UN’s (in)consistency on gender?

A discourse analysis on the criticism of the Millennium Development Goals and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Vera Atarodi
Abstract

The development discourse on the international agenda is currently dominated by the MDGs and the SDGs, which is why it is important to analyze them. In this thesis my main purpose was to understand whether there were any changes within the discourses of the criticism on the different development goals, when using a postcolonial feminist theory. I chose to study this criticism in order to understand the approach of gender in the formation of the goals: were the UN consistent or had they perhaps changed their attitude towards gender issues? As I pursued a discourse analysis, I used Foucault’s theories and methods as a base. In addition, I framed and used the concepts of development and women empowerment from a postcolonial feminist perspective and the theory on intersectionality. I applied my discourse analysis on criticism from established scholars within the scientific field of feminism and development. By doing so I studied the discourses of the criticism separately, and later compared them. I found that there were marginal differences in these and therefore have not been much change in the discourses between the two development projects. From these results I concluded that the UN’s approach towards gender issues were consistent.
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1 Introduction

In the year of 2000, the Millennium Declaration was signed at the United Nations (UN) in New York by 189 head of states. This contained a number of targets that later would develop into the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These were set to take a global stand and action against poverty that were to be achieved by 2015 (Sweetman, 2005: 2). This was not the first time that the abolition of human deprivation took place on the global agenda. Major conferences, prior to this event, created a platform for discussions on gender and development. Meetings that came to play a great role in the discussions later on the MDGs were: ‘Rio Summit’ (1992 in Rio de Janeiro), the World Conference on Human Rights (1993 in Vienna), the International Conference of Population and Development (ICPD, 1994 in Cairo), and the UN Fourth World Conference on Women (1995 in Beijing) (Hulme, 2009: 9-10). However, the MDGs are not a finished product, but under constant change. They must be seen as a work in progress when analyzing them (Ibid:7). Since this occasion, there have been heavy discussions in different disciplines on the development goals, their intrinsic values and what effect they will have. One of those disciplines is feminism. As the MDGs call for equality between women and men, the feminist critique is of high relevance.

It is now the year of 2014 and only one year left until the goals ought to be achieved. In 2010, the General Assembly adopted a resolution, where it was stated that big steps had been made towards achieving the goals. However, it was also said that there was still much to do, especially in the developing countries. In the same resolution it was stated that there would be a continuing project after 2015, the post-2015 development agenda. Parallel to the process of improving the MDGs, new framework for new goals started to be discussed within the UN. This was the main topic at the meeting known as Rio+20 in Rio de Janeiro in 2012. As a result ‘The future we want’ was published, in which a new framework was constructed. The main aim was to formulate a new set of goals: the Sustainable Development Goals (the SDGs). The work that was put in process was constructing Open Working Groups (OWG). They had the task of creating suggestions, frameworks and potential outlooks for how the goals would look. In September 2014, the results of the OWGs and the proposals on how the goals should be formed will be presented to the General Assembly. The debates on the SDGs are therefore highly relevant, as they affect the UN and shape the development agenda. The debates are primarily within fields linked to environment, since the goals were set with a focus on the earth’s (un)healthy state. However, gender is also a topic of discussion. How the SDGs are formed, with what perspectives and implications are important and thus engages many women groups around the world. Since the UN has power to set overarching, important
goals and affect international relations, they have, above all, the power of setting norms. It is therefore important for women groups to take part and affect the creation of these goals. This is also why the UN and the discussions that arise on the goals are interesting to study. The norms that are created can tell us something of the dominating discourse within the international field and in this case, from a gender approach. Thus, it leads us to a study on power relations between dominating and subjugated discourses, which will be explained below.

1.1 Research aim

This study is a discourse analysis of the criticisms on the MDGs and the SDGs. I will employ Foucault’s theories in combination with postcolonial feminism as a tool to map the discourse of the criticism. By doing so, I aim to shed light on discourses that have been overshadowed by other dominating ones. Critique is interesting to study for different reasons; one being that criticism can be viewed as a subjugated knowledge. This is what the French philosopher Michel Foucault would refer to as knowledge that has been concealed in its historical context and its formal systemization. Foucault meant that criticism is an independent form of theory production, as it does not depend on dominating theories to approve it (Foucault, 1980:81). I wonder what the subjugated knowledge within the discourse of the criticism can tell us about the UN’s relation towards gender issues.

Since the SDGs are a later project, and take place in a different context (a post-MDG context) than the MDGs, it is interesting to examine if the discourses within the critiques expressed are different. If they are, I would like to portrait how and understand why. By studying this I hope to understand and perhaps highlight a struggle that exists on the international agenda created by the discourse that the UN produces. This study is important because as further development goals are created there should be more research on subjugated knowledge, within the discussion on the goals. In doing so, more knowledge will be included, and with this the people who represent them. In conclusion, the goal of this thesis is to find out what the discourses of the criticism can tell us about potential changes in the Development Goals.

1.2 Research questions

The main question of this thesis is as follows:

*From a postcolonial feminist perspective, have the discourse of the criticism on gender issues changed from the Millennium Development Goals to Sustainable Development Goals, and if so how?*

To be able to approach the above question I will address the questions below:
- What can the discourse on the criticism of the MDGs expose about the UN’s approach on gender issues?
- What can the discourse on the criticism of the SDGs expose about the UN’s approach on gender issues?

1.3 Thesis outline

As it can be read above, the interest and objects of this thesis lies in the discourse of the criticism. I will therefore start by presenting discourse analysis, which is how I have chosen to approach the power relations. Since the study will deal primarily with these power relations I will build my methodology for this thesis on Foucault’s theory on power. This theory will be explained in the next chapter, entitled discourse analysis.

In addition to Foucault’s theories and methodology, I will use postcolonial feminism to deepen the analysis and to understand the history of some discourses. I have chosen to use Chandra Talpade Mohanty, who is a prominent scholar within this field, as the main source on postcolonial feminism. She is also inspired by Foucault and follows his poststructuralist thoughts. In addition to postcolonial feminism, Patricia Hill Collins’ theories on intersectionality are also used in this thesis. They are also connected to Foucault and Mohanty’s thoughts. In combination with these theories, I have selected to look at two concepts: development and women empowerment. These are the main aspects that are the basis of my analysis, which runs through my paper. The concepts are framed from a postcolonial feminist view, which means that the analysis will be made with this approach.

The analysis itself will start by studying the discourse of the criticism on the MDGs. The literature I used was: “No empowerment without Rights, No rights without Politics: Gender-Equality, MDGs and the post 2015 Development Agenda” and “Critiquing the MDGs from a Caribbean perspective 1” and “Targeting development – critical perspectives on the Millennium Development Goals” (the chapter “Promoting gender equality”). All texts were strategically chosen, as the authors Peggy Antrobus, Ramya Subrahmanian, Gita Sen and Avanti Mukherjee are active within the debate of the development goals. They are well known scholars and active in promoting the global south. They are names that are referred to in other articles.

The second part of my analysis aims to study the discourse of the criticism of the SDGs. Since the goals are not yet set I will analyze the discussions in the process of the making of the goals. I will look at an OWG of the SDGs, held the 5th of February 2014 in New York. The objective of the meeting was to discuss how to achieve gender equality and women’s empowerment for sustainable development. I have chosen to analyze two of the speakers who represent the global south:
Professor Gita Sen and Mrs. U Joy Ogwu, a Permanent Representative from Nigeria in the UN.

Finally, I aim to investigate if the discourses of the criticism on the gender issues in the MDGs and SDGs have changed, and if yes, how.
2 Discourse analysis

By using discourse analysis, the researcher views language as a machine that constitutes a social world (Winther Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:12). The analysis has its base in social constructivism. It is not to be understood as a theory without its methodology, and vice versa (Ibid:3). Whichever approach a researcher chooses to use within the discourse analysis, it should be considered as a complete package, as it consists both a theoretical and methodological approach. These are intertwined and should not be separated to achieve a complete study. The package includes a philosophical aspect on the premises of the role of language and how a social reality is constructed is included (Ibid:4).

There are different definitions and understandings of what discourse is, which is seen in how different theorists present different meanings of it. One way to understand discourse is as a fixation of meaning within a certain context (Ibid:141). This kind of analysis has its basis in poststructuralism, and as the poststructural theory, the analysis as well points out that discourse and meaning constructs and is constructed by the social world. They are ever changing, as there is a discursive struggle between different discourses in the same domains (Ibid:6).

Understanding where one discourse begins and ends is one of the complications in analyzing and identifying a discourse. The aim for the researcher is to find out how an aspect of the world is mediated through meaning and what consequences this has for the social world (Ibid:145).

2.1 Michel Foucault on discourse analysis

Michel Foucault played a major part in forming the discursive analysis. From a foucauldian perspective, the definition of discourse is often broader than other ones. Foucault himself spoke of discourse as a practice that generates any kind of expression and or opinion (Berström, Boreus, 2005:309). Through his active years, his work changed shape and entered different phases. They started with the archaeological phase and later evolved into the genealogical phase. The archaeological phase entailed a methodology where the research must primary study the history of the discourse. The purpose of using the archeological method is to expose what rules affect discourses, which in turn (un)consciously constituted the subject (Wagenaar, 2011:114). Whilst he left the archeological phase, his findings from this time, still pervades the work that he came to produce later (Winther Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:12), as he kept the idea on how the historical analysis characterizes a discourse (Wagenaar, 2011:117). As his work
continued in to the genealogical work, Foucault focused more on power. He stated that like discourse, power is not a part of an agent, like individuals, states of groups, but is spread in social practices. In his further discussions, Foucault stated that, if one wants to establish a theory on power (as he does himself), one would have to respect the context. This could be difficult and complex for the researcher, since every constellation of power relations demands its on set of analysis and tools to be derived and understood (Foucault, 1980: 199).

In a lecture given by Foucault 14th of January in 1976, he states that there are certain methodological precautions when studying power relations between dominating and subjugated knowledge. In studying power, Foucault says that one should start with locating power far away from where it is centralized (Ibid: 96). Further, he states that studying power means studying where the effect of the power has actual affect. It is therefore important to study the current subjugation, rather then to focus on the dominant part and, to understand how through different power relations, subjects are constituted (Ibid: 97). This is what I will pursue to do this thesis as I will study the criticism of the development goals. I mean that the critique is localized far away from where the power is centralized and represent subjugated discourses. Therefore they are of my interest in this study. Next, Foucault focuses on how power is constituted and constitutes at the same time and pictures power as a net-like organization. He states that power must be analyzed as a circulating phenomena, rather than a for example dominating force from one group or individual upon another (Ibid:98). On this topic he creates the last methodological precaution, where he discusses that yes, power may be distributed but not necessarily in certain, perhaps democratic or anarchic orders. Since Foucault’s theories on power are the underlying basis of my thesis, it is of importance for me to know how he states that power is produced and producing, constituted and constitutes and how it is dominant and subjugating.

2.2 Michel Foucault on power and genealogy

Where there is power, there is resistance, said Foucault (1978:94). This means that it can be studied and observed by locating the different forms of power by the discourses that it comes through (Ibid:11). However, he emphasizes that there is not just one discourse of power on one hand, and on the other hand, a total oppositional discourse. Discourse is rather a part of force relations, as mentioned earlier, meaning that different discourses can occur in the same context (Ibid:101-102). It is by localizing where one discourse meets the other that power relations can be framed, meaning that it is within the sphere of force relations that the researcher can analyze the mechanism of power. I identify one of these meetings, where the dominant discourse of the development goals, meets the subjugated
discourse that is presented in the critique. It is here power can be found and it is here I may identify their relations. By seeing discourse as an instrument as well as an effect of power, it opens up to study power relations by discourse analysis. Discourse does spread and produce power, but it also exposes it and makes it fragile for uncovering and revealing the relations of power (Ibid: 97).

Foucault understands power as a composition of force relations by points at a complex situation in a certain society or context (Ibid:13); furthermore, he links power with relations, more detailed as an organized, hierarchal and coordinated bunch of power relations (Foucault:, 1980: 198). Therefore, he does not focus on agents and structures, as former philosophers had done. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Foucault is interested in highlighting the discourse of the criticism, rather then the dominating knowledge’s discourse. He claims that when questioning the subjugated knowledge, one can find a historical knowledge of struggles buried in its discourse. The mainstream or dominating knowledge is limited, as a result of the historical struggles. In this struggle, it is noticed that power, in its relation to knowledge, can be both limiting and constructing. It is in these struggles where Foucault deduces the term genealogy, as this is what the outcome of these struggles: a complex field of genealogies (Ibid: 83). Judith Butler, a prominent feminist, bases her research primarily on Foucault, as she beholds a poststructural viewpoint as well. She describes how the genealogical method classifies concepts in their political and ideological contexts, with the aim to reveal its history and how it has changed with time. It will also expose certain specific, fragmented knowledge that is local and hidden (Butler, 2007:8). Foucault, himself, means that the aim of genealogy is to release the historical knowledge that has been oppressed by discourses (Foucault, 1980: 85). What we find here is the interest for subjugated knowledge again. This, what may be called for disqualified and local knowledge, is therefore the center of genealogical methodology. Foucault states that this kind of knowledge is not a positivistic answer to determined science (Ibid: 83), but rather knowledge that has been disguised or shoved away from other knowledge, higher ranked in the hierarchy of knowledge (Ibid: 85). This is the main interest in this thesis: to find out what the subjigated knowledge and criticism towards the development goals, through its own historical context, can tell us about the specific approach that I am interested of: gender issues.

It is in his genealogical work and understanding of power that his idea of truth is created, as he states that there it no possibility of gaining access to the universal truth. This is because there is no possibility to view the social world from a state outside any discourse and therefore one cannot get away from any kind of representation. Further, Foucault states that the truth that exists in a context is a part of the systems of power that are dominating (Winther Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:14). In addition, he states that the discussion on truth is important in the aspect that the discourse on the topic allows practice of power. This is because he believes that the subject is, through power, subjected to the production of truth. Therefore he derives that power may only be derived through the production of
truth (Foucault, 1980: 93). This is something that each researcher, who moves within the field of discourse analysis and use Foucault’s theories on for example power and support their research on genealogical methodology, must be aware of. This, of course, includes this thesis, and myself as a researcher. What I do in this paper is not producing, or revealing the truth, as there is no such thing as one truth or reality from the epistemological and ontological premises within the theories that I have chosen to use. What is in focus, and therefor the aim, as stated earlier, is to highlights the discursive struggles within the specific case that is of interest in this paper. Below, I will continue to go into detail on exactly how this will be approached.

2.3 Using discourse analysis in this thesis

Where one discourse meets another is where power can be framed. It is in the critique of the dominant discourse that, in this case of the MDGs ad SDGs, that the power relations can be exposed. To understand power, according to Foucault, the study should be conducted by an ascending analysis. By an ascending analysis of power, he means that one should not try to derive power by starting from its very center. His point is, that if the researcher starts with studying the smallest mechanism, its history and qualities within the power relations, can be understood. After this has been done, the researcher will study how these smaller mechanisms fit into a bigger structure. In this way, the connection between these different scales becomes crucial for the analysis. As this is done, one might interpret how this power mechanism changes and is used in connection with other more broad mechanisms and systems of global domination (Foucault, 1980: 99).

As presented in the thesis outline in chapter 1.3, I have chosen to look specifically on two concepts: development and women empowerment. These will be my two mechanisms that I will use and follow throughout the analysis. As I am interested in studying a subjugated discourse, I have chosen to analyze the criticism, for it is here that knowledge that is not a part of the dominant discourse, is presented. Choosing to study dominant and subjugated power relations is connected to the method on ascending analysis, but is also strongly linked to the theories on power and the genealogical methodology. I aim to do what the genealogical methodology offers to do, expose the history, the hidden knowledge and how what changes may have occurred, within the discourse on the discussions of the development goal projects that started after the year of 2000.
3 Theory and concepts

To be able to proceed with a deeper analysis, I have chosen to use the theory on postcolonial feminism. This will help me to approach the discourse on gender on yet another level. In addition, I have chosen to write about intersectionality as a section of postcolonial feminism, since it as well shows a wider complexity, which I can benefit from in my analysis.

Further down in this chapter I have framed the concept of development and women empowerment. These concepts have been framed according to scholars who have emphasized either the postcolonial or feminist importance, or both. The reason for this is it to be coherent with the theories, and to later be able to implement a discourse analysis on the criticism through postcolonial feminist lenses.

3.1 Postcolonial feminism

Postcolonial feminism established the concept “double colonization”, which refers to how both those who colonized and the liberators are male dominated in their approaches. This is problematic since it means that both the colonizers and liberators have a male perspective. In the double colonization the postcolonial feminism is exercised by highlighting the parts where gender is not addressed as an issue (Mohanty, 2006: 010). In this paper gender will be referred to the social construction of women and men, rather then the biological determination, which will be referred to as the sex (Momsen, 1991:4).

Besides correcting the field of postcolonial research, postcolonial feminism also criticizes feminist theories, as it states that there is a big issue with universalizing women’s experiences. By claiming that there is not only one experience of oppression amongst women, the postcolonial feminism adds that the global viewpoint in feminism is western centralized. Even within the feminist movements there are power structures, which means that what is liberating for one group of women may be oppressing for another (Mohanty, 2006:012). Mohanty states that what creates and maintains one position is on the benefit of another. In this certain case she refers to how the discourse on “the third world (women)” creates “the first world”, hence it is beneficiary for the west to create a discourse that enables its position (ibid: 057). This is where the postcolonial feminists point at the theory on intersectionality: how patriarchal power, racism and class are intertwined. In this discussion it is of highest importance that women’s experiences are not generalized and must consider local views and norms
When women’s experiences are equalized to one in different feminist theories, all stories that are professed by marginalized groups of women are erased. If the premises are what Foucault says, that power is understood in the context of the opposition, equalizing women’s different experiences is problematic on a strategic level. Since marginalized women’s voices are not heard, there is no chance to pursue an accurate analysis (Ibid:056). Every definition and experience of women can lead to a genealogy (Ibid:158). To define the discourses are of importance in constructing a critical and multicultural feminism, since they not only highlight historic and cultural differences but also adds to the action of constructing politics and knowledge (Ibid:146).

Mohanty’s research is based on, amongst other theories, Foucault’s theories on power. Her inspiration of Foucault is also visible when it comes to her statements on how the feminist research should be more effective strategically. She claims that research must be contextualized and gender should be considerate from a historical and geographical point, both in the methodology and analysis (Ibid:012). In practice, Foucault influences her in how she conducts her researches. To understand the “third world” feminist movement, she aims to understand the “western feminist” discourse. It is a big part of her methodology to analyze how the “third world-women” is constructed within the western feminism (Ibid:033-034). In the discourse analysis, she finds that there is a discursive colonization of material and historical differences for women in developing countries (Ibid:035). In her definition of colonization, she is mainly discursive, as she points out how women in developing countries are portrayed through certain codes and categories by western feminists (Ibid:033).

By using postcolonial feminism I hope to intensify the analysis of the power relations, by providing an extra theoretical angle to the context. Will I find the double colonization, the western critique and unifying women’s experiences in the discourses that I study? How does the historical knowledge of struggles that are buried in the discourses that I study reflect the power relations?

3.1.1 Intersectionality

One of the prominent scholars within black feminism, Patricia Hill Collins, wrote:

Intersectionality refers to particular forms of intersecting oppressions, for example, intersections of race and gender, or of sexuality and nation. Intersectional paradigms remind us that oppressions cannot be reduced to one fundamental type, and that oppressions work together in producing injustice” (Collins, 2000:18).
Intersectionality therefore provides a tool to analyze social inequality, power and politics (Collins, 2012: 444). With its roots in the social movements that were emerged in the 1960s (Ibid:444), the term was connected to academic politics (ibid:451) and reflected upon. It gave space to marginalized groups in society, such as people of color, women, gays and lesbians. This was shown in how they, who historically had been restrained, legitimated their knowledge to a greater extent in the 1980’s (Ibid:444). One of the strongest arguments was the criticism of gender-only or race-only theories, as they lacked to include in the periphery of these groups (ibid:449).

Collins lists four characters that intersectional scholarships possesses, the first, as mentioned above, that this field of knowledge regards intersecting power relations of race, gender and sexuality and how these relations lead to the formation of different social spheres (Ibid:452). The second is viewing intersectionality as a knowledge project where the power relations have specific epistemological implications. These are that no knowledge can be separated from power relation, including the knowledge of intersectionality itself. Since it is built upon critique, it is exercised by studying patterns of amongst others, exclusion and misinterpretation within accepted disciplines. In conclusion, its epistemological point of view is that knowledge in all forms are constructed by and constructs in the intersecting power relations, which means that intersectionality itself is constructed within these relations of power as well (Ibid:453). Further, the third nature of the scholarships is the view on how the constitution of race, gender, class and other systems of power and how these are preserved relational processes, pointing out the importance of the context where the power relations are intersected. The last core idea is on how not only are the social relations mentioned above are relational, but so is the outcome of intersectionality. This means that focus lies on all the intersecting power relations, not only a binary analysis (Ibid: 455). According to Collins, it is important to highlight the debate on power and social inequalities to enhance the courses within the discourses and the outcome of them (Ibid: 455).

As Foucault states that power is a phenomenon that is circulating, it is interesting to study with an intersectional perspective since it enhances his statement. It is also more concrete to portray a net-like construction that the power relations constitute by using the intersectional theory as an additional tool. Are there traces of intersectionality from the power relations in the criticism? How are these expressed and what can they tell us about hidden knowledge in the subjugated discourse?

3.2 Development

There are many theories on the concept of development and different theorists have understood the concept and its functions differently. It has been an object of
interest to analyze since it has its roots in state institutions, bureaucracies and academia, which means the ideas of it set norms and affects political decision making in its field (Omar, 2012:46).

In this paper I will frame the concept of development based on postcolonial feminist theories. As the concept rose in the post-war era, a debate considering it followed. As new analytical tools where conceived, mainly through post structuralism, the critic was reflecting these. This can be seen as a big part of the debate is on the discourse of development, pointing out what consequences the discourse has for developing countries (Ibid:42).

From a postcolonial analytical view, Dr. Sidi M Omar criticizes the development discourse, stating that there is an inflation and imprecision in the concept which undeniably will lead to consequences. He means that development should be understood in its historical context. There has been a change in the discourse of the concept, as it, in the beginning (in the 1940s), addressed economic growth and industrialization, but then changed (in the 1980s) as the discourse emphasized on the change of structures and liberalization. This has been manifested in actions as for example the Millennium Development Goals, stated Omar (Ibid:43). Omar calls for a rethinking of the concept, meaning that a change in the discourse and its practice might create other reflections, strategies and solutions (Ibid:45).

Critics mean that development is an offspring of colonization, as it reflects upon the epistemological hegemony of the Western thinking (Ibid:46). The question whether development is created to approach the developing countries’ needs, or if it is a way to pursue the wests’ hegemonic powers. These postcolonial critics are highly skeptical towards its function, since they see development as a social construction, seen in its historical and discursive context.

The feminist approach to development stresses the argument that women and men are differently affected by development processes and emphasizes the same points as mentioned before (Momsen, 1991:1), but also questions whether it includes and considers women’s needs and position. Vandana Shiva, active in debates on feminism and development, presents an ecological critique and a gender analysis, where she facilitates the “male” stream impact on the concept of development. She observes development theories from a historical and conceptual view in combination with colonization, capitalism, ecological degradation and the subjugation of “third world women”, as she states that these factors are linked with each other (Sittirak, 1998:23-24). Her criticism towards mainstream development theories is based on that she claims that these theories hold both implicit and explicit premises, for example that indigenous techniques are ineffective and that these need to be revealed (ibid:27). Furthermore, Shiva claims that the current neo-colonial era has moved the production and industry to the peripheral areas, in assumption that poverty will evaporate through the consequences that industrialization creates (Ibid:24). This is something that Shiva opposes and instead enhances the backsides that follow the process, such as
ecological instability and increasing of women’s subjugation. These effects are seldom spoken of in mainstream development theories. Shiva explains this as a cause of the concept being rooted in western history, which leads to the illusion of development as neutral when it comes to gender, class and race (Ibid: 26).

It can be understood that the concept of development is complex. The approach I choose to frame the concept for this thesis is characterized by the theory on postcolonial feminism and intersectionality. I understand that it is limiting to choose such a narrow approach, but as the aim of the paper is to study this specific critique I find it relevant.

### 3.3 Women empowerment

“Third world feminists” implemented the concept of women empowerment in the feminist debate in the 1980s. They used it with the aim to empower women from within (Sittirak,1998:102), it is something that is experienced in peoples self-reliance, and this in turn is related to how society view them (Kabeer, 2005:15). The “third world feminists” stressed that oppression towards women was not only a result from a patriarchal society, but also from colonial and neo-colonial forces. (Sittirak,1998:102). A discussion on women empowerment and the different approaches demands a definition of the concept, This is what Naila Kabeer does in her article on gender equality and women’s empowerment in relation to the third Millennium Development Goal. She starts with defining empowerment in relation to power, stating that one way of considering power is in the ability to make a choice, hence to be disempowered means being denied to be able to choose (2005:13). There may be people making changes everyday, however, they are not empowered unless they were disempowered before: meaning, empowerment intends to define the progress, as were they who have been disempowered demand the possibility of making choices (Ibid:14). Kabeer points out that a choice needs to answer to certain qualities, one being having more than one option. Here, the fact that poverty and disempowerment are related is stressed, as it means that one part is depending on another, creating a situation where a choice being made by the depending part is reliant on the more powerful part. Furthermore the difference of women and men being in a dependant role is contrasted, as gender-related inequality enhances the consequences of poverty. Such inequalities, as gender-related ones, are usually not put on trial and are accepted as norms, which enhance the power relations. This leads to the other quality that needs to be achieved for a choice to be regarded as a real choice, that there must be alternatives that actually exist. Since choices may appear to exist but by action do not because of alternatives, but rather through the denial of choice. As an example, Kabeer pictures women in abusive relationships, where women appear to have a choice in acceptance but are deprived of choices first of all, and consequently the choices that are made from such a situation are not based on alternatives from a “fair construction” (Ibid:14).
Continuously, Kabeer describes how the concept of empowerment may be followed through different dimensions: agency, resources and achievement. These are all intertwined; agencies that determine the processes and how they are put into practice, resources that are necessary to execute projects from a financial perspective, which agencies will use these resources and the effects of these on the achievements. This is the way Kabeer studies the concept of empowerment and its meanings and function. She also implements it on the case of the third Millennium Development Goal (Ibid:14).

The concept of women empowerment is strongly linked to both postcolonial feminism and intersectionality since it includes a class perspective and lifts poverty as an issue that needs to be addressed to achieve women empowerment. This will also contribute to a more profound analysis. Besides this, the third Millennium Development Goal is to “Promote gender equality and empower women” (UN, 2001: 56). It is therefore relevant to know what is meant with the concept of women empowerment and if this is implementable through the MDGs. In this paper it will be emphasized that not only are poverty and gender linked but also that there is a patriarchal force, as well as a (post)colonial force that restrict women’s existence.
4 Analysis

In this chapter I will proceed with the discourse analysis. At first, I will examine the criticism on the MDGs, as I will study what is said about the concepts of development and women empowerment. As I do this, I hope to find what subjugated knowledge is hidden in the discourse of the critiques. Followed by this will be an analysis on the criticism on the SDGs, were I aim to achieve the same process as the former. Both of these will be analyzed from a postcolonial feminist perspective, for which theory I have outlined above. Some theorists that I have analyzed, use terminology as north/south and developed/developing countries, however, postcolonialism is still central in their analysis, so their material is still highly relevant for this thesis. The articles that I have chosen to use for this analysis only represent one opinion: gender-based critic on the UN’s strategies. By choosing these articles I hope to view the specific field of discourses that the criticism represents.

4.1 Criticism on the MDGs

Dr Ramya Subrahmanian, writes a chapter in the book Targeting Development; a critical perspectives on the Millenium Development Goals, on promoting gender equality and what is problematic with the concept of the MDGs. She questions whether gender equality really is articulated in the MDGs and if so, what way and how these can, or will have an outcome with concrete strategies, which can and will benefit women (Subrahamanian, 2003: 186). She states that there are differences in what different scholars think of the MDGs. Either the MDGs are praised as a symbol of the significant print of what the feminist movement made after their struggle, or they are viewed as a product of the problematic approaches in every development process. The reason for the latter would mainly have its basis in the complex question on (dis)integrating gender in development. I understand that Subrahmanian means that gender is put as in the second case; gender is not integrated in the term of development. She states further that this leads to major complications in the development process.

From a postcolonial feminist perspective it is problematic if gender is not reflected within the terminology of development on more then one level. On one hand, a postcolonial feminist would claim that it is not possible to generalize all women’s experience; therefore, it is not applicable to use a concept, seemingly
shallow, on all women. If it were to be universalized, the concept would need a
deep content to include a larger group of women. On another hand the
postcolonial feminist would discuss whether women are included in the first
place. Considering the history of the concept, it is relevant to discuss who was the
target of development. From a postcolonial perspective, as it is a product of
colonization and not universally applicable, it has to step away from the western
thinking that is dominating in its epistemological views. The postcolonial feminist
would add that not only are women in the southern hemisphere suppressed by
western women and men, but also by men in the southern hemisphere. If gender is
not included in the concept, focus will lie on men in the southern hemisphere,
which would lead to double colonization.

Besides viewing the historical context, a current context is important to analyze
from both a postcolonial and poststructural point of view. For the postcolonial
feminist it is essential to highlight the context of women in developing countries:
what their needs are and what knowledge they posses. Using this knowledge
would make it possible to frame a more appropriate concept. Changing the
concepts dominant meaning would lead to a change within the discourse of the
debate, which is what the postcolonial feminists strive to do. Subrahmanian states
that this is a matter of gender awareness and the link between gender and
development is essential; although, she strongly emphasizes that gender equality
will not be achieved if the means of the concept are not rewritten (Ibid:186). From
a perspective of power this is an interesting case, as there is a struggle within the
discourses. It is not bipolar struggle, as it can be seen by the double colonization.
However we can highlight two discourses within the power relations from a
gender perspective. This power relation reflects two opposing kind of knowledge,
one subjugated and one dominating. Subrahmanian views the different levels on
which the MDGs can be assessed from a gender perspective. Where the political
value is on the first level, the second is the substantive value of the ways the goals
and targets are produced and perceived. The last level is the institutional context
in which they most probably are to be implemented: the larger, social, political
and economic context, where they will be operative (Ibid:186). Through these
levels, the criticism and study of the MDGs is more approachable. She discusses
whether the goals are implementable in the way that they are structured. These
different levels show a field of discourses that can be studied. The power relation
are not always about a case of top down power oppression, but can be a struggle
within one discourse as power is both produced and spread within it.

One other power struggle within the discourse that can be found is the debate on
poverty in relation to gender and development. As the aim of the goals is to
reduce poverty, this parallel is important to analyze. Subrahmanian describes the
MDGs as disappointing as they are gender blind towards the problem of poverty.
She points at the goal on eradicating income poverty (see appendix) and means
that women are more vulnerable towards poverty than men. Not addressing
gender in this question is to overlook one of the important factors in women’s
situation. It, of course, is a matter of how one chooses to define poverty, and this
too is a social construction and a matter of dominant discourses within the MDGs that will affect the outcome of the process (Ibid:190). From a postcolonial feminist perspective, it is relevant to take an inclusive stand towards poverty. If we turn to intersectionality, we can see that it is a matter of different oppressions intersecting each other, in this case poverty or class, and gender. However, it agrees with the poststructural way of viewing the outcome of the MDGs. The lack of intersectionality in the gender analysis of the goals will lead to a certain imbalance in the discourse and therefore in the power relations. This will affect the social context that the power relations produce.

Dr. Peggy Antrobus, one of the founders of DAWN (Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era), describes the first reactions to the MDGs from the global feminist community as extremely negative. This was mainly because of the fact that sexual and reproductive rights, both as a goal and target in itself, and a target for other goals, such as the third, on women’s equality and empowerment, was excluded from the goals. This was one of the important debates at the conference in Beijing, and as it was not included, it was understood that other powers, i.e. religious ones, were getting stronger and more dominating in the debates (Antrobus, 2005:95).

Prof. Gita Sen, another founder of DAWN, and Dr. Avanti Mukherjee writes about the contradiction in how the goals (specifically MDG3) call for women’s equality, but how the goal cannot commit to be achievable. The main argument in their article is that the MDG3 has targets and indicators that from the very start were inadaptable to be applied, to achieve the goal itself. They highlighted that women can empower themselves depending on their own context and is different in every culture. They also conclude that empowered women are full citizens and agents of change (Sen, Mukherjee, 2013:7). They point out that the problems with the MDGs should be analyzed from different levels. First, the goal is problematic by not approaching women’s autonomy and agency, as well as their sexual and reproductive right. Second, they state that the MDGs are very light in their attitude towards women’s economic and political participation and finally, they create no connection between gender and poverty. As all researchers who criticize the MDGs point out, the need of sexual and reproductive rights for women would lead to, or be a big step towards women empowerment. In this critique it is understood that there is a weakness in the MDGs when it comes to women empowerment, as the oppressed opinions, in this case postcolonial feminists, call for adjustments. As the dominant discourse (re)produces power, the outcome of the development process would be different if other discourses were represented.

Sen and Mukherjee state that in the MDGs, gender is consistently the second priority within the MDGs (Ibid:8). They claim that empowerment is essential, since the power relations that currently exist are unequal and by this concept, these unbalanced power relations might be adjusted (Ibid:9). Acknowledging women’s autonomy is essential for empowerment as it entails the ability of making choices. When autonomy is deprived, as it is when not recognizing
women’s sexual and reproductive rights, women are not in a position where decisions can be made independently. Hence without such essential targets, a goal of gender equality and empowerment of women is impossible to achieve.

One example used in how the MDGs are insufficient in their structure is that only education is highlighted as a solution for gender equality in MDG3. Antrobus writes about her research in the Caribbean where education, in relation to many other countries, is high, whilst women empowerment is still highly needed. They are suppressed in other ways other than being denied education, of which, one of the biggest issues are domestic violence and rape:

> We can hardly speak of equality, equity and empowerment in a situation where poverty persists, violence against women continues unabated, there is increasing hostility against women.” (Antrobus, 2005: 98).

The dominating discourse of the MDGs, hence the dominating discourse of development is neglecting the real needs of women, as they are not approaching all women’s needs. Education and knowledge is not necessarily correlating with justice and human rights, for what is knowledge if not an expression for the global dominating discourse? Nor is this necessarily the face of justice and human rights. Opposing and subjegated discourses, such as the postcolonial feminism, definitely will not acknowledge this, as they demand and highlight many other targets and indicators that are erased from the MDGs.

Sen and Mukherjee elaborate on the problems that follow as the MDGs reduce gender issues to a matter of education. The two researchers distinguish between three different weaknesses in the MDGs, which are related to the levels discussed above. They start by stating that the targets and indications are too mainstream to be able to solve a broad assignment, where consideration must be taken towards the many issues and consequences that the inequality causes. Next, they write about gender power relations. As they state that it is a social structure that must be acknowledged in its context, they claim that political intervention must respect the nation, regional and subnational varieties. This can be done by letting actors that are active on a national and regional level implement their own strategies, as these actors will know how to find a suitable strategy to fit the context better (Sen, Mukherjee, 2013:11-12). This can be identified as a poststructuralist and postcolonial approach as they speak of context and respecting both a historical and current context. Also the way they enhance regional differences can be understood as an postcolonial feminist approach, stating that the west dominating discourse is not necessarily in agreement with other discourses existing in other non-western discourses. The third shortcoming in the goals is seen in the critique on the political representation. Here it is stated there must be a fair representation, both from gender and from a southern and northern hemisphere’s perspective (Ibid:11-12). This is an intersectional claim, stating that it is necessary for different classes, ethnicities and genders, in this case, are necessary. This is an
essentiality as no oppression stands alone, it is always intersected with other power relations, in this case when it comes to gender, race and class. As these different power relations (re)produce knowledge, it is not possible to separate them and this is where the theory of intersectionality emphasizes the importance of all of this intersecting powers, as they are coherent to each other in the big web of power relations.

Further, Antrobus takes an intersectional point of view, as she strongly opposes the neo-liberal basis in the agreement. As an example for this she writes:

“There is a similar risk to public water supplies. It is difficult to reconcile the pressures of powerful governments on poor countries to privatize water and liberalize trade in service with appearing to support the goals and targets of poverty reduction, access to safe drinking water and improvements in the lives of slum dwellers” (Antrobus, 2005: 101).

On big discussion in the development agenda is water and how the lack of it is a problem that hits women and children hardest. Here, Antrobus combines the gender perspective with the class perspective, saying that they are intertwined and should be approached as such. This is another disappointment for her and other opponents of the MDGs, since the goals ignore this connection.

As Antrobus, Sen and Mukherjee also criticize the neoliberal program, they claim that it is the hegemonic economy that will and have lead to inequalities between and within countries. The ones who will suffer the most from these inequalities are women. In this statement, they integrate a perspective from the southern hemisphere and point out that women in these parts of the world are the ones who are the most exposed for the disadvantages that are created. Women’s wages are lowered as the labor market gets more liberated, social conflicts are increased and it gets harder to get ahold of former common resources as the neoliberal agenda proceeds to dominate. Besides this, the battle of the concept of development, between the south and the north is enhanced. As this gap between the two hemispheres increases, the more divided the gender issue becomes. For example both parts speak of women’s sexual and reproductive rights, but perhaps not of women’s economic justice. The authors use the northern hemisphere as an example and question why they choose to demand certain rights for women, but neglect others, using areas where the north use for production and exports and abandon the rights of the women in those areas (Sen, Mukherjee, 2013:17). In this criticism, it is more obvious whom the critique is aimed towards. They are criticizing the liberal forces that are dominating not only in the UN but also globally. The critique is aimed towards the neo-liberal forces and the discourses they have created. The researchers use tools, as intersectionality, to expose the dominant discourse goals and how women’s empowerment and gender equality is not a part of their development agenda.
I have studied the discourses of the criticism on the MDGs by taking the history and the meaning of the concepts in regard and seeing how these are expressed. By doing so, I have understood the criticism as a call for a change in the UN’s approach towards gender issue, as it is not sufficient enough to reach out to women globally.

4.2 Criticism on the SDGs

On the eight session of the OWG on SDGs, there was a panel discussing gender equality and women empowerment for sustainable development. There were representatives from Sweden, Turkey, Nigeria, the World Bank and UN Women. In the meeting, it was stated that gender inequality is the most profound form of inequality in the world and it is currently a factor that oppresses human rights. However, some positive process is acknowledged. The main example was implementing mandatory elementary education, for both girls and boys. Nevertheless, it is not a consistent process as gaps between the genders increase in certain countries, and not to mention the financial crisis that has hit women around the world hardest. To achieve human rights, it is essential to fully achieve women empowerment with the aim to achieve a completely inclusive society and sustainable development (UN Women, 2014).

Mrs. U Joy Ogwu, speaks of limitations and biases against women around the world, but claims that in a “contemporary, modern and globalized world” it is only of interest to gather experiences and values. She wants to use the development approach to meet the limitations that create the oppression towards women (Ibid.). The discourse that Mrs. Ogwu use implies that development is a part of the civilized world, and in contradiction the less advanced countries are in need of development. This is a statement that the postcolonial feminist would strongly oppose, as it is reflects a statement that entails a western hegemonic epistemology. Like Foucault, the postcolonial feminist would state that the western epistemology is not to be universalized since knowledge and experiences are contextual.

Mrs. Ogwu continues by stating the importance of integrating gender into development, since it is paralyzing if it is not done. The main reason for her statement is that women represent half of the population, hence half of the human resources. As women not are included in the concept of development, the concept is not used fully and correctly. This is a different approach to development than what was mapped earlier in the analysis of the MDGs. From a postcolonial feminist perspective it is a rather shallow analysis of why gender and development should be integrated, as it does not approach any other problems except for using women as a number of the population. Further, she talks about women’s rights and human rights in combination to the right of owning land. She states that land is not just an economic resource, but is also significant in the formation of social
identities. She pursues the argument that owning land is seen as an asset in Africa. She says that this view is deeply rooted in the people and is essential to their livelihood, as a large part of the people live in rural areas. In addition, she states that it is not only about the people per se, but about women and their rights. This is her main reason to why women’s ability and choice to own land should be a global priority. This is indeed an argument for women empowerment as it draws arguments to women autonomy and ability to make choices. However she does not approach the question including class, as a theorist of the intersectional scholarship would do.

One other argument for this is that it is a step towards sustainable development and parallels between gender and environment is drawn. Mrs. Ogwu has a different approach to gender, women empowerment and development. In the discourse, there is no trace of intersectionality or postcolonial approach, as she does not mention class or former suppression of the west. This shows that there are not only two opposing discourses, but it is a field of discourses and the power relations in between are not necessarily in a top down approach, but within the same contexts as well. This is due to that power not only constitutes the subjects, but also is constituted by subjects within power relations.

Gita Sen was also in the OWG meeting, as a representative of the civil society. Much of her critique is historical, as she refers to the Vienna, Beijing and Cairo. She starts with direct criticism towards the MDGs, which has been analyzed in the former subchapter in this thesis. Further in the speech she approaches the question on how to ensure implementation of gender, as she asks and discusses accountability for what, whom and how. First she states that there is no coherence in the MDGs (specifically goal nr 3) as goals and targets are framed weakly (Ibid). From a postcolonial feminist aspect it could be derived to the west not wanting to discuss gender equality for everyone, since the western discourse upholds its global dominant status. Therefore there are no incentives for the west to create goals with targets that actually would achieve this.

Connecting to historical events in the development agenda, she states that when it comes to gender, integration across all sectors and a broader spectrum is required. Built on her historical knowledge she also explains what is missing in the MDGs, and should be taken in to serious consideration in the framing of SDGs: the question of how to create accountability. She suggests implanting a team of independent experts from civil societies, who will observe specific situations and report back to government and UN Women. This would expand the dialogue and create transparency. She states that this will create clearer accountability and inclusion and stops only in using words (Ibid.). This is a postcolonial feminist approach with a clearer intersectional approach, as she appeals to inclusion and intersecting gender in all sectors within the process of development, since gender is not a problem that stands alone.
Further, Sen calls for a development agenda that is more clearly specified (Ibid). This would include more histories and experiences and as discourses (re)produce power, the results of an agenda with a wider approach to development would be change.

As I implemented my discourse analysis on the criticism on the SDGs my interpretation was that the critique still invokes a change in the gender approach that the UN possess and it is crucial that the change can be made as the new framework of goals are to be set. If this is not done the goal of gender equality is not inclusive towards all women of the world.

4.3 Are there any discursive changes?

I found the OWG meeting interesting to observe especially as the audience got involved in the end, some contributed with very interesting objections and questions. Queen Mother Dr. Delois Blakely, civil activist and ambassador of Goodwill to Africa shares her experiences from working in different countries and asks:

“… I hear from women at the most indigenous parts of the world and the question that they are concerned about, as we sitting at the table and I think women of the world, should be concerned about: when we are talking about equity and we are talking about equality to empower women, there is women saying how do we take the bucket of water of our heads just to get drinking water? And that’s the dire question, how do we deal with systematic issues on the ground right now? I thank you.” (UN Women, 2014).

The interpretation that is made from this statement is that there is still long way to go in the development process, and the critique resembles earlier critiques towards the MDGs. It is however a sign that the experiences of women in the southern hemisphere are being represented in the major process of developing the next set of goals.

As I study the discourses of the critique on the different goals, I see no major changes. The same arguments are being used and what is trying to be pursued in these arguments are the same. One example is how the discussion on water in relation to gender still is alive and no concrete solution has been presented. Another issue is that women’s sexual and reproductive rights still are not acknowledged. As long as women are deprived human rights, such as these examples, it is not possible to achieve gender equality. From these patterns I draw the conclusion that the UN has not changed their approach towards gender issues.
One change that I did see in the OWG was how Gita Sen provided thoroughly constructed alternatives to the development process. Since the MDGs were implemented, the civil society has continued their research and provide results and options for the next set of goals.
5 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to understand whether there has been change in the discourses of the criticism on the MDGs and the SDGs. As I chose to study the criticism from a specific theory, postcolonial feminism, I also studied a specific field of discourses. As I mapped the criticism and its discourses I have come to understand that there are not any major difference in the discourses towards the two development agendas. In my analysis I came to the conclusion that the UN had indeed a consistent gender approach in these agendas.

By having Foucault’s theories and methods as a core in the thesis, understood the importance of the historical aspect in the power relations were highlighted. In turn, the knowledge hidden in the subjugated discourses was exposed. I came to see different alternatives to the formation of the development goals. My further interpretations were that the dominant discourses on gender issues in the UN represents a western idea, which entails western experiences and knowledge. Accordingly, this consistent approach leads to an exclusion of other experiences and other’s knowledge, which are of high value if the goal is to globalize gender equality.

Would I have chosen other concepts or discursive methodologies, other findings from the same material would be extracted. In future research it would be interesting to map the discourses in struggle to further define which are more dominant, and who are the main actors enforcing the power relations.
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Millennium development goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 1. Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day</td>
<td>1. Proportion of population below $1 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Poverty gap ratio (incidence x depth of poverty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 2. Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</td>
<td>4. Prevalence of underweight children (under five years of age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2. Achieve universal primary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 3. Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3. Promote gender equality and empower women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 4. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4. Reduce child mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 5. Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5. Improve maternal health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 6. Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 7.</strong> Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 8.</strong> Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Goal 7. Ensure environmental sustainability** |
| **Target 9.** Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources | 25. Proportion of land area covered by forest |
| | 26. Land area protected to maintain biological diversity |
| | 27. GDP per unit of energy use (as proxy for energy efficiency) |
| | 28. Carbon dioxide emissions (per capita) [Plus two figures of global atmospheric pollution: ozone depletion and the accumulation of global warming gases] |
| **Target 10.** Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water | 29. Proportion of population with sustainable access to an improved water source |
| **Target 11.** By 2020 to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers | 30. Proportion of people with access to improved sanitation |
| | 31. Proportion of people with access to secure tenure [Urban/rural disaggregation of several of the above indicators may be relevant for monitoring improvement in the lives of slum dwellers] |
Goal 8. Develop a global partnership for development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system. Includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction — both nationally and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Address the special needs of the least developed countries. Includes: tariff and quota free access for least developed countries’ exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPCs and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing States. (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Some of the indicators listed below will be monitored separately for the least developed countries (LDCs), Africa, landlocked countries and small island developing States]

**Official development assistance**

32. Net ODA as percentage of OECD/DAC donors' gross national product (targets of 0.7% in total and 0.15% for LDCs)

33. Proportion of ODA to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation)

34. Proportion of ODA that is untied

35. Proportion of ODA for environment in small island developing States

36. Proportion of ODA for transport sector in landlocked countries

**Market access**

37. Proportion of exports (by value and excluding arms) admitted free of duties and quotas

38. Average tariffs and quotas on agricultural products and textiles and clothing

39. Domestic and export agricultural subsidies in OECD countries

40. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity

**Debt sustainability**

41. Proportion of official bilateral HIPC debt cancelled

42. Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services

43. Proportion of ODA provided as debt relief

44. Number of countries reaching HIPC decision and completion points

45. Unemployment rate of 15-to-24-year-olds

46. Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis

47. Telephone lines per 1,000 people

48. Personal computers per 1,000 people

[Other indicators to be decided]

*The selection of indicators for goals 7 and 8 is subject to further refinement.*

(United Nations, 2001:56-58)