exists among those in decision-making contexts, those working in global health and development organizations or government ministries. Just not knowing, or not willing to know the extent of NTD. Another example of contributory injustice is the cholera epidemic in Haiti and the UN's response. There is substantial evidence to support the fact that cholera came to Haiti by one of the Nepalese soldiers as members of the UN peacekeeping force. Since October, 2010 some 8,000 Haitians have died and 646,000 have become ill due to cholera. The virulence of the disease and the high mortality and morbidity rates has only been aided by the existence of deplorable water and sanitation facilities within those populations where the disease has been found, not least in the UN camps. The UN has rejected any claim of responsibility to offer compensation to victims and their families. Ban Ki Moon, Secretary General of the UN justifies this position for the diplomatic immunity of the UN. Louise

McIvers, Senior health and policy adviser at Partners in Health says, "The United Nations has a moral, if not legal obligation to help solve a crisis it inadvertently helped start" (2013). It is an example of contributory injustice for the way the UN represented by its staff, demonstrate a form of willful hermeneutical ignorance. The state of social knowledge is altered by the use and maintenance of structurally prejudiced hermeneutical resources. Pohlhaus says, "when judging situations in areas where one has little experience one would do well to suspect that one's perception may be distorted" (2011, 18).

Working toward epistemic justice

For Santos, to achieve cognitive or epistemic justice we need to have an "ecology of knowledges." Pluralist forms of knowledges coming from different worldviews. Social movements constitute many of these other forms of knowledge. Thus strengthening and empowering social movements is a plausible move. But, I would not begin there. The work of feminist epistemologists has identified certain aspects of knowledge as problems to be addressed, such as testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory injustice. Fricker also talks about the importance of epistemic virtues: intellectual and ethical, such as humility and responsibility. However, we saw that this is insufficient; if we consider that an underlying problem of epistemic injustice is the latter's structural form. This will require a structural solution: institutional reforms at a global level. How can these reforms be motivated in the face of competing political and national interests?

Currently, there is much discussion within the development field about the post-2015 agenda, since the Millennium Development Goals reach their deadline in 2015. Without entering into an analysis about the extent of their achievement, suffice to say that as a global society we have a long way to go in light of global affluence and powerful institutions before we can acknowledge that the majority (if not) all children, women and men on this global can deem to be living some sort of "fulfilling life" or what Henry Shue would consider fulfilling subsistence rights as basic rights (1980). Rather, I offer a caveat. The post-2015 development agenda has constituted a process whereby many voices around the world have come together to discuss what happens after 2015. This is commendable, since in a way it reflects

"the ecology of knowledges" Santos refers to. However, I would argue that more importantly there is an urgent need to enter into a critical analysis and reflection of the actual situation. Certain questions need further scrutiny. What have been some of the obstacles to reaching the MDGs? Should we be talking about individual and collective responsibility as a fundamental norm? What in my view is urgent is a better understanding on the part of everyone involved or implicated in global development of the flagrant injustices and inequities which confront us on daily basis. We need a better understanding of how testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory injustice play out in the practice, in the reality of the lives of those development is aimed at. Without this period of critical reflexivity, we become pawns of a global system destined for failure.

Anderson does provide us with some ideas on how to address these structural injustices. First, at the scale of individuals and institutions, epistemic virtue is a requirement. This epistemic virtue can be understood as one's obligation and responsibility to not 'know well' but to know within an ethical framework which allows one to identify epistemic actions that are both harmful and wrongful. One structural remedy is group integration, this necessarily needs to become a virtue of epistemic institutions. In the case of development practice, this would demand the equal hermeneutical participation of all.

If we think back to the three causes of epistemic injustice that Anderson talks about this will help in thinking about how to address them. To avoid the use and exploitation of credibility markers, first an understanding needs to take place among all concerned about what this actually means, why and how it happens. This shared inquiry can lead to the production of a shared reality. Ethnocentrism can be addressed by an increased understanding and awareness of those with the most propensities to commit ethnocentric acts. This is difficult given that, "Reflection which lies at the core of testimonial justice, is cognitively taxing and impossible to keep up in an environment that demand rapid responses" (Anderson, 2012, 168). But on a more positive note, there are steps to be taken by those in more powerful situations that can begin the process. According to Pohlhaus, " The dominantly situated knower cannot

step outside of her situatedness in order to experience the world as others do; however, she can learn to use epistemic resources developed from the experiences of marginalized knowers," (2011, 7). We learn to use these epistemic resources from listening, from learning from and with marginalized knowers and with epistemic humility.

The focus needs to be on mitigating epistemic injustice, and this can be facilitated by considering such an idea as a component of a strong ethical approach. Recall that the other components include a feminist standpoint, ethical praxis and political responsibility. This does imply the bringing together of ethical and epistemic issues, or rather a form of thinking that denotes epistemic injustice as an ethical problem. However, this may be one way of addressing it.

Conclusion

I have presented both Santos' concept of cognitive justice and the concept of epistemic injustice analyzed in feminist epistemology. Santos offers a critique of our globalized world which is calling out for change – this call is coming from the social movements scattered all over the globe, north and south. This has dire consequences for the theory and practice of global development. Santos's thinking on cognitive justice echoes issues in the feminist discussion of epistemic justice; there is much to gain from bringing these concepts together in a synergistic way. One of the main contributions that Santos's project can make to feminist epistemology is the awareness that work on cognitive/epistemic justice is crucial for work on global justice and global development for that matter. Providing critical readings on the epistemological foundations of global justice can fill the lacunae which are missing from the philosophical work on global justice. Strong objectivity, situated knowledge, testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory justice, epistemic agency and the epistemology of ignorance are all sub-themes developed in feminist work which could greatly help in understanding the injustices taking place at a global level, particularly in the practice of global development. It seems that melding the two would also demand the inclusion of voices of those which need to be represented, those who are the oppressed, the

dominated, and the marginalized. I think that while feminist epistemologists are aware of this, they are still not very good at achieving this project.

Feminist epistemology contributes to Santos's project, through the former's intellectual rigor. Feminist epistemology can provide the knowledge necessary to build on the concept of cognitive justice, and assist in constructing the *ecology of knowledges* Santos talks about. Feminist epistemology also provides a more in-depth analysis of the gender imbalances evident in our society as well as those of other subordinate groups. The work of Fricker and others brings forth the importance of an ethical dimension to work in knowledge. And the epistemology of ignorance is becoming an increasingly important area within feminist epistemology for the way it analyses the links between oppression and knowledge production; the way conceptions and assumptions can foster white privilege but also white ignorance. Both of these areas can provide a substantive contribution to Santos's project, but more importantly to the theory and practice of global development. And since the problem is also structural, this requires change at a higher, more complex and complicated level. A first step towards change here is rooted in epistemic issues, and particularly, the epistemology of knowledge production, the need for a greater understanding of what we ought to know, and how we should develop better knowledge practices.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and rethinking the theory and practice of global development

As I wrote in the introduction, Thomas Pogge believes that philosophers can bring to light what really matters, by working through a problem making evident its importance. I hope I have done justice to this in this piece of work. I also believe that philosophers can make a very valuable contribution to the theory and practice of global development, but this will require some effort on their part to leave the ivory tower and come down to the ground. [34] Coming to the end of this dissertation I can accept that to be able to generate real change within the current development structure – we need to work within and outside the system. Working outside as Lorde and Esteva claim is definitely necessary, but I think it is as equally necessary to generate a critical reflexivity within the development schema, both at an institutional level, or if you like policy level but also at an individual level. I believe that it is only when we have a better understanding of any situation can we then think more clearly and collectively of the best path forward.

In Chapter One I began with an interpretation of global development through my eyes, as someone who has worked in global development for many years. It was important to begin with the practice, since development in the context used throughout the dissertation is very much grounded in the practice. It is what happens in the rural villages of Kenya, the offices of the NGO in La Paz, Bolivia, but also in the air-conditioned offices of the WB and UN in Washington D.C. and New York respectively. The practice of development is thwarted with complexity for the social hierarchy of the development paradigm. An interminable number of organizations and institutions, both public and private, from the powerful to the powerless are embroiled in the business of development. Any analysis of development needs to take into consideration the power dynamics inherent within this framework.

Too many development projects which have been planned consuming both human and economic resources continue to produce minimal results or fail – and do not necessarily address some of the

[34] I am not claiming that all philosophers should do this, but those who specifically choose to work on issues of global and development ethics.

structural issues which perpetuate the meagre existence of some, such as the global economic order, post-colonialism, global inequity, hegemonic forces between richer and poorer countries, etc. There is also a desperate need for an ethical analysis and action in regard to the value of all human lives – not just those deemed to have more worth than others but ALL, irrespective of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, disability and more.

I offered the example of cholera as a failure of development, because of the way it makes present its ugly face among the most poor and unequal societies. The fact that people today are dying from cholera in any country is a moral failing on the part of individuals and institutions. One hundred and sixty years ago John Snow showed that basic water and sanitation facilities could easily prevent the onset of cholera. What the incidence of cholera in any country shows, is that despite water and sanitation facilities being the most effective solution, this cannot happen without the political will and responsibility of the state. Dr. Charles Almazar, a physician and Director of the new Partners in Health hospital in Haiti says, "Haiti has been struggling to provide clean water to its citizens since its independence in 1804" (Almazar, 2013). Haiti may not be the best example to use because of its convoluted history of military coups, weak governments and international intervention. Noam Chomsky says this about Haiti, "Probably the richest colony in the world the source of much of France's wealth. By 1789, it was producing 75% of the world's sugar and was the world leader in the production of cotton," (2010, 7). It is now the poorest country in Latin America. Despite the complicated history and situation in Haiti, 9 billion dollars in promised aid after the earthquake in 2010 has yet to arrive or has not been utilized in the most effective way due to a weakness in the coordination of development organizations amidst other reasons. Also, it is in these types of situations where the hegemonic forces of institutions like the UN become visible. I argue that if we are seeking change then it needs to begin from these high level institutions. More accountability and responsibility, political, legal and moral is called for.

Development is a western construct entrenched in a way of thinking that equates development with material wealth, with tangible outcomes such as the level of income. Over the years we have seen

the concept evolve to one which now includes more qualitative dimensions such as well-being and levels of happiness, yet within a paradigm of western ideals and values. However, I can't help but think that for any revolutionary process to take place this will require an understanding of the actual situation: the interrelationality and interdependence of peoples and countries; the alienation and marginalization of certain groups of the society; power struggles; unequal distribution and many more.

Development has a normative dimension which is often ignored or taken lightly. Giving more value to this dimension would in fact, make many come to the realization that what this would entail is actually not happening to the extent it should. But what a normative dimension can also do is help identify some of the root causes of the structural problems such as poverty and hunger which are used to justify the existence of development. To do this I have proposed a non-idealized approach to development which departs from the poor and the hungry, the oppressed and the marginalized. Thinking through why there are so many people in extreme poverty. It does not totally ignore what ideal we should be aspiring to but does emphasize the value of understanding the context with which an ideal is set.

There are many critics of development which have become recognized as post –development or anti-development theorists. Their criticism is based on a western ideology of progress – they refute it. For them, development is only redolent of a form of politics which is imperial and neo-colonial. It is by no coincidence that critical discourses emanating from the countries of the periphery are usually ignored or given little credibility. Some post-development theorists have acknowledged that a dimension of development theory and practice often overlooked is epistemological. Development is a fundament of one type of knowledge system, a western one. New knowledges need to be sought and included. There is also a growing awareness among development critics that economic prosperity and ecological harmony are not necessarily coherent with each other. The growing fragility of our earth requires sensible thinking and prudent action.

Feminism as a theory and as a practice is crucial to any discussion and analysis related to development and post-development. Any struggle within a framework of global justice necessarily needs to incorporate feminism. The role of women in development discourse has undergone a steady progress from being objects of study to actual subjects with distinct ideals, values, traditions, beliefs and so forth. One of the most salient features of feminist post-development critique is the need not to view women as a homogenous group. Women from different parts of the world have differing needs, lives, wants and thoughts. A feminist perspective necessarily needs to incorporate this heterogeneity. Despite advances made in regard to gender and development, not enough have been able to influence development planning sufficiently. To be able to address and understand gender inequities it is necessary to understand the social, political and cultural implications of the global capitalist framework.

In Chapter Two I consider NTD and in particular Chagas Disease as an example that reflects how development has inadequately addressed this problem. Many of the NTD are considered ancient diseases since their existence has been traced back to the early writings of the Bible, Talmud and Hippocrates. Millions of people die from these diseases every year or suffer from chronic pain, illness or disability. I argue that the way the problem of NTD has been addressed is too narrow. There is an assumption that by investing more money in research or the production of drugs, that this alone will reduce the global burden of disease. This is not so. The problem of NTD requires a deeper analysis of the existence of poverty. The 'neglect' in the term NTD goes beyond the disease process. We need to begin to talk about neglected people.

Thomas Pogge attributes the causes and extent of global poverty to the global institutional order. If NTD are to be considered within a causal relationship of global poverty then we can conclude that the persistence of NTD is also attributable to the global institutional order. Therefore, the problem of NTD is not confined to one nation, nor is it purely attributable to a weak state. In this chapter I also discuss how the persistence of NTD can be understood as a form of violence. I use the notion of structural violence as a form of violence which is indirect, is not visible for its embeddedness within the social structure of our

society. The fact that NTD predominantly affect the poorer sections of any society, and how these sectors are often marginalized leads to the violation of their social and economic rights. These silenced populations render it easy for institutions and governments to ignore them. It is necessary to undergo an analysis which leads us to consider the breadth and depth of NTD within this context.

Another way to think about NTD is through the eyes of Iris Marion Young who argues for a definition of justice which is structural in nature. This does not preclude the idea that the injustice which is evident is not resultant of distributive injustice such as the unequal distribution of health resources, but does imply that the analysis needs to go beyond distributive justice. She is more concerned with the five faces of oppression such as exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Included in any analysis of NTD must be a cultural dimension – an understanding of what NTD signify for the population affected. For example, in Bolivia I noted that *campesinos* consider *vinchucas* as a sign of fertility of their livestock. They are not so keen to eliminate the presence of *vinchucas* for this symbolic meaning. And where I do not think it is propitious to accept this type of knowledge as sacrosanct, I do think it is essential that development professionals and agencies have a better understanding of these cultural idiosyncrasies to then consider possible steps forward.

The role of the WTO and other multilateral organizations was discussed for the way these organizations have contributed to the persistence of these NTD, as a result of policies emanating from these groups. Global Development policies reflect the global economic order; these are tainted with asymmetrical power dynamics, and regurgitated policies that favor richer countries. Many smaller development organizations, both international and national are pressured to comply with a system which only perpetuates it. The absence of a critical reflexivity among these organizations allows for this. The way NTD are currently addressed is consistent with the way they are perceived, as a health problem. This I argue is inadequate. The prevention and treatment of Chagas disease and other NTD requires a much more integrated approach, it demands an approach which addresses poverty.

There is very little written about the ethical aspects of NTD. This needs to change. I used Henry Shue's expression, "Holocaust of neglect" which he used to describe the millions dying from starvation in Asia at the same time that Jews were being killed during the Holocaust. The same question needs to be asked about NTD. Why a holocaust of neglect has been allowed to happen and why these appalling tragedies and prolonged undeserved suffering have gone virtually unnoticed in the global development community. NTD are a social disaster – they afflict many but receive very little attention. There is an urgent need for a deeper understanding of the ethical issues surrounding NTD by policymakers and development professionals. In the final section of the chapter I introduce the idea that understanding the problem of NTD also requires an epistemological dimension. This requires an analysis of knowledge by way of its production, its sources and forms of credibility.

In Chapter Three I do two things. First, I argue for the need for an ethical approach to development, and second I propose a strong ethical approach based on the premise that the current ethical approach in development is latent and rather weak. I construct a strong ethical approach based on the work of Denis Goulet, Thomas Pogge, Stephen Esquith, Jane Addams and Paul Farmer. The need for ethics arises at two levels. First at the level of institutions or what we can identify as the ethics of development; and second, at the level of everyday working practices of those working in development, ethics and development. The first theorist I turn to is Denis Goulet who argued that development needed to be thrust into the arena of moral debate. That was 40 years ago! One of the most significant features of Goulet's work is the type of ethics needed for development. It could not be a purely abstract one. The type of ethics which development needs is both critical and practical. A second one is the need for development scholars and practitioners to understand the "shock of underdevelopment." We cannot really understand the plight of people merely by observation. It requires a process of critical reflection, experience and understanding.

David Crocker argues for the need to consider abstract ethical principles as well. And where I agree with Crocker here, I also argue that this rarely happens in the field. It primarily takes place among

philosophers confined to the academic realm. An authentic type of development ethics requires philosophers and others to engage abstract principles in the practice. Relegating the sub-discipline of development ethics to philosophers in theory only, and the practice to development professionals who are primarily social scientist produces a risk that ethics is not only succumbed to a lessened intellectual rigor but is also given a diluted reductionist view. I argue that it is of the utmost importance that philosophers actively engage in development ethics.

In the face of global disparities as individuals we need to assume our global obligations and responsibilities. Thomas Pogge considers that the notion that we are moral people, caring about our moral responsibilities is in fact very weak. Although his critique of global poverty places an unjust global economic order as its primary cause he also argues for the need for individuals – particularly those of us in richer countries to be more responsible. I extend this notion of responsibility to those in poorer countries as well, particularly political elites and other members of the ruling class. I also argue that those working in development need to be cognizant of their political responsibilities claiming that they hold a special type of responsibility based on the nature of their work. Stephen Esquith discusses the political responsibilities of those working in institutions and the need for a greater awareness and understanding of the benefits they receive as a result of the injustices of others. He argues for the need for a process of democratic political education and claims that one way this can happen is through cultural reenactments and layers of interpretations. I express the need for this process of democratic political education to be introduced into the working practices of development institutions and organizations on a continuous basis. One cannot ignore the pretentiousness of global institutions and NGOs, nor the sense of false consciousness that is common.

I incorporate Jane Addams for her work on social ethics which moves away from a focus on the individual. This form of social ethics begins with an awareness of the interdependence we have with each other, and the importance of mutual cooperation and responsibility. Other tenets of her theory include reciprocity and sympathetic understanding which I would argue is more akin to empathetic

understanding. I consider Addams' work crucial for development ethics for the emphasis she places on experience, especially the need for a greater understanding and acceptance of the experience of the "other." But Addams is also cognizant of the fallibility of human understanding and advocates for the need to constantly reflect upon and even revise our own beliefs, values and their limitations- not to impose our own assumption, values or even experiences. The depth of misunderstanding and its pernicious effect cannot be emphasized enough.

The last thinker I include in this chapter is Paul Farmer. He is very helpful in the construction of a more robust account of a strong ethical approach. I consider three coinciding issues with Farmer's critical analysis of medical ethics. The abstraction of ethics, the fact that development ethics remains predominantly a phenomenon of the richer countries and it continues to be dominated by experts. Farmer emphasizes the importance of global health equity to which I have broadened to global equity and pragmatic solidarity.

At this stage of the chapter it was deemed important to consider a critical response to western dominated concepts of development by introducing an alternative vision from Latin America. In 2009 in the rewriting of their new constitution Bolivia adopted the strategy of *buen vivir* or the good life. This idea is firmly engrained in the *cosmovision andina* which denotes the particularities of Andean culture. It offers an understanding of the ontology of Andean existence. I include this here for the different understanding of development it expresses. However, I also think it is important to critically evaluate these concepts in an attempt to move away from patriarchal and homophobic ideals.

A strong ethical approach to development includes the following components: feminist standpoint theory, an ethical praxis which is practice driven; the exercising of political responsibilities and working towards the mitigation of epistemic injustice. The approach needs to begin from the problems on the ground departing from the lives of the marginalized. A critical analysis of the development process needs to be an integral part of the operations of any government, institution, NGO, community based organization or social movement working in global development. The analysis of

problems such as NTD needs to depart from a broad framework. The collective responsibilities of institutions, but also the individual responsibilities of those working within the institution need to be made more visible and confronted. This implies the need for more stringent notions of accountability and mechanisms implemented to monitor this accountability.

Underlying principles of this practice driven theory include empathetic understanding and reciprocity, pragmatic solidarity and working towards global equity. Finally, I argue that for a strong ethical approach to be successful will necessarily require the active involvement of philosophers. It is not enough that philosophical thinking be instilled into development but philosophers need to become engaged in the theory and practice of development. But in a way that is not moralistic and thus patronizing. This can and does isolate philosophers. Ultimately, philosophers have a moral obligation and responsibility to contribute to the problems of global development, but in a way which is helpful.

In Chapter Four, the second focus of my dissertation is discussed, the epistemology of knowledge production. One of the fundamental problems of development theory and practice is grounded in the limitation in the theoretical discussions of knowledge, and how this knowledge is then applied in the practice. What I offer is an analysis of the notion of epistemic justice based on the claim that global development is epistemically unjust. Addressing epistemic justice is also a component of a strong ethical approach I am proposing. The epistemology of knowledge production as presented here emphasizes its normative role. It not only describes the current practices of knowledge production, but also tries to understand how one ought to know, and contemplate how one can improve one's own knowledge production.

In my analysis I bring together Boaventura de Sousa Santos' notion of cognitive justice and Miranda Frickers' and others concept of epistemic injustice to produce a more robust concept. Santos argues for the need for another type of epistemology. His critique is based on western thought and the need to supplant this dominant monocultural paradigm with an ecology of knowledges. Social movements which have arisen as a form of resistance can be seen as expressions of alternative forms of

knowledge. And this is where Santos sees the need for cognitive justice where alternative forms of knowledge are given the same credibility as more formal forms of scientific and academic knowledge. The new epistemology Santos is arguing for is one that derives from the south. A western understanding of the world is not broad enough There are four steps to build an epistemology of the south. These are: a sociology of absences, sociology of emergences, ecology of knowledges, and intercultural translation. However, I argued that even though social movements present the potential for an alternative form of knowledge, we cannot ignore epistemic injustices that occur within these, such as power asymmetries, testimonial and hermeneutical injustice.

Santos work is compared to the analogous projects of feminist epistemology. Both originate from a critical response to an unsatisfactory and undesirable condition of a dominant paradigm in both science and philosophy. Miranda Fricker in her work exposes some of our moral and epistemic assumptions which influence how we constitute what is knowledge, but also reveals the ethical dimension of epistemic practices. She also offers an understanding of oppression which is epistemic – this form of oppression is pervasive in global development. She introduces two forms of epistemic injustice, testimonial and hermeneutical. Testimonial injustice takes place when a deflated credibility is given to a speaker by the hearer as a result of prejudice. A significant feature of this type of injustice is that it is systematic. It is embedded within the diverse dimensions of a social structure and is closely linked to social identity or what Fricker calls *identity prejudice*.

The second form is hermeneutical injustice which provides a description of how power relations and privilege influence interpretations and understandings which are socially embedded. This form of epistemic injustice is reflective of the social situation of marginalized individuals and groups within society based on gender, race and other social categories. It allows us to identify a hermeneutical marginalization that indicates the subjugation and exclusion of these groups.

A number of feminist epistemologists have criticized Fricker claiming that her account is not adequate for breaking down some of the social constructs endemic to our societies. Elizabeth Anderson

argues that epistemic injustice is primarily a structural problem so demands a structural solution. Epistemic virtues which Fricker suggests will mitigate or prevent epistemic injustice are not enough. Anderson also argues that we must consider other ways than just prejudice by which credibility can be denied. She offers three other causes: differential access to markers of credibility; ethnocentrism and the shared reality bias.

Kristie Dotson introduces a third type of epistemic injustice: contributory injustice. This form of injustice is caused by the situated ignorance of an epistemic agent recognized as willful hermeneutical ignorance. Dotson argues that compromising the epistemic agency of one not only damages the individual knower but also the condition of social knowledge. She says that there are various sets of collective hermeneutical resources; our knowledge is not derived from the same hermeneutical resources. According to Dotson, Fricker's hermeneutical marginalization does not emphasize the role power plays in obscuring some hermeneutical resources. Epistemic frameworks both obscure and illuminate epistemic differences. We choose not to recognize these differences due to a willful form of ignorance. Dotson also argues that although it may be impossible to eliminate epistemic oppression we can definitely work towards mitigating it. This, although difficult is facilitated in the presence of trust. It also "requires a kind of embodied engagement that extends beyond conversation and dialogue." This embodied engagement is what I consider to be essential for shifting the development paradigm.

I also consider three differences between Santos' project and that of feminist epistemologists. First, Santos' project has a much broader focus for the way he talks about global social movements and a pluralist understanding of knowledge. Santos defends the role cognitive justice plays towards the achievement of global justice, however does not expand on this enough. The focus of feminist epistemology does not have a global reach but what it does provide is a more intellectually rigorous challenge to Santos'. This, I argue is the second difference , standpoint epistemology and strong objectivity as presented by Sandra Harding, as well as Lorraine Code's work on subjectivity.

In the last sections of this chapter I provide a description of how global development is epistemically unjust. Frist, I consider the theory and argue this is where it begins. A principal way global development is epistemically unjust is conceptually. It is based on a certain epistemology embedded within a particular social imaginary. This usually means the exclusion of other epistemologies such as those from other cultures. The dimension of power within an epistemic landscape is not often thought of – this needs to change. Global development programs and policies are epistemically dependent on types of knowledge which lead to injustices.

The second way I analyze epistemic injustice in global development is through its practice. Using NTD as a case study I offer three examples to exemplify how this happens as testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory injustice. Testimonial injustice takes place as credibility deficit and credibility excess between the different levels on the social hierarchy of the development paradigm. I use NTD as an example of hermeneutical injustice for the way NTD have been neglected repeatedly within debates of global development. It is a form of contributory injustice for the willful hermeneutical ignorance that is present on the part of development organizations. I also offer the cholera epidemic in Haiti as another example of contributory injustice. The UN represented by its staff demonstrates a form of willful hermeneutical ignorance. There is substantial scientific evidence to support the fact that cholera came to Haiti via one of the soldiers as members of the UN peacekeeping force. Through the use and abuse of the power they exercise, they choose not to accept the knowledge that the UN should assume some form of responsibility. Rather, they willfully ignore it.

Finally, I consider the requirements needed for working towards epistemic justice in global development. These include: a pluralist form of knowledge; the strengthening and empowering of social movements. But a prior step is needed, a better understanding of how testimonial, hermeneutical and contributory injustice play out in the practice. This comes back to a normative role of knowledge production. What we ought to know and how we should develop better knowledge practices. Other ways for mitigating epistemic injustice include the promotion of group integration and shared inquiry.

The objective is to obtain hermeneutical participation for all. Addressing epistemic injustice as a component of a strong ethical approach I am proposing also broadens the possibility to enhance critical analysis and reflection – however taxing it could be.

Some concluding thoughts

I do believe we are at an opportune time as the target for the Millennium Development Goals gets closer(or maybe we are too late!). More critical analysis and reflection is urgently required by leading policy-makers, development managers and professionals in general, as well as those representing social movements. Ultimately, what I hope to have achieved is to create some disquietude among development professionals, policy makers, executive managers, etc., not necessarily enough to want to pursue PhDs in philosophy but enough to encourage some critical thought and reflexivity of their practice. My one hope is to kindle the desire to grasp a greater understanding of the need to use new tools to dismantle the master's house but also to understand and accept that we all have political responsibilities. We cannot remain complacent about the impasse global development has reached. As much as the emphasis of my work is in the structural, I also think what we, as individuals, whether as a policy-maker, development worker, social scientist, or philosopher do in the everyday practice of our work can also have some profound effects.

Throughout the writing of this I have identified certain areas which require further inquiry. More needs to be said about the idea of cognitive justice as an essential component of global justice. The notion of epistemic responsibility as an adjunct to political responsibility is another. A third area of further inquiry is to consider how we motivate people to assume their moral obligations and responsibility. Morality is lightly esteemed to in everyday life and calls for a heightened awareness and practice of morality, but how do we actually do this? I hope that others will continue to ponder and write about these areas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addams, Jane. *Newer Ideals of Peace*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907.

Addams, Jane. *Democracy and Social Ethics*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Alcoff, Linda & Elizabeth Potter, eds. *Feminist Epistemologies*, New York: Routledge, 1993.

Almazar, Charles, Reflecting on the cholera outbreak in Haiti, three years later. http://www.pih.org/blog/reflecting-on-the-cholera-outbreak-in-haiti-three-years-later Retrieved May 1, 2014

Anderson, Elizabeth. Epistemic Justice as a Virtue of Social Institutions, *Social Epistemology*, Vol.26, No.2, April, 2012, 163-173.

Anzaldua, Gloria. *Borderlands, La Frontera*, 3rd edition. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 2007.

Apffel-Marglin, Frederique. *The Spirit of Regeneration: Andean Culture Confronting Western Notions of Development*. London: Zed Books, 1998. Print.

Apffel-Marglin, Frederique and Loyda Sanchez, Developmentalist Feminism and Neocolonialism in *Feminist Post-Development Thought*, Ed. Kriemild Saunders, London: Zed Books, 2002.

Bakan, J. Chapter 2, Business as usual from *The Corporation.* New York: The Free Press, 2004.

Barker, Drucilla K. A seat at the table: feminist economists negotiate development in *Feminist Economics and the World Bank: History, Theory and Policy,* Eds. Edith Kuiper and Drucilla K. Barker . London: Routledge, 2006. Print.

Baru, Sanjay, Mahbub ul Haq and Human Development: A Tribute, Economic and Political Weekly 33/5, (Aug.29-Sep.4, 1998), 2275-2279.

Bernstein, Richard, *Praxis and Action; contemporary philosophies of human activity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.

Bufacchi, Vittorio. *Social Injustice*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Chomsky, Noam. *Hopes and Prospects*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2010. Print.

Coady, David. *What to Believe Now,* Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2012.

Crocker, David. Ethics *of Global Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Crump, Andy. The A to Z of World Development, ed. Wayne Ellwood, Oxford: New Internationalist Publication, 1998.

Code, Lorraine. Taking subjectivity into account. In *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, New York: Routledge, 1993.

Code, Lorraine. Chapter 2, Ecological Naturalism, *Ecological thinking: the politics of epistemic location*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Code, Lorraine. Advocacy, Negotiation, and the Politics of Unknowing, *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 2008a, Vol. XLVI, p.32-51

Code, Lorraine. Book Review of Miranda Fricker's *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing.* Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews, 2008b. http://ndpr.nd.edu/recent-reviews/

CRS Report for Congress, *The WTO, Intellectual Property Rights, and the Access to Medicines Controversy, updated Dec.12, 2006.*

De Rivero, Osvaldo. *The Myth of Development*, New York: Zed Books, 2001.

Dotson, Kristie. "In Search of Tanzania: Are Effective Epistemic Practices Sufficient for Just Epistemic Practices?" *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 2008, Vol. XLVI, 52-64.

Dotson, Kristie. A Cautionary Tale: On Limiting Epistemic Oppression, *Frontiers* 33.1 Jan, 2012, 24-47.

DSW and Policy Cures, *Saving lives and creating impact: EU investment in poverty-related neglected diseases*, 2012.

Escobar, Arturo. Actors, Networks, and New Knowledge Producers, in *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledge for a Decent Life.* Ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, New York: Lexington Books, 2007, 273-294.

Escobar, Arturo and Mauricio Pardo. Social Movements and Biodiversity on the Pacific Coast of Colombia in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, London: Verso, 2008.

Esquith, Stephen L. and Fred Gifford, eds. *Capabilities, power, and institutions: towards a more critical development ethics*, University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

Esquith, Stephen L. *The Political Responsibilities of Everyday Bystanders*, University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press: Pennsylvania, 2010.

Esquith, Stephen L. The political responsibility of bystanders: the case of Mali, *Journal of Global Ethics*, Vol.9:3, 377-387.

Esteva, Gustavo. Development, in *The Development Dictionary*, ed. By Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books Ltd. 1992.

Esteva, Gustavo, Salvatore Babones, and Philipp Babcicky. *The Future of Development: A Radical Manifesto*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2013. Print.

Farmer, Paul. On Suffering and Structural Violence: A View from Below, in *Violence in War and Peace, An Anthology*, eds. Nancy Scheper Hughes and Philippe Bourgois, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Farmer, Paul. *Pathologies of power*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Fricker, Miranda. Epistemic Oppression and Epistemic Privilege, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Supplementary Volume 25/25, 1999, 191-210.

Fricker, Miranda. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Friere, Paolo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Continuum, 1974.

Gasper, Des. *The ethics of development: from economism to human development*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Gasper, Des, Development ethics – Why? What? How? A formulation of the field, *Journal of Global Ethics*, Vol.8 No.1, April 2012, pp.117-135

Gould, Carol. *Globalizing democracy and human rights*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Goulet, Denis, *The Cruel Choice*, New York: Atheneum, 1973.

Goulet, Denis. A New Discipline: Development Ethics, *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 24, No.11, 1997, 1160-71.

Grasswick, Heidi. "Feminist Social Epistemology", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = ‹http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/feminist-social-epistemology/›.

Grillo Fernandez, Eduardo. Development or Decolonisation in the Andes, in *The Spirit of Regeneration*, ed. Frederique Apffel-Marglin, London: Zed Books, 1998.

Gudynas, Eduardo. Buen vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo, *América Latina en movimiento*, No. 462, febrero 2011a.

Gudynas, Eduardo. Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow, *Development*, 2011b, 54 (4), 441-447

Gurtler et al, Sustainable vector control and management of Chagas disease in the Gran Chaco, Argentina. *PNAS*, October 9, 2007. Vol. 104, no.41 16194-16199

Harding, Sandra. Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: "What is Strong Objectivity" in *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, New York: Routledge, 1993.

Harding, Sandra G. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Hartsock, Nancy. The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

High Level Panel Report, http://report.post2015hlp.org/ n.d. retrieved April 28, 2014.

Hotez, Peter J. *Forgotten People , Forgotten Disease*, Washington: ASM Press, 2008

Irwin, Terence and Gail Fine, Aristotle Selections, *Metaphysics*, 1.980a21 , Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co., 1995.

Ivers, Louise C. *A Chance to Right a Wrong in Haiti*, http://www.pih.org/blog/cholera-louise-ivers-ny-times-opinion-editorial?utm_medium=email&utm_source=pih&utm_content=2+-+httpactpihorgoped&utm_campaign=20130228oped_onfy13_email&source=20130228oped_onfy13_email Retrieved 5//1/14.

Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Trumansburg, New York: Crossing Press, 1984. Print.

Malavisi, Anna. A critical analysis of the relationship between southern non-government organizations and northern non-government organizations in Bolivia. Journal of Global Ethics, Vol.6, No.1. April 2010, pp.45-56.

Marx, Karl. The *Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1978.

Mason, Rebecca. Two Kinds of Unknowing, *Hypatia*, Vol. 26, no.2 Spring, 2011,294 -307.

McIver, Louise. New York Times Op-Ed: A Chance to Right a Wrong in Haiti, posted on February 22, 2013. http://www.pih.org/blog/cholera-louise-ivers-ny-times-opinion-editorial?utm_medium=email&utm_source=pih&utm_content=2+-+httpactpihorgoped&utm_campaign=20130228oped_onfy13_email&source=20130228oped_onfy13_email Retrieved March 31, 2014

Medecins San Frontieres, *Fighting neglect*, 2012.

Médicos sin fronteras (2005), http://www.msf.org/msfinternational

Médicos sin fronteras, http://www.msfaccess.org/sites/default/files/MSF_assets/NegDis/Docs/NEGDIS_briefing_Chagas_TimeToBreakSilence_ENG_2009.pdf

Medina, Jose. Hermeneutical Injustice and Polyphonic Contextualism: Social Silences and Shared Hermeneutical Responsibilities, *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 2012, 26:2, 201 – 220.

Medina, Jose. The Relevance of Credibility Excess in a Proportional View of Epistemic Injustice: Differential Epistemic Authority and the Social Imaginary, *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 2011, 25:1, 15 – 35.

Mignolo, Walter. The Splendors and Miseries of "Science". Coloniality, Geopolitics of Knowledge, and Epistemic Pluriversality in *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledge for a Decent Life.* Ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos. New York: Lexington Books, 2007, 375-396.

Mignolo, Walter. The Geopolitics of Knowledge and The Colonial Difference in *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, Eds. Moraña, Mabel, Enrique D. Dussel, and Carlos A. Jáuregui., Durham: Duke University Press, 2008, 225-258.

Miller, David. *National Responsibility and Global Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Miller, Richard. Global Power and Economic Justice in *Global Basic Rights*, ed. Charles R. Beitz and Robert E. Goodin, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Miller, Richard W. *Globalizing Justice: The Ethics of Poverty and Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.

Mills, Charles. "Ideal Theory" as Ideology, *Hypatia*, 2005, 20:3, 165-184.

Mills, Charles. White Ignorance in *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, Ed. Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana, Albany: SUNY Press, 2007.

Mohanty, Chandra. Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, eds. C.Mohanty, A.Russo and L. Torres, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Mohanty, Chandra. "Under Western eyes" revisited: feminist solidarity through anti-capitalist struggles', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28:2, 2002, 417-37.

McCollum, James. Hermeneutical Injustice and the Social Sciences: Development Policy and Positional Objectivity, *Social Epistemology*, Vol 26, No.2, April 2012, 189-200.

Nelson, Michael P. On Doing Helpful Philosophy, *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 2008, 14:611-614.

New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/29/science/spread-of-vhagas-is-cal.....retrieved 12/12/2012

Nussbaum, Martha, *Women and Human Development: A Capabilities Approach*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Online Etymology Dictionary, http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=development&allowed_in_frame=0, retrieved 9/3/13

Oxfam International, Oxfam Briefing Paper, No. 131 *Empty Promises*, 16 July 2009.

Penz, Peter, Jay Drydyk, and Pablo Bose. *Displacement by development: ethics, rights and responsibilities*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Pogge, Thomas. *Freedom from poverty as a human right: who owes what to the very poor*? New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pogge, Thomas. *World poverty and human rights: cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms*, Cambridge: Polity, 2008.

Pogge, Thomas. *Politics as usual*, Cambridge: Polity, 2010.

Pohlhaus, G. Relational knowing and epistemic injustice: Toward a theory of willful hermeneutical ignorance. *Hypatia*-1127 .4 (2011):715-35.

Priest, Graham. What is philosophy? *Philosophy* 81.2 (2006): 189-207.

Priest, Graham. Philosophy and its history. Oxford University Press Blog, http://blog.oup.com/2014/04/philosophy-history/?utm_content=bufferb51c9&utm_medium=, retrieved 9/24/14.

Rai, Shirin M. The history of international development: concepts and contexts in. *The Women, Gender and Development Reader*, eds. Visvanathan, Nalini, Lynn Duggan, and Nancy Wiegersma, New York: Zed Books, 2011.

Sachs, Wolfgang. *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power*. London: Zed Books, 2010. Internet resource.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. Public Sphere and Epistemologies of the South, *Africa Development*, 37/1, 2012, 43-67.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. Ed. *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, London: Verso, 2008.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 'The World Social Forum and the Global Left', *Politics & Society* 36/2, 2008, 247-270.

Santos, Boaventura. ed. *Cognitive Justice in a Global World: Prudent Knowledge for a Decent Life.* New York: Lexington Books, 2007.

Saunders, Kriemild. *Feminist Post-Development Thought: Rethinking Modernity, Post-Colonialism & Representation*. London: Zed, 2002. Print.

Schmitt, Frederick. ed. *Socializing Epistemology*, Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1994.

Schwartzman, Lisa. H. Intuition, Thought Experiments, and Philosophical Method: Feminism and Experimental Philosophy, *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol 43:3, Fall 2012, 307-316.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*, New York: Oxford University Press: 1999.

Shue, Henry. *Basic Rights: subsistence, affluence, and U.S. foreign policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Singer, Peter. *The Life You Can Save*, New York: Random House, 2010.

Snow, John. On the Prevention of Cholera, *Med. Times and Gazette*, n.s. vol.7, Oct.8, 1853, 367-369.

Snow, John. *On the Mode of Communication of Cholera*, London: John Churchill, New Burlington Street, England, 1855.

St. Clair, Asuncion. A Methodologically Pragmatist Approach to Development Ethics, *Journal of Global Ethics*, Vol 3:2 August, 2007 pp.143-164.

Sullivan, Shannon and Nancy Tuana, Eds. *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary, Oxford, sixth edition, edited by J.B Sykes, 1976.

Toulmin, Stephen. "The Recovery of Practical Philosophy," *American Scholar*, 57,3 1988, 337- 352.

Tuana, Nancy. The Speculum of Ignorance: The Women's Health Movement and Epistemologies of Ignorance, *Hypatia*, 21, 2006, 1-19.

Tuana, Nancy, Coming to Understand : Orgasm and the Epistemology of Ignorance, *Hypatia*, Vol. 19, 1 (2004), 194-232.

Tzannatos, Zafiris. Chapter 2, The World Bank, development, adjustment and gender equality in *Feminist Economics and the World Bank*, ed. By Edith Kuiper and Drucilla K. Barker, London: Routledge, 2006.

The Whirled Bank Group, http://www.whirledbank.org/environment/dams.html, retrieved 5/6/2012

Visvanathan, Nalini, Lynn Duggan, Nan Wiegersma and Laurie Nisonoff. Eds. *The women, gender and development reader*, 2nd edition, London: Zed Books, 2011.

Visvanathan, Shiv. An Invitation to a Science War in *Another Knowledge is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, ed. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, London: Verso, 2008.

Wolff, Jonathan. *Ethics and Public Policy: A Philosophical Inquiry*, New York: Routledge, 2011.

World Health Organization. A66/20, 15th March, 2013

World Health Organization. *Chagas Disease: control and elimination*. Report of the Secretariat. November 2008.

Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the politics of difference*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Young, Iris Marion. *Responsibility for justice*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.