It is argued – and generally accepted – that although there has been observed a general willingness to express rhetorical support for a human right to development, there has been observed a related tendency to neglect its basic precepts in development practice. This paper examines the reasons for the gap between rhetoric and reality and then moves on to determine strategies to reduce or indeed bridge this gap, which would in turn contribute to the realization of a full protection to the human right to development.
A Human Right to Development
– Moving Beyond the Rhetoric

Lead Authors: Salma Yusuf and Jennifer Woodham
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A HUMAN RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT - THE CHALLENGES</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EXPLORING THE RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE - THE RHETORIC AND THE REALITY</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. THE UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL AND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FORUM.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MOVING BEYOND THE RHETORIC - MAKING DEVELOPMENT A REALITY</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1. CREATING A UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED DEFINITION</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2. IMPROVING CURRENT DEVELOPMENT MECHANISMS</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. THE REGIONAL LEVEL</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. THE NATIONAL LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1. DEVELOPED STATES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2. DEVELOPING STATES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONCLUDING REMARKS</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ABOUT THE AUTHORS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ABOUT THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF SRI LANKA</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is argued – and generally accepted – that although there has been observed a general willingness to express rhetorical support for a human right to development (RTD), there has been observed a related tendency to ‘neglect its basic precepts in development practice’. Consequently, there exists a significant gulf between the ‘rhetoric’ and the ‘reality’ of development practice. This paper examines the reasons for the gap between rhetoric and reality and then moves on to determine strategies to reduce or indeed bridge this gap, which would in turn contribute to the realization of a full protection to the human right to development.

The current mechanisms for implementing RTD are assessed, and an analysis of the possible approaches to overcome their difficulties is discussed. The conclusion reached is that, in order to move development beyond rhetoric, the current systems need to be given greater authority, and wider mandates. Further, it is observed that the current internationally agreed definition of the right to development needs to be expanded upon, with increased specificity and consensus reached on what the right should entail.

A caveat is in order. It should be borne in mind that ways of advancing the human right to development considered in this paper are not exhaustive. However, it is hoped that the issues addressed will inform the work of practitioners in the development field so that there can be generated a greater momentum towards a full and meaningful human right to development, both nationally and internationally.

---

Attitudes towards the introduction of a human right to development are unusual in that there is a general willingness to support such a right in theory, yet there is less enthusiasm about adopting such a right in practice. This does not mean that states ignore the right to development completely in their policies, but rather that they acknowledge that such a right exists, but tend to attach greater focus on the obligations that it places on other states. There has been observed a reluctance of states to put themselves in a position where they could be held to account for failing to adequately protect the right to development: for developed states this may be because of apprehensions that subscribing to such legally binding obligations will limit their sovereign powers; for developing states the issue may be one of concern of costs associated with implementing the human right to development nationally. This has led to the current situation of a significant gulf between the rhetoric and practice accorded to the right to development.

Development practitioners such as Laure-Hélène Piron have picked up on these issues, arguing that:

a. ‘Northern governments recognise the RTD as a human right. But it is a right of individuals ... not a right of states. States have the primary responsibility for realising the RID’;\(^2\) whereas

b. ‘Non-Aligned Movement countries and China argue that the RTD is a right of states and a collective right of peoples to development ... and that it has an international dimension ... There is an obligation of international cooperation, but it is not just about charity...’\(^3\)

\(^2\) Laure-Hélène Piron, ‘The Right to Development: A Review of the Current State of the Debate for the Department of International Development’, April 2002, p.18. ‘Northern governments’, as defined by Piron, include: all EU states, the US, Canada, South Korea and Japan, as well as Australia and New Zealand.

\(^3\) Ibid, pp.18-19
Although there exists some international cooperation at this level – most notably through the United Nations Development Programme – and developed nations have also taken measures to help to implement the right to development, these differences in opinion have created tensions between the two groups of states.⁴ Further, the differences in opinion have created a dilemma for practitioners who wish to move the human right to development beyond rhetoric and into reality: how to generate consensus between states, and encourage them to engage fully with a human right to development. This paper aims to go some way in addressing this dilemma through an in-depth analysis of the right to development through which solutions are seen to emerge, which in turn will be able to inform the work of development practitioners to move RTD beyond its current barriers.

⁴ See, for example, Marks, supra, note 1, p.139, where it is argued that ‘The United States, joined by several other Western Countries, has been frustrated by what it perceives as the determination of countries in the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) to force their interpretation of this right on what is essentially a group of donor states’
CHAPTER 2
EXPLORING THE HUMAN RIGHT TO DEVELOPMENT

The human right to development is most clearly defined in the 1986 United Nations Declaration, which states that:

‘The right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized.’

This definition is expanded upon by scholars such as Arjun Sengupta, who identifies four key components of the human right to development:

1. ‘The right to development is a human right’;
2. ‘The human right to development is a right to a particular process of development in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized’;
3. ‘The meaning of exercising these rights consistently with freedom implies free, effective and full participation of all the individuals concerned in the decision making and the implementation of the process’; and
4. The human right to development ‘confers unequivocal obligation on duty holders: individuals in the community, states at the national level, and states at the international level’.

Following on from this definition, it is clear that the right to development is intended to be a wide and far-reaching right that is essential to the realisation of other human rights – including those contained within the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights. This interpretation fits squarely with the views of international scholar Amartya Sen, who views development as ‘a

---

5 General Assembly Resolution A/RES/41/128, Article 1(1)
6 Sengupta, ‘The Right to Development as a Human Right’, p.5
process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy’. Such ‘freedoms’ clearly include other human rights. Sen argues that by focusing on development as a means of increasing freedom, the implementation of a right to development will not focus too heavily on individual components of development, such as increasing individual incomes or the Gross Domestic Product. This approach could therefore be useful towards the full realization of the right to development.

Moreover, Sengupta’s definition makes it clear that a duty to protect RTD is placed on all parties concerned, ranging from individuals to the international community. Therefore, in order to bring the right to development fully into reality, it will be necessary to identify the responsibilities of all actors – and to introduce legal mechanisms to ensure successful enforcement and realization of the right.

---

Despite the all-encompassing definition of RTD discussed above, the reality is that the human right to development is a highly controversial and contested concept. This is seen in the work of a number of authors,\(^8\) as well as in the ways RTD is protected in practice. An assessment of the way RTD is presented against the way it is practically applied demonstrates how significant the discrepancies are between RTD-rhetoric and RTD-reality. This would be the first step to determine why this is in fact the case, and how development practitioners could move beyond these challenges.

### 3.1. THE MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The implementation of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) is illustrative of how RTD-rhetoric can be contrasted against RTD-reality. The introduction of these goals can be seen as promoting the right to development, particularly as they recognise that moving people out of poverty requires much more than just money. Targets based on health, education, gender equality and environmental sustainability are included within the MDGs, demonstrating a wide-ranging idea of ‘development’. However, there is an argument to be made that by separating out specific goals from the concept of development more generally, RTD as a whole is weakened. In particular, whilst certain targets relating to components of RTD are set, other components of RTD are largely ignored. An analysis of the application of the MDGs to date will be indicative of the extent to which this is the case.

---

\(^8\) See, for example, Marks, ‘The Human Right to Development: Between Rhetoric and Reality’, where it is argued that whilst RTD has been included in international debate for 30 years, it has yet to be practically implemented; or Sitta, ‘The Role of the Right to Development in the Human Rights framework for Development’, where it is argued that whilst certain aspects of RTD can be agreed upon, there are many different interpretations of how development and human rights relate.
The 2011 Millennium Development Goals Report is useful for assessing the reality behind the MDGs. The Report describes how the international community is achieving its development goals, in the view of the United Nations. It is clear from the report that the United Nation’s assessment of development is very target-focused, and looks specifically at statistics relating to the MDGs; however, the targets are not necessarily focussed on the well-being of the developing world as a whole. Meeting Goal 1, eradication of extreme poverty and hunger, by reaching the target of halving the number of people living on less than $1 a day, is the reported as:

‘Sustained growth in developing countries, particularly in Asia, is keeping the world on track to meet the poverty-reduction target.’

This demonstrates that the international community may meet its targets for Goal 1, without necessarily improving poverty in all areas of the world. For example, improvements in Asia that go above and beyond what is necessary to meet this MDG target may compensate for falling well short of meeting the targets in parts of Africa. Such criticism of the MDGs has also been noted by the likes of Alessandro Sitta, who argues that:

‘If, for example, we have a country with 10 million people living under the poverty line, we can try to reach the goal of halving poverty by progressively improving the general life conditions of all the people, or by sharply improving the conditions of 5 million people running the risk to worsen the life of the other 5 million...’

Indeed, it becomes increasingly apparent from the 2011 Report that the goal of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger may be met by ‘sharply improving the conditions’ of some, rather than ‘progressively improving the life conditions of all’.

---

9 The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011, p.6
10 Sitta, ‘The Role of the Right to Development in the Human Rights Framework for Development’, p.21
The Report makes much of improvements made in China, where poverty is likely to fall to less than five per cent, and India, where poverty is likely to fall to around 22 per cent, which is down from 51 per cent in 1990.\textsuperscript{11} In terms of how the target is being met in sub-Saharan Africa, a prediction that poverty rates will fall to less than 36 per cent is described as being ‘slightly more upbeat than previously estimated’.\textsuperscript{12} It is argued that the World Bank still expects poverty rates to fall below 15 per cent by 2015, ‘indicating that the Millennium Development Goal target can still be met.’\textsuperscript{13} Thus, the concern is not with a failure to meet the target in certain regions of the world; rather, it is with whether the target can be met more generally and sans a wave of selective progress in one region of the globe and at the expense of another.

This does not mean that there is a deliberate lack of concern with meeting the MDG target throughout the world. Indeed, in relation to many of the other MDG targets, there is at least a greater recognition that sub-Saharan Africa is falling behind. For example, in relation to Goal 4 (reducing child mortality) it is stated that:

‘The highest levels of under-five mortality continue to be found in sub-Saharan Africa, where one in eight children die before the age of five ... With rapid progress in other regions, the disparities between them and sub-Saharan Africa have widened.’\textsuperscript{14}

Therefore, there exists recognition at least, of a failing to meet obligations in this region. Additionally, the report engages discussion on what can be done to improve the situation – pointing to the prevention of diarrhoea, malaria and pneumonia in sub-Saharan Africa, and post-natal care in Southern Asia. There is no doubt that if

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} Supra, note 9, p.7
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Ibid
  \item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Ibid, p.25
\end{itemize}
more is done to improve these sectors, child mortality rates in sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia will improve. However, it could be argued that the international community is only interested in taking such action in order to meet its MDG targets overall.\textsuperscript{15} This can be contrasted to Goal 1, where the overall target is likely to be met without particular attention being paid to sub-Saharan Africa. However, it is worth noting that the report discusses the reasons why there are discrepancies with child mortality rates \textit{within} countries, suggesting that there is some concern about this issue, even if it is not directly related to meeting the MDG target.

It is not within the scope of this paper to consider each of the MDGs in depth; however it is worth considering the impact of Goal 8, namely, to develop a global partnership for development, as this goal critically reflects the responsibilities of the international community in realizing and fulfilling the right to development. It is interesting to note, for example, how significantly the international community has failed to meet its commitments with regard to international aid. The 2011 report states that:

‘...when comparing the 2010 outcome with pledges made in 2005, there was a shortfall of $19 billion. A little over $1 billion of this shortfall can be attributed to lower-than-expected levels of gross national income due to the economic crisis. However, the remaining gap - $18 billion – was due to the failure of donors to meet their commitments.’\textsuperscript{16}

This then is a poignant example of a case where there has been rhetoric that supports RTD, with much less willingness to support RTD in practice. Moreover, the report looks at whether the international community is improving access to world

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Ibid.} It is stated that: ‘the MDG target can be reached, but only with substantial and accelerated action to eliminate the leading killers of children’.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid, p.58}
markets by setting up less-restrictive trade agreements with the developing world,\textsuperscript{17} whether the debts of the least developed countries are being dealt with appropriately,\textsuperscript{18} and whether developing countries are being provided access to technology.\textsuperscript{19} All of these place some degree of responsibility on developed countries for helping to achieve RTD in the developing world; however it is arguable that these responsibilities do not go as far as an outright human right to development would — and further there is little action available to take to hold the international community to account when they are not meeting their responsibilities.

Admittedly, whilst the MDGs place some responsibilities on the international community to achieve certain development goals, there is no obligation to support RTD as a whole. In fact, it is possible to meet certain targets overall, without meeting them in large regions: a clear example of rhetoric over reality. Furthermore, the MDGs fall subject to criticisms made by the likes of Sitta, who claims that they ‘are conceived mainly in terms of development outputs [emphasis added], while the RTD paradigm aims to put the same relevance on development outputs and processes [emphasis added].’\textsuperscript{20} Consequently, Sitta argues that the MDG framework fails to recognise the importance of participation in the development process. Moreover, he argues that the MDGs miss out a number of important components of the overall right to development.\textsuperscript{21} This is not to say that the MDGs are not improving development in many areas of the world; however it is probably fair to say that they are not engaging people in the same way as a full human right to development would. In this respect, greater effort is required to move the system beyond mere rhetoric.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, p.60
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p.62
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p.63
\textsuperscript{20} Supra, note 10, p.21
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, pp.21-22
3.2. THE UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL AND THE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION FORUM

The consideration of development issues through the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) is another way in which RTD-rhetoric can be assessed against reality. This is done primarily through the Development Cooperation Forum (DCF), which was set up following the 2005 World Summit. The DCF was originally mandated to:

1) ‘Review trends in international development cooperation, including strategies, policies and financing’;
2) ‘Promote greater coherence among the development activities of different development partners’; and
3) ‘Strengthen the links between the normative and operational work of the United Nations’. 22

This mandate has since been expanded upon by the United Nations' General Assembly. The DCF is now mandated to:

1. ‘Review the trends and progress in international development coordination, and give policy guidance and recommendations to promote more effective international development coordination’; 23
2. ‘Identify gaps and obstacles with a view to make recommendations on practical measures and policy options to enhance coherence and effectiveness and to promote development cooperation for the realization of the internationally agreed development goals, including [the MDGs]’; 24

22 2005 World Summit A/RES/60/1, para.155(b)
23 General Assembly Resolution A/RES/61/16, para.4(a)
24 Ibid, para.4(b)
3. ‘Provide a platform for Member States to exchange lessons learned and share experiences in formulating, supporting and implementing national development strategies,’ and
4. Be ‘open to participation by all stakeholders, including the organizations of the United Nations, the international financial and trade institutions, the regional organizations, civil society and private sector representatives.’

The DCF through ECOSOC therefore provides a mechanism that is useful to contrast to the MDGs in terms of how its development rhetoric is engaged against reality. The two mechanisms work in different ways, although there is clearly some degree of overlap: whilst the MDGs have clearly defined targets, there are no such targets to be enforced for the DCF, and the DCF cannot compel the international community to act in a certain manner. However, unlike the MDGs, the DCF’s mandate is wider – it has the ability to consider more fully all aspects of the human right to development. As with the MDGs, the best way to consider the DCF is by analysing its reports. In this case, the most recent report was published in 2010.

A first glance at the 2010 DCF Report reflects that a much wider concept of ‘development’ is being assessed than that of the MDGs alone. For example, the Official Summary of the ECOSOC President addresses issues that include promoting coherence between the various states and organisations that deal with development, increasing aid and ensuring that aid is made use of effectively, the responsibilities of both providers and recipients of aid, and identifying the best practices for going ‘beyond aid’ in terms of meeting the MDGs. In looking at how to best make use of aid, and how to provide accountability for all parties contributing to the development process, it is evident that the DCF is doing more than simply assessing how far the international community has come in terms of meeting specific targets – it is

---

25 Ibid, para.4(c)
26 Ibid, para.4(d)
27 Report of the 2010 Development Cooperation Forum, pp.4-8
looking beyond actors only, by consideration of the processes involved, giving it the potential to do more for the reality of development than the MDGs. However, the MDGs carry the merit of being legally binding, hence unless the DCF is doing more than simply issuing recommendations that are largely ignored, then it too may be considered only to amount to rhetoric.

One of the advantages that the DCF has over the MDG system is that its reports are able to highlight particular policy issues and provide solutions to the difficulties being experienced. For example, the 2010 Report selects ‘allocating resources among competing needs’ as one such issue.\footnote{Ibid, p.25} It is noted that the global financial crisis means that ‘declines in aid flows in the years ahead can be expected – at exactly the time when the financing needs to achieve the MDGs will become more urgent.’\footnote{Ibid, p.26} It is suggested that the developed world still needs to meet its commitments – and aid to the least developed countries, and most vulnerable groups, needs to be increased most urgently. However it is additionally noted that ‘capacity development’ will enable the recipients of international aid to contribute more to their own development,\footnote{Ibid, p.27} and, additionally, ‘financing gender equality and women’s empowerment’ is considered an integral part of RTD as a whole. It therefore becomes evident that the DCF views RTD as a wide all-encompassing human right, in line with that explored in Sengupta’s definition. The implementation of the DCF’s recommendations could be vital for bringing the RTD-rhetoric into reality.

Clearly, the DCF does much more than the MDGs in terms of looking at development processes. It is also useful in bringing together the international community to discuss development issues, and to learn from each other. However, it is not clear whether the rhetoric of the DCF is passing over into reality. Just as many of the MDGs are not likely to be met, development as a
whole is not progressing as quickly as it could or should. Until there begins to
emerge evidence of the DCF making a sustained contribution to development
in practice, it is best considered to be not more than rhetoric. However, the
value of the DCF as a system should not be dismissed outright since it is a
useful platform that can be strengthened and expanded upon to contribute
towards the full realization of the human right to development.
CHAPTER 4

MOVING BEYOND THE RHETORIC - MAKING DEVELOPMENT A REALITY

The foregoing discussion demonstrates why caution needs to be taken against too great a focus on meeting specified targets since it has led to other aspects of a full human right to development being neglected; however having a system with a considerably broader mandate in relation to RTD will only be effective if it is coupled with enforceability. What is needed then is for practitioners to learn from the mistakes of the current development mechanisms, and to build and improve upon them. Possibilities for translating RTD from rhetoric into reality at national, regional and international levels are considered below.

4.1. THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

4.1.1 CREATING A UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED DEFINITION

The priority for bringing RTD into reality at the international level should be to ensure that a clear and accepted definition of what the human right to development entails, is drawn up. States often disagree about what RTD should require or does in fact require, and it will be near impossible to transcend this right into reality until this difficulty is overcome. Sengupta’s definition of RTD could be used as a starting point for such an endeavour, however it will be necessary to add greater detail to this general definition so as to secure firmer commitments to RTD. The aim of practitioners should be to create as full a definition as practicable, without compromising on the feasibility of achieving widespread acceptance by making it too controversial. Ideally, an agreement as to the rights and responsibilities of all members of the international community should be included: there should be an obligation on recipient states to ensure that human rights and development processes are promoted at the national level, and also an obligation on donor states to uphold their aid commitments, and to ensure that their national and international policies do not hinder RTD overall.
Reaching an agreement on an internationally recognised definition of RTD will be no easy task; however, it is important that practitioners persevere in their aim to achieve this. Arguably, even if only a small number of states can be persuaded to sign up to a definition at first, it can always be made possible for other states to sign up at a later date. The existence of an agreement or a framework for an agreement at the very least in itself will place political pressure on other states to embrace consensus, and will in turn propel the issue of RTD higher up the political agenda.

4.1.2 IMPROVING CURRENT DEVELOPMENT MECHANISMS

There is little doubt that the current international development mechanisms need to be improved upon: the MDGs and ECOSOC do not go far enough to move the right to development into reality on their own. The MDGs are not comprehensive enough at present, and are too strictly target-focused; however ECOSOC does not have the ability to impose the level of accountability on states that is needed to enforce a right to development. Therefore, a stronger and more robust system is needed.

As a result of its already wide mandate, one possible solution is to develop the ECOSOC system further, giving it a level of accountability equivalent to that currently given to the MDGs. It becomes paramount, however, that ECOSOC continues to focus on development processes, rather than simply meeting targets: this will ensure that the shortcomings of the MDG system are averted. Targets introduced should be process-based, rather than results based, therefore neutralising the danger that comes with being able to meet targets with laudable progress in one region, but little progress in another. State reports should focus on whether people living in rural areas have the same access to development as people living in urban areas, and whether the frameworks being put in place are effective.
As with signing states up to a definition of RTD, it will be a challenge to persuade states to make the ECOSOC system stronger and more authoritative. However, even if ECOSOC can only succeed in obtaining greater political influence, this in itself should be regarded as a milestone in the achievement towards the ultimate realization of RTD. If practitioners can highlight the issues brought up by ECOSOC to national governments and international bodies and organisations, this will increase the influence that ECOSOC’s recommendations could exert. In time, such will lead to states following ECOSOC recommendations, even if they have not yet signed up to being legally bound by them.

4.2. THE REGIONAL LEVEL

They have an important role to play in terms of linking international and national action towards achieving a human right to development. As demonstrated in the foregoing discussion, such a collaboration will be critical to the successful promotion of development aims. They can often be more effective than international mechanisms in terms of setting standards, and persuading states to sign up to these standards, only because they have a better understanding of the concerns of states within their region and will not be perceived as being coloured by a ‘Western bias’. The role of regional mechanisms should therefore be to encourage states within their region to promote development, by developing national development policies and programmes.

To improve the current situation, regional mechanisms need to explore drawing up of a Charter as a start. That said, it must be remembered that such will not suffice for the evolution of development rhetoric into reality. Following on from a Charter, agreements will need to be carefully crafted, and critical reports into the implementation of RTD need to be conducted on a regular basis. Developing states may be required to introduce principles of equity and good governance nationally; whereas developed states may be required to remove trade restrictions against least-developed countries. In all of the above
endeavours, both developed and developing states need to be constantly reminded of the benefits of protecting RTD.

4.3. THE NATIONAL LEVEL

4.3.1. DEVELOPED STATES

Developed states should ensure that their national policies are working to encourage development worldwide, and are not restricting development in any way. Setting out, through their national governments, exactly what actions are going to be taken to meet their commitments is crucial to the enterprise. This could include agreeing on the proportion of indices such as the Gross Domestic Product to be committed to international aid, or legislating to open up trade with developing states. Through transparent declarations of intentions to commit to RTD, developed states could be held to account in the event that fail to meet their obligations.

4.3.2 DEVELOPING STATES

It is important that developing states are seen to take action to implement the RTD nationally: developed nations will be much more willing to offer assistance if they can see that developing nations are also taking responsibility for the realization of RTD. To achieve this, developing nations should draw up national development plans, setting out exactly what action they will take to encourage development nationally. Such plans whilst being ambitious, must not be unrealistic, and should include details on the infrastructure that will be introduced to improve development, rather than consisting of a mere statement of development targets only.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

Although there are some positive aspects to current development mechanisms, a great deal more is needed to translate RTD from rhetoric into reality. Possible improvements to current systems have been considered in the foregoing discussion; however they are only possible improvements - other possibilities need to be explored and developed. Such approaches need to inform the work of development practitioners, at the national and international levels, across both developed and developing states alike, so as to make the necessary improvements in the current existing structure of development mechanisms. This will contribute significantly towards the ultimate realization of a full and enforceable human right to development which will in turn lead to the increased quality and standard of life and living for people in every region of the world.
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