International Organizations Research Group • White Paper • Number Ten

The Millennium Development Goals

In Light of Catholic Social Teaching

By D. Brian Scarnecchia, JD
and Terrence McKeegan, JD

IORG
International Organizations Research Group
A Program of Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute

The Millennium Development Goals

In Light of Catholic Social Teaching

By D. Brian Scarnecchia, JD
and Terrence McKeegan, JD

IORG
International Organizations Research Group
A Program of Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute

Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute
866 United Nations Plaza, Suite 495
New York, New York 10017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

With noble hopes, leaders of the international community agreed to establish the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) after the World Summit of 2005, which met at United Nations Headquarters in New York. The MDGs are to be a sign of our collective humanity and, according to the World Summit outcome document, "collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level."

We now find ourselves at the halfway point for achieving the eight noble goals by 2015, and world leaders, civil society, and UN officials agree that there is an urgent need to improve the way we pursue these goals if they are to fulfill their responsibilities. Ah, there is the rub. It is no longer the goals that are important but the manner in which they are pursued. As authors Brian Scarnecchia and Terrence McKeegan make us aware in this study, there is wide and growing divergence on how best to proceed.

On one hand there are those who call for continuing the top-down, elite-driven approach to solving the "problems" of poverty, health, education and collective response. On the other are those, like the authors, who see this approach as fundamentally flawed because it treats the poor in developing societies as a problem to be solved rather than partners in achieving their own development and success. If the poor are in fact to be the beneficiaries of the MDGs, should they not have a say in how they are to be treated in the processes used to achieve the MDGs?

"The way nations approach and implement the MDGs, the way the rich respond to the poor, is truly a test of our collective humanity," the authors observe. Delving deeply into each of the eight MDGs, their history and current status, the authors take a measure of our collective response against one of the world's oldest and highly respected standards of social justice, the social teachings of the Catholic Church. Using Church teaching as articulated in Holy See interventions and foundational documents of the Church and of western civilization, they ask how contemporary approaches to social justice measure up to the fundamental principles of solidarity with the poor and subsidiarity in the policy process.

"Without a course correction," the authors conclude, "the nations of the world are now in great danger of missing this historic opportunity to fulfill these noble collective goals."

Readers who would like to know more about the Church, her social doctrine and the various functions of the Holy See at international conferences will find Part I especially informative. For the reader more interested in the history of how the MDGs came about, Parts II to IV will be of particular interest. Part V is the heart of the study, providing the authors' analysis of the goals.

Of particular importance is the section entitled, "The Role of Special Interests in the MDGs — the 'Phantom Goal' of Access to Sexual and Reproductive Health." This section exposes the way the MDGs are becoming increasingly politicized and why this is so detrimental not only to achieving the goals, but to our "collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level."

The astute observations and analysis of the authors demonstrate how the nobility of the sentiments that underlie the MDGs has been distorted to implement objectives alien to those the MDGs were designed to achieve. Their study serves as a catalyst for critical evaluation of what had begun as a righteous enterprise.

Robert John Araujo, S.J.
John Courtney Murray, S.J. University Professor
Loyola University of Chicago
May 2009

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) from the perspective of Catholic social doctrine in three ways. First, it demonstrates the reason why studying the MDGs in light of Catholic social doctrine allows the policymaker to test how well current international development schemes fulfill their fundamental goal of improving human dignity. Second, it briefly summarizes the history of international development, offering a critical analysis of the MDGs' underlying principles. Third, it takes each of the eight MDGs in turn and considers them in light of the *Millennium Development Goals Reports* through the years 2005 to 2008, the Holy See's interventions at the United Nations (UN), and the authors' own analysis. The paper finds that without some changes to the way the MDGs are now promoted by various UN and other officials, they will not live up to their mandate. The paper concludes that for international development to succeed it must build community with, not simply for, the poor. We warn that without genuine solidarity with the poor, development aid tends to reinforce class differences. When this happens, wealthy countries are tempted to view developing countries — especially where populations are growing — as a threat to their security and to devise development targets and objectives that promote the national interests of donor nations over the genuine needs and human aspirations of the people in developing countries.

Introduction

Are the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) "actively seeking a new social order in which adequate solutions to material poverty are offered, and in which the forces thwarting the attempts of the weakest to free themselves from conditions of misery and slavery are more effectively controlled;"[1] or are they a sign of "Messianistic beliefs that sustain the illusion that it is possible to eliminate the problem of poverty completely from the world?"[2] Do the MDGs advance the integral development of developing countries and their peoples, or do they legitimize an ideological agenda that sees population control as the primary component of development?

The history of "development," a term that came into vogue after World War II, has been uneven. A staggering amount of foreign aid has been given; and yet the poor, those with fewer talents and/or those who suffer in mind, body and spirit, are still with us.

The MDGs aspire to address some of the most pressing problems facing developing countries by 2015 as laid out in eight goals, 20 targets, and 56 indicators: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; Achieve universal primary education; Promote gender equality and empower women; Reduce child mortality; Improve maternal health; Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; Ensure environmental sustainability; and Develop a global partnership for development. Thus, the MDGs represent the culmination of more than a half century's development endeavors.

The history of "development," a term that came into vogue after World War II, has been uneven. A staggering amount of foreign aid has been given; and yet the poor, those with fewer talents and/or those who suffer in mind, body and spirit, are still with us. The MDGs are the latest and most ambitious "Big

1 *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (*CSDC*), #325, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (2004).
2 Ibid., #183.

Push"[3] by the UN and developed nations to bring the least developed nations out of the "poverty trap."[4] Some critics argue that they too closely resemble failed development programs of the past, in part, because they fail to promote the family, which as the framers of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights concluded, is the "natural and fundamental group unit of society" and source of human capital.[5] Others contend they are methodologically flawed since they provide poor means of assessment, lacking accurate methods to measure whether each goal has been met. Some ask: if the MDGs prove unattainable, will donors become jaded and less likely to give aid again? Others suggest the MDGs will enable the UN to partner with big business and big government in a global project that will expand the power of both exponentially.[6]

Without truth...there is no social conscience and responsibility, and social action ends up serving private interests and the logic of power, resulting in social fragmentation, especially in a globalized society at difficult times like the present.

The earliest and most perennially expressed test for the success of any project of human development is the extent to which it builds community *with*, not simply *for,* the poor. This requires qualitative, as well as quantitative, analysis. The poor, as such, do not have a single organization at the international level, but one voice has offered constant encouragement and a critique of modern development projects on their behalf: the Catholic Church through its international juridical personality, the Holy See.

In his most recent encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate* (Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth) Pope Benedict XVI offers a comprehensive view of the Catholic Church's teaching on proper development, and stresses that it can only be achieved in recognizing the truth of love and charity as proclaimed by Christ:

> This dynamic of charity received and given is what gives rise to the Church's social teaching, which is *caritas in veritate in re sociali:* the

3 Jeffrey Sachs, *The End of Poverty* (NY: Penguin Books, 2005), Introduction.
4 Ibid.
5 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 16, http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/.
6 Michel Schooyans, *The Hidden Face of the United Nations*, translated by John Miller (St. Louis: Central Bureau, 2001): 59-65.

> proclamation of the truth of Christ's love in society. This doctrine is a service to charity, but its locus is truth. Truth preserves and expresses charity's power to liberate in the ever-changing events of history. It is at the same time the truth of faith and of reason, both in the distinction and also in the convergence of those two cognitive fields. Development, social well-being, the search for a satisfactory solution to the grave socio-economic problems besetting humanity, all need this truth. What they need even more is that this truth should be loved and demonstrated. Without truth, without trust and love for what is true, there is no social conscience and responsibility, and social action ends up serving private interests and the logic of power, resulting in social fragmentation, especially in a globalized society at difficult times like the present.[7]

---

7 Pope Benedict, XVI, *Caritas in Veritate,* #5. Available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.


SIXTVS·PP·V·A·MDXC·PONTIF·V·S·PETRI·GLORIAE

Part I: The Church's Diplomatic Role and Catholic Social and Political Thought

With 192 nations who are member states of the UN, it is reasonable to ask why it is important to study the position of a UN mission that is not a voting nation, but has only an "observer" status at the UN. The reason is that, unlike the 192 permanent member states, Holy See positions are not based upon national interests. Generally speaking, Holy See statements are instead a reflection of two thousand years of Catholic social thought, at once underpinning and emanating from Western, and arguably international, political thought. By studying the comments of Holy See observers on fundamental questions of social development, it is possible to test the propositions of current policy analysts against fundamental principles of social doctrine which have endured two millennia of scrutiny in the Western intellectual tradition.

Why the Catholic Church has diplomatic relations with the United Nations

The reason the Catholic Church enjoys diplomatic relations with the United Nations and with other nations is found in the last two of the four distinguishing marks of the Catholic Church (one, holy, catholic and apostolic).[8] Because the Catholic Church is catholic or "universal," and because it is apostolic in the sense of having been actively involved in world affairs since the time of Imperial Rome, it has an international breadth and historical role unparalleled in the history of international affairs. As one diplomat put it, "[The Church] owes this to her universal and transnational organization... [and] to her history."[9]

8 *Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC)*, #811, English translation (1994).

9 Archbishop Jean-Louis Tauran, "The Presence of the Holy See in the International Organizations," Presentation at Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, April 22, 2002, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_doc_20020422_tauran_en.html.

The Catholic Church has sent and received diplomatic representatives since the fourth century,[10] exercising papal diplomacy by participation in the international order shortly after it was given legal recognition in the Roman Empire.[11] Those who today are called Papal Nuncios, such as the head of the Holy See UN mission, exercised the same office under different title in Constantinople in the fifth century:

> [T]he person of the Apostolic Nuncio, in the modern sense of the term, namely, Ambassador of the Pope invested with an ecclesial mission (to the local Church) and a diplomatic mission (accredited with the government), already existed in 453 at the end of the Council of Chalcedon. In fact, once the Council was concluded, Pope St. Leo the Great asked his Legate, Julian of Cos, who had followed the work of the Council, to stay there to apply the decisions of the assembly. To this end, he provided him with two Letters of Credence: one to accredit him with the local hierarchy, represented by the Patriarch Marcion, and one for the Emperor of Constantinople, Theodosius.[12]

In the 11th century the Catholic Church decreed that Catholic princes obey the "Truce of God," which restricted the terms of combat, and the "Peace of God," which protected non-combatants. These decrees give evidence that all classes of society acknowledged the Holy See's authority as the supranational mediator in Christendom.[13] At the end of the 15th century, Pope Alexander VI acted as an arbitrator between Spain and Portugal. Alexander's decree, *Inter Cetera Divinae,* separated each country's sphere of influence for exploration and colonization of the New World by drawing a line around the world. It forbade slavery and promoted the conversion and baptism of indigenous people.[14]

By means of [the Lateran Treaty], Vatican City State came into existence. Article 12 of the Treaty notes that diplomatic relations with the Holy See are governed by the rules of International Law.

10 Holy See Mission, *A Short History of the Holy See's Diplomacy*, http://www.holyseemission.org/short_history.html.

11 Robert Araujo and John Lucal, *Papal Diplomacy and the Quest for Peace: The Vatican and International Organizations from the Early Years to the League of Nations* (Naples, Florida: Sapientia Press, 2004): 1.

12 Tauran.

13 Araujo and Lucal, 19-20.

14 Ibid., 24. In modern times the Holy See has successfully mediated conflicts such as the

Even after the Protestant Reformation and the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) the Pope was recognized as a sovereign not because he was head of the Papal States, but because he was head of the Catholic Church:

> It is interesting to note that the personal recognition granted to the Pope (who in this period was still a temporal sovereign) was prompted by the fact that he was first and foremost the Spiritual Head of the Catholic Church, as Talleyrand pointed out when he presented a motion to the editorial committee of the congress [of Vienna (1815)] which was, moreover, approved without the slightest difficulty: "with regard to the religious princes and the Catholic powers (Austria, France, Spain and Portugal), nothing about the Pope should be changed." (It concerned the papal representative's right of precedence.) It is clear… that what the international community had taken into consideration was the papacy as a moral power *sui generis*![15]

With the unification of Italy and the loss of her temporal territory, the Papal States, the Holy See's influence declined in 1870. Pope Pius IX became a "prisoner of the Vatican," which served to underscore the independence of the Holy See from Italy and the unique sovereignty it still possessed.[16] The "Roman Question," as it was called, would not be settled until February 11, 1929, when Italy and the Holy See signed the Lateran Treaty. The sovereignty of the Holy See is indisputably recognized today in international law:

> By means of [the Lateran Treaty], Vatican City State came into existence. Article 12 of the Treaty notes that diplomatic relations with the Holy See are governed by the rules of International Law. Years later, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961), convened for the purpose of codifying diplomatic law, went even further by formally recognizing the practice accepted by any receiving State regarding the precedence of the representative of the Holy See within the Diplomatic Corps (Art 16, sec. 3).[17]

Thus, the Holy See was again recognized as possessing international

Beagle Channel Dispute in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and is credited with forestalling military conflict between Argentina and Chile over the dispute. See Mark Laudy, "The Vatican Mediation of the Beagle Channel Dispute: Crisis Intervention and Forum Building," http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/words/11.pdf.

15 Tauran.

16 Araujo and Lucal, 58.

17 Holy See Mission, *A Short History of the Holy See's Diplomacy*.

juridical personality. For the purposes of this analysis, it is also important to understand both the distinction and relationship between that international role and the Church's religious role.

The Catholic Church, the Holy See, and Vatican City State distinguished

Both the 1917 Code of Canon Law (canon 100) and the 1983 Code of Canon Law (canon 113 sec.1) distinguish between the Holy See and the Catholic Church — each have their own distinct juridical personality.[18] The Catholic Church sees itself as both a visible society and a spiritual community.[19] The Church includes all the living (throughout the world) and the dead (in purgatory and heaven) united by grace with their head Jesus Christ.[20] The word "See" is derived from "sedes," which is Latin for "chair," and thus "Holy See" refers to the chair of St. Peter, the first Pope.[21] The Holy See is comprised of the Roman Pontiff and Secretariat of State, Council for the Public Affairs of the Church and other institutions of the Roman Curia.[22]

Today the Holy See has diplomatic relations with 174 of the 192 member states recognized by the United Nations. The essential goal of the papal diplomatic service is to promote what Pope John Paul II referred to as a "culture of peace," to build a world without war or want, with tolerance for authentic freedom and respect for human rights.

The mission of the Holy See began with the Great Commission of Jesus to his Apostles to go out and preach the Good News throughout the world. Various gospel writers captured this mission. Saint John: "As the father has sent me so I send you."[23] Saint Mark: "Go into the whole world and proclaim the good news to all creation;"[24] Saint Matthew: "Go therefore, and make disciples of all the nations. Baptize them... Teach them to carry out everything I have commanded you."[25]

18 Araujo and Lucal, footnote 2.
19 *CCC*, #771.
20 *CCC*, #954.
21 Araujo and Lucal, 3.
22 1983 Code of Canon Law, canon 361.
23 John, 20:21, as cited in *CCC* #954.
24 Mark, 16:15.
25 Matthew, 28:19-20.

The Great Commission — to preach Christ — consists of two parts: to convert the whole world fully to Christ and baptize them; and to unite and permeate the world with Gospel values even if not everyone is converted to Christ and baptized:

> While working to *convert* all nations, Christianity wished also to *unite* them, and to introduce into their relations principles of justice and peace, of law and mutual duties. It was in the name of Faith, and of the Christian law that the Law of Nations was born in Christendom.[26]

Today the Holy See has diplomatic relations with 174 of the 192 member states recognized by the United Nations.[27] The essential goal of the papal diplomatic service is to promote what Pope John Paul II referred to as a "culture of peace," to build a world without war or want, with tolerance for authentic freedom and respect for human rights:

> It is a phrase which reflects the Pope's conviction that the diplomatic process is inherently capable of reinforcing the deepest aspirations of mankind, among them: a hope for life without violence; a desire for fairness in the distribution of the world's resources; the freedom to exercise conscience, including the legitimacy of religious practice; and progress in the expansion of human rights awareness.[28]

By contrast with the universal religious mission of the Holy See to carry out the Great Commission and build up a culture of peace, the Vatican City State has more limited goals. It encompasses merely 107 acres of land in the heart of modern Rome, contiguous with the basilica of St. Peter and the papal residence. Yet, Vatican City State also possesses international juridical personality and therefore enters into certain kinds of international agreements:

> In the Listing of Country Names, published annually by the United Nations, a note is added to the Holy See's entry, stating that — in United Nations documents — the term "Holy See" is to be used except in texts concerning the International Telecommunications Union

---

26 Araujo and Lucal, footnote 6, quoting John K. Cartwright, "Contributions of the Papacy to International Peace, "*Catholic Historic Review* 8 (1928): 157, 159, quoting Francois Guizot (emphasis in original).

27 Holy See Mission, *A Short History of the Holy See's Diplomacy.*

28 Bernard J. O'Connor, *Papal Diplomacy: John Paul II and the Culture of Peace* (South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine's Press, 2005): 1.

> and the Universal Postal Union, where the term "Vatican City State" is to be used. States, then, do not entertain diplomatic relations with Vatican City State, but with the Holy See.[29]

Vatican City State may be compared to the grounds of a foreign embassy that enjoys extra-territorial status and provides for the independence and diplomatic immunity of a sovereign authority within a host country: "Vatican City is the physical or territorial base of the Holy See, almost a pedestal upon which is posed a much larger and unique independent and sovereign authority/rule: that of the Holy See."[30]

Catholic Social Doctrine and International Political Thought

The primary source of the social doctrine of the Catholic Church is found in the magisterial teachings of the Church from the late nineteenth century through the present, which have applied the whole moral law to a consideration of the "new things" of the political, social and economic order in the spirit of Pope Leo XIII, as expressed in his 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum,* or "On the Condition of the Working Classes."[31]

With the release of the *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (*CSDC*) by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (2005), the major themes of the social teachings of the Catholic Church are now systematically addressed and indexed. The essential principles of Catholic social doctrine include: the dignity of the human person; the common good; the universal destination of goods and private property; the principles of subsidiarity and

29 Holy See Mission, *A Short History of the Holy See's Diplomacy.*

30 Ibid.

31 The list of primary sources of Catholic social teaching includes the following: Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno* (On Reconstruction of the Social Order), 1931; John XXIII, *Mater et Magistra* (Christianity and Social Progress), 1961, *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth), 1963; Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, *Dignitatis Humanae* (Declaration on Religious Liberty), 1965, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity), 1965, *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World), 1965; Paul VI, *Octogesmia Adveniens* (A Call to Action), 1971, *Populorum Progressio* (The Development of Peoples), 1967; John Paul II, *Centesimus Annus* (On the Hundredth Anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*), 1991, *Christifideles Laici* (On the Vocation and Mission of the Lay Faithful), 1988, *Dives in Misericordia* (On the Mercy of God), 1980, *Ecclesia in America* (The Church in America), 1999, *Evangelium Vitae* (The Gospel of Life), 1995, *Familiaris Consortio* (On the Family), 1981, *Laborem Exercens* (On Human Work), 1981, Letter to Families, 1994, Letter to Women, 1995, *Mulieris Dignitatem* (On the Dignity and Vocation of Women), 1988, *Redemptor Hominis* (The Redeemer of Man), 1979, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (On Social Concerns), 1987, Women: Teachers of Peace, 1995.

solidarity; as well as the fundamental human values of truth, freedom, justice and love.[32]

The principles of the Church's social doctrine shed light on each other and must be read in context and "appreciated in their unity, interrelatedness and articulation."[33] These principles are founded upon innate human dignity and apply not only to Catholics, but also have universal significance:

> The principles of the social doctrine, in their entirety, constitute that primary articulation of the truth of society by which every conscience is challenged and invited to interact with every other conscience in truth, in responsibility shared fully with all people and also regarding all people.[34]

The equal dignity of every human being is based on the fact that every human being is created by God in His image and called to eternal union with Him.[35] The Church sees this as "the ultimate foundation of the radical equality and brotherhood among all people, regardless of their race, nation, sex, origin, culture or class."[36] This equality in turn is the foundation of the principle of the common good, or "the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and more easily."[37] As such, it is distinct from the modern consequentialist or utilitarian tenet of opting for the "greatest good," or that which benefits a majority.

Securing the common good is the sole reason for the existence of civil authorities.[38] The human person is never an object or a raw material, "an inert element in society;" rather he must be esteemed as a subject and the "basis and purpose" of society.[39] Put another way, "it is and remains 'common,' because it is indivisible and because only together is it possible to attain it, increase it and safeguard its effectiveness, with regard also to the future."[40] When testing various social policies, then, the Church determines the extent to which the policy or scheme promotes a society that makes the common good its primary goal and takes into account the fact that "the human person cannot find fulfillment in

32 *CSDC*, #160, #171, #197.
33 Ibid., #162.
34 Ibid., #163.
35 *CCC*, #1937.
36 *CSDC*, #144.
37 *CSDC*, #164.
38 Tauran.
39 Pope Pius XII, broadcast message, Christmas 1944, AAS 37 (1945): 12.
40 *CSDC*, #164.

himself, that is, apart from the fact that he exists 'with' others and 'for' others."[41] Finally, an important implication of the principle of the common good is the universal destination of goods protected by a proper understanding of private property.[42]

The principle of subsidiarity is that action should be taken at the lowest level, that is, the level closest to the people that the action is seeking to help.[43] Solidarity therefore calls for development policies that are participatory and have goals set by those to be aided. This may take more time than a top down approach, but it better addresses the real needs of the poor. In this light, development "cannot be restricted to economic growth alone. To be authentic, it must be well rounded; it must foster the development of each man and the whole man."[44] Real development requires that aid, both the corporal and spiritual "works of mercy,"[45] be invested in the real source of wealth — human capital — in its material, cultural and spiritual dimensions. It also requires that the international political and juridical order be built up by reference to

41 Ibid., #165.

42 Ibid., #184, "When we attend to the needs of those in want, we give them what is theirs, not ours. More than performing works of mercy, we are paying a debt of justice," citing Saint Gregory the Great, *Regula Pastoralis*.; #176, "*By means of work and making use of the gift of intelligence, people are able to exercise dominion over the earth and make it a fitting home*: 'In this way, he makes part of the earth his own, precisely the part which he has acquired through work; this is the origin of individual property;'" #177, "This principle [the universal destination of goods] is not opposed to the right of private property but indicates the need to regulate it. *Private property, in fact, regardless of the concrete forms of the regulations and juridical norms relative to it, is in its essence only an instrument for respecting the principle of the universal destination of goods; in the final analysis, therefore, it is not an end but a means*;" #172, "All other rights, whatever they are, including property rights and the right of free trade must be subordinate to this norm [the universal destination of goods]; they must not hinder it, but must rather expedite its application. It must be considered a serious and urgent social obligation to refer these rights to their original purpose;" #182, "The principle of the universal destination of goods requires that the poor, the marginalized and in all cases those whose living conditions interfere with their proper growth should be the focus of particular concern. To this end, the *preferential option for the poor* should be reaffirmed in all its force." (all italics in originals.)

43 Pope Benedict XVI emphasized the need for the UN to be more mindful of the principle of subsidiarity when he addressed the UN General Assembly April 18, 2008, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2008/april/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20080418_un-visit_en.html.

44 *Populorum Progressio*, #14, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum_en.html.

45 The corporal works of mercy are: To feed the hungry; To give drink to the thirsty; To clothe the naked; To harbor the harborless; To visit the sick; To ransom the captive; To bury the dead. The spiritual works of mercy are: To instruct the ignorant; To counsel the doubtful; To admonish the sinners; To bear wrongs patiently; To forgive offences willingly; To comfort the afflicted; To pray for the living and the dead. *CCC*, #2447.

authentic human rights founded on the natural law, the common "grammar" of conscience around the world.[46]

Solidarity, which is a word akin to universal fraternity, defies quantitative analysis. According to the 1987 papal encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: "In order to be genuine, development must be achieved within the framework of solidarity and freedom, without ever sacrificing either of them under whatever pretext."[47] Thus, solidarity helps overcome inequalities between peoples and transform international institutions into "structures of solidarity through the creation or appropriate modification of laws, market regulations, and juridical systems." In that sense the principle of solidarity "rises to the rank of fundamental social virtue since it places itself in the sphere of justice. It is a virtue directed par excellence to the common good."[48]

Rather than any national interest, then, these four principles — human dignity, the common good, subsidiarity and solidarity — inform the position the Holy See has taken with regard to each of the eight MDGs as they have been proposed and developed since 2000.

---

46 *CSDC*, #436; See also *CSDC*, #186 and #187, citing Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno*, #1 and John Paul II, *Centessimus Annus*, #48: "Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them ...

Subsidiarity, understood in the positive sense as economic, institutional or juridical assistance offered to lesser social entities, entails a corresponding series of negative implications that require the State to refrain from anything that would de facto restrict the existential space of the smaller essential cells for society. Their initiative, freedom and responsibility must not be supplanted ...

The principle of subsidiarity is opposed to certain forms of centralization, bureaucratization, and welfare assistance and to the unjustified and excessive presence of the State in public mechanism. By intervening directly and depriving society of its responsibility, the Social Assistance State leads to a loss of human energies and an inordinate increase for public agencies, which are dominated more by bureaucratic ways of thinking than by concern for serving their clients, and which are accompanied by an enormous increase in spending."

47 *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, #33, http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0223/_INDEX.HTM.

48 *CSDC*, #193.

Part II: A Brief History of Development and the MDGs

In his 1949 Presidential inaugural address, United States President Harry Truman highlighted the massive post-war programs in foreign aid and development focused on rebuilding countries devastated by World War II. The Marshall Plan was emblematic of that effort:

> [W]e must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people.[49]

The assistance for poor countries by developed countries has a much longer history than American post-war largesse. The motivation, goals and the terms used to describe foreign aid have evolved over several centuries, and have included concepts of imperialism, utopianism, humanitarian concerns, collective security, environmental dangers, democracy-building, sustainable development, rule-of-law, and human rights imperatives. This is not an exhaustive list, but it helps to illustrate the competing interests that still exist today.

By the end of the 1950s the United States was no longer the only promoter of development assistance. The expansion of United Nations agencies began to impact the developing world, and "[s]oon was born the development expert, the heir to the missionary and the colonial officer."[50] As additional donor nations and large agencies such as the International Monetary Fund

49 President Harry Truman, Inaugural Address, Jan. 20, 1949, http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inagural20jan1949.htm.
50 William Easterly, *The White Man's Burden*, (NY: Penguin Press, 2006): 24.

(IMF) and World Bank (WB) became involved in aid and development, the international community slowly began to create universal guidelines and principles for development in an attempt to help the plight of people left behind in an increasingly prosperous and technologically advanced world.

The World Summit on Social Development (WSSD) in Copenhagen in 1995 was the first major UN conference to focus specifically on social development issues and principles. The Copenhagen Summit was the largest gathering of world leaders at that time, with more than 14,000 participants, among them delegates from 186 countries and some 2,300 representatives from 811 non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

The World Summit on Social Development (WSSD) in Copenhagen in 1995 was the first major UN conference to focus specifically on social development issues and principles. The Copenhagen Summit was the largest gathering of world leaders at that time, with more than 14,000 participants, among them delegates from 186 countries and some 2,300 representatives from 811 non-governmental organizations (NGOs).[51] *The Copenhagen Declaration* and *Programme of Action* was developed from the recommendations for sustainable development found at the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro and the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo (ICPD). *Copenhagen* recognized the need to put people at the center of development and pledged to make the conquest of poverty, the goal of full employment, and the fostering of social integration, the overriding objectives of development. World leaders agreed to a set of non-binding principles, known as the above mentioned *Copenhagen Declaration*, which would help to form the foundation of subsequent agreements through ten commitments.[52]

51 United Nations, Division for Social Policy and Development website, http://www.vision-office.com/socdev/wssd.htm.

52 The *Copenhagen Declaration's* ten non-binding commitments are: 1) Eradicate absolute poverty by a target date to be set by each country; 2) Support full employment as a basic policy goal; 3) Promote social integration based on the enhancement and protection of all human rights; 4) Achieve equality and equity between women and men; 5) Accelerate the development of Africa and the least developed countries; 6) Ensure that structural adjustment programmes include social development goals; 7) Increase resources allocated to social

On the heels of the Copenhagen Summit came a report by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in May 1996 entitled, *Shaping the 21st Century: the Contribution of Development Co-operation.*[53] This report provided six goals that shared some similarities with the Copenhagen commitments. The OECD report dropped any reference to employment and added goals such as "maternal mortality," and the controversial goal of "reproductive health services."[54] OECD intended to propose these new goals for development to the WB, the IMF, the regional development banks and the UN.

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan introduced the OECD goals at the World Summit on Social Development (WSSD +5) follow up summit in June 2000. At the same time a multi-agency group (UN/OECD/WB/IMF) released a report called *A Better World for All.* This report, commonly referred to as the "International Goals," included seven goals similar to those of the OECD. There was widespread criticism, and no consensus was reached on either the International Goals or the OECD goals at the WSSD +5.[55]

The Secretary General achieved a stunning turnaround at the UN Millennium Summit with the adoption of the Millennium Declaration by 147 heads of State at the UN General Assembly on September 8, 2000.

The MDGs released in August 2001 were drawn from the Millennium Declaration by a working committee including members from the World Bank, IMF, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), World Health Organization (WHO) and OECD. In September 2001 the Secretary General released the document *Road Map*

---

development; 8) Create "an economic, political, social, cultural and legal environment that will enable people to achieve social development;" 9) Attain universal and equitable access to education and primary health care; and 10) Strengthen cooperation for social development through the UN.

53 OECD's Development Assistance Committee, "*Shaping the 21st Century: the Contribution of Development Co-operation,*" May, 1996, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/23/35/2508761.pdf.

54 The six OECD goals are: 1) A reduction of one-half in the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015; 2) Universal primary education in all countries by 2015; 3) Demonstrated progress toward gender equality and the empowerment of women by eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education by 2015; 4) A reduction by two-thirds in the mortality rates for infants and children under age 5 and a reduction by three-fourths in maternal mortality, all by 2015; 5) Access through the primary health-care system to reproductive health services for all individuals of appropriate ages as soon as possible and no later than 2015; and 6) The current implementation of national strategies for sustainable development in all countries by 2005, so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015.

55 For one in-depth discussion of the creation of the MDGs, see Maria Sophia Aguirre, *The Millennium Development Goals,* http://faculty.cua.edu/aguirre/population/MDG%20Short%20Paper.doc.

Towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration that contained the eight MDGs. On December 14, 2001 the UN General Assembly voted to "recommend that the *Road Map* be considered as a useful guide in the implementation of the Millennium Declaration by the United Nations system."[56]

Ambassador Gert Rosenthal of Guatemala, who had a hand in drafting the Millennium Declaration, describes the MDGs "as a 'grab bag' of ideas drawn from a host of UN sources as well as the Millennium Declaration itself."[57] The MDGs explicitly included all of the International Goals save one — "to provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015."[58] The ongoing, and so far unsuccessful, campaign by abortion advocates to insert reproductive rights into the MDGs will be discussed in a following section.

---

56 United Nations General Assembly Resolution, A/RES/56/95, Dec. 14, 2001.

57 Barbara Crossette, "Reproductive Health and the Millennium Development Goals: The Missing Link," 7, http://www.cwgl.rutgers.edu/globalcenter/policy/b10/Crossette.pdf.

58 *A Better World for All*, http://www.paris21.org/betterworld/repro.htm.

Part III: Holy See Interventions on Development Prior to the MDGs

At the WSSD in Copenhagen in 1995, Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Angelo Sodano set the stage for subsequent interventions by the Holy See at the UN on the issue of integral human development. Humanity urgently needs a "stable peace," he said, which in turn requires that the world's goods, destined by God for all, should be "justly and peaceably shared."[59] Cardinal Sodano noted that Pope John Paul II had given this Summit "his decisive support,"[60] and the Catholic Church also bears witness to its concern for development in "the more than 270,000 Church educational and welfare institutions, spread across all continents."[61]

The State must accord religion more than "mere tolerance;" political society must enable believers "to contribute to society's development with the religious inspiration which is their most valuable possession."

The vision of development found in the WSSD, which includes "political, economic, ethical and spiritual" dimensions, echoes that of the Church: "The development we speak of cannot be restricted to economic growth alone. To be authentic … it must foster the development of each human being and of the whole human being."[62] This view of development is similar to that of all the great world religions that express the profound aspirations of humanity. Therefore,

59 Cardinal Angelo Sodano, Declaration at World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen, http://www.ewtn.com/library/CURIA/STATCOPE.HTM.
60 Ibid., #1.
61 Ibid., #2.
62 Ibid., #3 (citing *Populorum Progressio*, #14).

the State must accord religion more than "mere tolerance;" political society must enable believers "to contribute to society's development with the religious inspiration which is their most valuable possession."[63]

Cardinal Sodano said government's function to provide the "essential framework for social development" still requires the "active participation" of civil society — businesses, professions, trades, arts, media, education, families, etc. — for authentic development to have effect. "Exaggerated nationalism" in government can thwart this development.[64] Political and civil society must shape a "cultural climate" which restores confidence in the traditional family and provides it the stability to perform its essential function of "raising children and preparing them for life in society."[65]

The Holy See also recognized the convergence between the Copenhagen Declaration, Commitment 1(h), and the papal encyclical Centesimus Annus (n. 34) on the need of government to keep the free market truly free and attentive to the complete dignity of the human person.

Cardinal Sodano also emphasized that the human person is central to both "sustainable development" and the "sphere of economics" because the person is prior and higher than the market due to his "lofty dignity." Development must not attempt to cure material poverty by inculcating spiritual poverty — the vice of *consumerism* — which is "linked to an incorrect understanding of the economy;" and to the "anthropological error" of valuing, having, and enjoying over being and growing. Authentic development is not based on economic systems that create "false needs" and exploit the "frailty of the weak."[66]

"*Participation,*" Cardinal Sodano said, was integral to understanding the Summit's goals.[67] In this light, the poorer nations must be able to "participate actively in international trade" and migrant workers and women must be empowered to "participate fully in the social and economic order, especially through their access to education."[68] Women and children must also be protected from trafficking and exploitation and societal and economic recognition

63 Ibid., #4.
64 Ibid., #5.
65 Ibid., #6.
66 Ibid., #7.
67 Ibid., #8 (emphasis original).
68 Ibid.

must be given to a woman's work in the home. He stressed that peace and development are correlative principles: "Without peace the development of peoples will never come about, just as without development there will never be peace."[69]

On June 30, 2000 at the Special Session of the General Assembly of the UN, a mere three months before the Millennium Summit, the Holy See analyzed the targets and goals set at the Copenhagen Summit (WSSD):

> Indeed, in the five years since Copenhagen, we have learned still more clearly that there is *no single answer to the challenges posed by poverty and exclusion: no single ideology, no single economic model contains a totally adequate response.* No one sector of society can by itself satisfactorily address the question… no single nation or economic block can hope to resolve questions which have assumed a global dimension. A truly international community must be created, in which each sector and each nation assumes its appropriate role and responsibility, within a framework of solidarity and respect for the rights and dignity of each person.[70]

The Holy See also recognized the convergence between the *Copenhagen Declaration*, Commitment 1(h), and the papal encyclical *Centesimus Annus* (n. 34) on the need of government to keep the free market truly free and attentive to the complete dignity of the human person. Economic growth and renewed interest in the market has led to a fuller understanding of the need to integrate human values into the idea of development for an overall "quality growth" — one attuned to "equity, stability and ecological sustainability," especially in the era of an information-based economy. Democratic societies are most conducive to social development when human rights are fostered and citizens participate as "true protagonists."[71] Too often poverty is caused by war and conflict that impedes social stability and progress, damaging the environment and basic infrastructures, not to mention the loss of life and injury of innocent people. Armed conflict retards progress for decades and discourages investment. The biblical sense of peace, the Holy See stressed, is social development "in which [nations] live in harmony among each other

69 Ibid., #9.

70 Intervention by the Holy See Delegation to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Social Development, June 30, 2000, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_doc_20000630_social-development_en.html (emphasis added).

71 Ibid., #2.

and in harmony with their own environment... [and] each person can realize his or her talents fully and in which the goods of creation — both material and spiritual — are equitably shared."[72]

At the UN Millennium Summit held in September 2000, the Holy See's Secretary of State, Cardinal Sodano, conveyed the encouragement of Pope John Paul II and his fervent hope that "at the dawn of the third millennium the UN will contribute to the building of a new civilization for the benefit of all mankind," a true "civilization of love."[73] The address argued that in order to fulfill its noble purpose the United Nations must remain true to its four principle duties: to promote peace, development, human rights and equality amongst all member nations. To effectively promote peace it is necessary to engage in preventative diplomacy, strengthen respect for international law and control arms proliferation. Moreover, in the face of outbreaks of violence the UN is "duty bound to intervene within the framework of its Charter to restore peace." Cardinal Sodano emphasized that human rights have "a solid ethical basis." Moreover, no one creates or concedes human rights; "rather, they are inherent in human nature" in "the natural law, inscribed by God on the heart of every human being." Natural law is a "common denominator," or a "universal language, which everyone can come to know, and on the basis of which we can understand one another."[74] In his 2008 address to the UN General Assembly, Pope Benedict XVI further revealed that by promoting rights as commodities to be doled out by governments rather than inherent to each individual, the UN sets up a competitive version of rights which renders its goal of promoting peace impossible.[75]

---

72 Ibid., #6.

73 Sodano, Message at the Millennium Summit of the United Nations, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_doc_20000908_millennium-summit-onu_en.html.

74 Ibid., #3.

75 Pope Benedict XVI, Address to the UN General Assembly, April 18, 2008, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2008/april/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20080418_un-visit_en.html; Susan Yoshihara, "How to Think About the Responsibility to Protect," *First Things*, June 16, 2008, available at http://www.firstthings.com/onthesquare/?p=1093.

Part IV: MDGs: An Economic Model of Development?

Taken at face value the MDGs, along with their targets and indicators, seem straightforward and reasonable, perhaps even too ambitious for some. As noted above, however, the MDGs are the culmination of efforts to achieve consensus and adopt a final form of the various versions of the international development goals. It is not just the agreed language but, rather, how it will be interpreted, and even more importantly, by whom it will be implemented that presents problems. So, what exactly is the stated purpose of those who promote and implement the MDGs?

It is not just the agreed language but, rather, how it will be interpreted, and even more importantly, by whom it will be implemented that presents problems. So, what exactly is the stated purpose of those who promote and implement the MDGs?

Jeffrey Sachs, a well-known economist, is the MDGs chief promoter. He has received mixed reviews for his attempts to jump-start several troubled economies, most notably Bolivia, Poland and Russia.[76] In 2002, he left his position at Harvard to become the chief advisor to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan on the MDGs. At the same time he assumed the directorship of the newly formed Earth Institute at Columbia University, which runs the Millennium Project, and essentially oversees the implementation of the MDGs.[77] Sachs has even

76 Sachs' efforts at jumpstarting the economies of these nations have come to be referred to as "shock therapy" in many economic and development circles. For more in-depth discussion, see "Up for Debate: Shock Therapy: Bolivia, Poland, Russia. Same Policies-Different Results", PBS' Commanding Heights website, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/commandingheights/shared/minitextlo/ufd_shocktherapy.html; John Cassidy, "Always with us: Jeffrey Sachs's plan to eradicate world poverty," Book Review in *The New Yorker*, April 11, 2005, http://www.newyorker.com/critics/books/articles/050411crbo_books.

77 Sachs, 224.

attained celebrity status, with music rock-star Bono having written a fawning forward for *The End of Poverty*, Sachs' opus on development, and his personal playbook for promoting the MDGs.

Even Sachs' harshest critics are effusive in their praise of his tireless efforts to promote the plight of the poor.[78] They do not question Mr. Sachs' sincerity, only his philosophy and economic plan, which in many ways contradict his previous efforts and beliefs. His view can be characterized as a top-down approach that relies on some variation of a "Grand Plan" or "Big Push" to transfer vast amounts of money from rich countries to poor countries, with few strings attached. Because so many agencies and players are involved there is little accountability, success is difficult to measure, and feedback is not a large priority. This approach rests upon the presumption that rich elites and aid agencies are the saviors of the poor, and that if the developing countries would come to think and act like the West, they would be quickly transformed economically if enough money is transferred to them.

Sachs praises the Enlightenment thinkers as ushering in a new era of social progress, before which "humanity had known only unending struggles against famine, pandemic disease, and extreme poverty, all compounded by endless cycles of war and political despotism."[79] Sachs talks of the great debt owed to the "awe-inspiring geniuses of the Enlightenment, who first glimpsed the prospect of conscious social actions to improve human well-being on a global scale."[80] The word "global" is crucial to this worldview; it stresses the need to dispense with antiquated concepts of national sovereignty. Citing Immanuel Kant, Sachs calls for "an appropriate global system of governance to end the age-old scourge of war." In this way Sachs believes "perpetual peace" can be achieved by the United Nations.[81]

Sachs is convinced that those living in extreme poverty are caught in a "poverty trap," and are not even on the first rung in what he portrays as a ladder of economic development. The only way for them to start climbing the ladder of development is with foreign help, a "Big Push" from the rich countries. In *The End of Poverty,* Sachs asserts that the United States and other developed countries committed themselves in the Monterrey Consensus to 0.7% of Gross National Product (GNP) to Official Development Assistance (ODA). However, the Monterrey Consensus is a non-binding declaration that only "urges" a goal of 0.7% of GNP for ODA. Nonetheless, he repeatedly accuses the United States of not fulfilling its aid commitments made at Monterrey.

78 See generally, Easterly and Cassidy.
79 Sachs, 347.
80 Ibid., 348.
81 Ibid., 348-9.

Sachs then uses the lack of donor commitment to the Monterrey agreement to explain the recent failures of the UN and aid agencies to really help the poor; namely, that the Western countries have simply been too stingy.[82]

According to Sachs, a developing country's poverty reduction plan is a failure unless it allows them to achieve the MDGs. The MDGs become the only developmental program that can make a difference, and he views them as enjoying a monopoly on global development in terms of funding, administration and resources. Sachs further insists that only the MDGs can help the poor and the MDGs can only be met through a massive international aid system run by the UN Secretary General, which would control bilateral donors, regional development agencies and banks, as well as the IMF and WB:

> Aid flows are often small and unpredictable, while hundreds of small-scale aid projects eat up the time and attention of overstretched and impoverished governments. Harmonization of aid in support of a single MDG-based poverty reduction strategy is vital.[83]

Sachs simply dismisses more modest plans for development: "to do things piecemeal is vacuous."[84] He blames the operational inefficiency of the UN-run development programs on extrinsic political causes:

> We have gotten the UN that has been willed by the powerful countries of the world, especially the United States. Why are UN agencies less operational than they should be? Not because of UN bureaucracy, though that exists, but because the powerful countries are reluctant to cede more authority to international institutions, fearing reduction of their own freedom to maneuver. [85]

William Easterly, Professor of Economics at New York University and Senior Fellow at the Center for Global Development, is highly critical of Sachs' plan to end poverty. In *The White Man's Burden,* he responds to Sachs and others who push grand-plan development models. Easterly credits Sachs for drawing attention to the extreme poverty that afflicts over a billion people, including millions of children who die from easily preventable diseases. Easterly also recognizes a second tragedy — that developed nations have spent

82 Ibid., 218, 288, 338, Introduction.
83 Ibid., 285.
84 Jeffrey Sachs, letter to editor, *Washington Post*, March 27, 2005, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A64541-2005Mar24.html.
85 Sachs, 366.

Easterly cites the Center for Global Development study (also cited by the 2005 **UN Millennium Project Report***) that shows multilateral aid "had a* **zero** *effect on growth when it reached 8 percent of the recipient's GDP, and after that the additional aid had a* **negative** *effect on growth."*

$2.3 trillion in foreign aid over the last five decades with little to show for it. The traditional approach of the developed nations is to impose a grand plan from the outside, rather than working within the system on the inside and listening to what poor people want and need. "The right plan is to have no plan," he says, but to develop one through interaction with the poor.[86]

Easterly divides the development project into two camps — the "Planners" who have a top-down blue print for other people's development, and the "Searchers" who come to the poor with more questions than answers:

> Let's call the advocates of the traditional approach [to aid and development] the Planners, while we call the agents for change in the alternative approach the Searchers... Planners announce good intentions but don't motivate anyone to carry them out; Searchers find things that work and get some reward ... A Planner thinks he already knows the answers; he thinks of poverty as a technical engineering problem that his answers will solve. A Searcher admits he doesn't know the answers in advance; he believes that poverty is a complicated tangle of political, social, historical, institutional, and technological factors. A Searcher hopes to find answers to individual problems only by trial and error experimentation. A Planner believes outsiders know enough to impose solutions. A Searcher believes only insiders have enough knowledge to find solutions, and that most solutions must be homegrown.[87]

Easterly challenges two of the long-held beliefs of Sachs and other "planners." He finds no evidence for a "poverty trap," and no correlation between aid and investment, nor between investment and growth.[88] Further, Easterly

86 Easterly, 4-7.
87 Ibid., 5-6.
88 Ibid., 41.

cites the Center for Global Development study (also cited by the 2005 *UN Millennium Project Report*) that shows multilateral aid "had a *zero* effect on growth when it reached 8 percent of the recipient's GDP, and after that the additional aid had a *negative* effect on growth."[89] If true, this study portends disastrous consequences if the MDGs are fully implemented because "virtually all low-income countries (forty-seven of them) will be far above that level [8 percent]."[90]

Sachs also focuses on "scientifically achievable" development. "Fundamentally," he says, "progress on the MDGs rests on thorough scientific understanding of the underlying challenges of disease, food production, under-nutrition, watershed management, and other related issues."[91] The lack of data supporting Sach's plan is revealing. One of his colleagues, Amir Attaran, Canada Research Chair in Law, Population, Health and Global Development Policy at the University of Ottawa, with whom Sachs co-authored a study on financing for HIV/AIDS,[92] acknowledges the gaping holes in the research. Attaran points to an independent study commissioned by the British government in 2002 that revealed that the UN's efforts to measure incidences of malaria had serious methodological flaws:

> The main problem affecting... data collection efforts... has been that an overly complex and insufficient prescriptive approach has been taken. There has been a failure to clearly define goals and priorities of the (measurement) strategy at the global and regional levels... Too many indicators are proposed. Too many sources of data are suggested. Insufficient guidance is given to countries on data collection and methodology... Some countries are measuring one thing, some countries are measuring another... In some cases, data are being collected without any systematic and scientific sampling methodology, and so are essentially meaningless and impossible to interpret.[93]

The 2006 *Millennium Development Goals Report* even cautions the reader about inaccuracy in the measurement of progress toward attaining the MDGs:

---

89 Ibid., 50 (emphasis in original)

90 Ibid., 50.

91 Sachs, 224.

92 Amir Attaran and Jeffrey Sachs, "Defining and Refining International Donor Support for Combating the Aids Pandemic," *The Lancet*, Vol. 357, Jan. 6, 2001.

93 Amir Attaran, "An Immeasurable Crisis? A Criticism of the Millennium Development Goals and Why They Cannot Be Measured," (September 13, 2005), http://medicine.plosjournals.org/perlserv/?request=get-document&doi=10.1371/journal.pmed.0020318.

> Since the periodic assessment of progress towards the MDGs began five years ago, the international statistical community has been concerned about *the lack of adequate data* to compile the required indicators in many parts of the developing world. [The standards] have focused attention on this shortcoming...[T]hough ... much remains to be done until all countries are able to produce a continuous flow of social and economic data needed to inform their development policies and track progress.[94]

Attaran lamented as "profound disrespect for the scientific process"[95] that the United Nations Deputy Secretary General (UNDSG) believes there should be no changes in MDG targets despite growing methodological concerns. "Any changes at this stage," the UNDSG said, "would only distract from the result that we are trying to achieve."[96]

Besides the anthropological and methodological problems, critics are concerned by an ideological agenda they see operative in the MDGs. The 2005 UNFPA report, *The Promise of Equality: Gender Equity, Reproductive Health and the Millennium Development Goals,* for instance, calls for greater development spending on contraception because "poverty is 'intimately associated' with the lack of access to family planning and 'reproductive health.'"[97] As will be addressed more fully in a discussion about the "Phantom Goal," this has led to a fear that can best be portrayed by the impression of one commentator: "Women and girls — or more accurately, their fertility — are the real targets of the MDGs."[98]

---

94 *MDGs Report 2006*, 26 (emphasis added).

95 Attaran.

96 Deputy Secretary General United Nations: Message to the inter-agency and expert meeting on MDG indicators Geneva 29 September–1 October 2004. New York: United Nations.

97 Zenit News Agency, http://www.zenit.org/article-14269?l=english.

98 Mary Jo Anderson, "Implosion: The Collapse of the United Nations," *Crisis Magazine*, October 6, 2005.

Part V: Analysis of the Eight Millennium Development Goals

A recently released report from the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), finds that the credit crunch caused by the current global economic downturn will make achieving the MDGs in the developing world even more difficult than before. The report asserts that income will drop 20 percent more in Sub-Saharan Africa than in the developed world, costing 18 billion U.S. dollars or 46 US dollars per person.[99] The current economic crisis makes scrutiny of the MDGs more urgent than ever. This section considers each of the MDGs individually and asks whether the current approach to reach each goal advances or undermines solidarity with the poor.

GOAL 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger

The first Millennium Development Goal, through two targets and their respective indicators, focuses on halving the number of people with income under one dollar per day by 2015, and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. Extreme poverty afflicts more than a billion people who subsist on less than a dollar a day.[100]

In 1990, 1.25 billion people lived in extreme poverty, dropping to 980 million in 2004.[101] The proportion of the world's population living in extreme poverty declined during the years 1990 to 2002 from 27.9% to 19.4%.[102] Economic growth in China and India, the two most populous countries in the world, accounted for the overall decline in extreme poverty in Asia and the world,[103] where almost a quarter of a billion people progressed out of extreme poverty.[104]

---

99 *The Guardian UK,* March 5, 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/mar/05/poverty-credit-crunch-un-development.

100 *MDGs Report 2005*, 6. The rate of a dollar a day was set as an international poverty rate in 1985. Since 1993 the rate has been set at $1.08. For more on this standard, see *MDGs Report 2008,* 7.

101 *MDGs Report 2007*, 6.

102 *MDGs Report 2006*, 4.

103 *MDGs Report 2005*, 7.

104 *MDGs Report 2006*, 4.

The proportion of people living in extreme poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean declined slightly from 10.3% in 1990 to 8.7% in 2004. Those living in extreme poverty stayed nearly the same in most other regions of the world: in sub-Saharan Africa it was 46.8% in 1990 and 41.1% in 2004; in Northern Africa it was 2.6% in 1990 and 1.4% in 2004 and in Western Africa it was 1.6% in 1990 and 3.8% in 2004. In the transition countries of South-eastern Europe extreme poverty was less than 0.1% in 1990 and reached 1.8% in 2004; in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) it was 0.5% in 1990 and 0.6% in 2004.[105]

Disease and armed conflict in sub-Saharan Africa account, in part, for its slow advance out of extreme poverty.[106] Despite the overall slight decline in the poverty rate, the total population living in extreme poverty in sub-Saharan Africa rose by 140 million.[107]

According to the *MDGs Report 2005*, chronic hunger means, "lacking the food to meet their daily needs."[108] Overall, chronic hunger has declined from 20% in 1992 to 17% in 2003 in the developing world and an estimated 824 million people were afflicted by chronic hunger in 2003.[109] In sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia, where the greatest number of people live with chronic hunger, their numbers grew by 34 million and 15 million respectively from 1990 to 2002; this is blamed on "growing populations and poor agricultural activity." Sadly, much of the progress in hunger reduction was made between 1990 and 1997; the number of people going hungry actually increased between 1997 and 2002.[110]

UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon wrote in the introduction of the 2008 MDGS Report that significant progress has been made in eliminating extreme poverty, but the goal for sub-Saharan Africa at this point is unlikely to be reached by 2015. Still, global progress against poverty appears threatened by the foreboding economic lull across the world. "We face a global economic slowdown and a food security crisis, both of uncertain magnitude and duration," states the Secretary General, listing several challenges to attaining goals.[111] Higher food prices are also likely to push as many as 100 million people into absolute poverty within the regions sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia.[112]

---

105 *MDGs Report 2007*, 6.
106 *MDGs Report 2005*, 7.
107 *MDGs Report 2006*, 4.
108 *MDGs Report 2005*, 7; *MDGs Report 2006*, 5.
109 *MDGs Report 2006*, 5.
110 *MDGs Report 2005*, 8 (emphasis added).
111 *MDGs Report 2008*, 4.
112 Ibid., 6.

The Holy See supports the MDGs as an expression of a "preferential option for the poor" and therefore a "permanent task and commitment."[113] At the same time, it calls them "off target" because of an undue focus on population control and unsubstantiated claims. "Data for poverty eradication for regions in Africa reveal that at the present rate of growth they will not meet their goal in 150 years!" The Holy See recognizes that other factors such as bad government also contribute to economic stagnation, and keeps the focus on the poor by insisting that "the growing multitudes of poor and hungry people (doubling from 1980 to the present) must be assisted."[114]

Cardinal Sodano echoed the words of John Paul II that express the exasperation of all those who must watch while the poor suffer and die — "the poor cannot wait!"[115] In "putting flesh to the MDGs" as he termed it, Archbishop Migliore said tireless efforts need to be made to create a "mechanism to make ethical standards and human rights binding for nations, corporations and individuals," so as to ensure that multilateral agreements are enforced and that global markets consistent with authentic human development are established.[116]

The Holy See has warned that the MDGs can only be reached if poor persons are placed at the center of development and those obligated to help the poor actually fulfill their duty.[117] The focus in the fight to eradicate poverty must be squarely on who — not what — is to be improved. It is the integral development of poor persons, not improvements in markets and infrastructure *per se,* that is the key to social development:

> A clear idea of who the poor are, followed by practical, direct, personal assistance to them through people-centered policies must always be born in mind. Only such focus will promote the poor as real people, because it is a focus based upon the dignity of every man, woman and child, rather than upon policies that risk overlooking their worth as persons.[118]

---

113 Archbishop Celestino Migliore, *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit*, October 9, 2003, http://www.holyseemission.org/9oct2003.html.

114 Monsignor Giampaolo Crepaldi, Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, Intervention of the Holy See at the 43rd Session of the UN Commission for Social Development, February 11, 2005, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/2005/documents/rc_seg-st_20050211_crepaldi-new-york_en.html.

115 Sodano, Statement at the 60th Session of the UN General Assembly, September 16, 2005, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/2005/documents/rc_seg-st_20050916_onu_en.html.

116 Migliore, *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit.*

117 Migliore, Informal consultations on the report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change and on the United Nations Millennium Project 2005 report, February 22, 2005, http://www.holyseemission.org/22February2005.html.

118 Ibid.

Regarding the UN Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries (LDC), Archbishop Migliore said productivity was enhanced by peace, good governance and favorable macroeconomic conditions. He insisted developing nations ensure their aid policies are "people-centered" and that they implement measures to eradicate corruption, guarantee the rule of law, and enforce polices that will increase the production capacity of their countries. He compared the communist dictatorial regimes of twenty years ago with the "dictatorship of poverty" today and how, then as now, people will risk death by climbing fences to escape and find "living conditions that can truly be called dignified."[119]

The barriers that keep the poor penned may be characterized as "attitudes contrary to solidarity," as Pope Benedict XVI noted in a message to the director of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO). He pointed to solidarity as the ladder that will lift the poor up, feed and clothe them:

> Solidarity is the key to identifying and eliminating the causes of poverty and underdevelopment... Without this solidarity, there is a risk of limiting or even impeding the work of international organizations that set out to fight hunger and malnutrition.[120]

Pope Benedict XVI told the General Assembly during his April 2008 visit that development goals should be promoted through solidarity within the weakest regions of the planet rather than through a globalization effort. "I am thinking especially of those in Africa and other parts of the world which remain on the margins of authentic integral development, and are therefore at risk of experiencing only the negative effects of globalization," the Holy Father said.[121]

Extreme poverty and hunger have been categorized as cause, symptom and effect of many of the pressing issues facing much of the developed world, such as war, natural disasters, famine, corruption, lack of infrastructure and access to potable water, inadequate education, poor health care and ineffectual governance. This causes many to argue that Goal One is the most important goal and the best indicator for evaluating the overall success of the Millennium Development Goals.

---

119 Migliore, High-level Meeting on the Midterm Comprehensive Global Review of the Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010.

120 Benedict XVI, Message to Mr. Jacques Diouf, Director-General of Rome's Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), *L'Osservatore Romano*, English ed., November 1, 2006, 5.

121 Benedict XVI, Address to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, April 18, 2008, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2008/april/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20080418_un-visit_en.html.

Not a single developing region is on track to meet the second target of halving hunger. While much of Asia and Oceania could meet the first target of halving poverty if current trends hold, the rest of the developing regions will not. As for the second target, there was an overall decrease in extreme hunger from 20% in 1990 to 17% in 2002, but this is far from the final target of a decrease of 10% by 2015.[122] Barring a radical new approach to fighting poverty and hunger, it appears efforts to reach the targets for Goal One will fail. Some warn that to promise and not deliver on this — the most important goal — may discredit the development project as a whole and seriously jeopardize efforts to elicit future donors.[123]

MDG GOAL 1*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger	***Target 1A*** Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day	1.1 Proportion of population below $1 (1993 PPP) per day 1.2 Poverty gap ratio [incidence x depth of poverty] 1.3 Share of poorest quintile in national consumption
	Target 1B Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people	1.4 Growth rate of GDP per person employed 1.5 Employment-to-population ratio 1.6 Proportion of employed people living below $1 (PPP) per day 1.7 Proportion of own-account and contributing family workers in total employment
	Target 1C Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	1.8 Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age 1.9 Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

122 *MDGs Report 2005*, 7.

123 See generally, Attaran and Easterly.

GOAL 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education

The second Millennium Development Goal targets the achievement of universal primary education for boys and girls by 2015. Education is essential to integral social development. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child guarantees primary education as a basic human right, and stipulates that signatories to the treaty shall "make primary education compulsory and available free to all."[124] Unfortunately, far too many of the world's children, more than 115 million of primary school age, are denied the most basic education. Although seven regions of the world have at least 90% enrollment in primary education, sub-Saharan Africa and Oceania lag far behind, with enrollment rates of 57% and 81% respectively in 1999, and 70% and 89%, in 2005.[125]

UN reports based on household surveys in 80 developing countries note lack of access to primary education is more acute in rural areas — 30% compared to 18% for urban areas.[126] The UN reports also address primary school drop-out rates and those factors that may help children to stay in school, namely, "reducing or eliminating school fees, providing school lunches, improving the quality of teaching and bringing schooling closer to home."[127] Indigenous peoples, studies point out, have the lowest rate of primary school attendance.[128]

There is also a significant disparity in the ratio of girls and boys who receive primary education — while one in six of boys who are primary school age are not in school, the number for girls is higher at one in five.[129] One of the social implications of denying girls primary education is its possible correlation to income and child mortality: "Educated women have more economic opportunities and engage more fully in public life," and "tend to have fewer and healthier children who are more likely to attend school," thereby "breaking the cycle of poverty."[130]

Breaking the cycle of poverty, according to the UN's suggestions, entails two elements: 1) raising the educational and economic attainment of women that will, thus, 2) incline them to have fewer children. The result, according to UN logic, will be fewer and better educated people in the developing world.

---

124 Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 28, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm.
125 *MDGs Report 2007*, 10.
126 Ibid., 7.
127 *MDGs Report 2005*, 12.
128 Ibid.
129 *MDGs Report 2006*, 7.
130 *MDGs Report 2005*, 10.

The Holy See agrees with the overall thrust of Goal 2 and its commitment to increase access to basic education, calling it "as serious as lack of food,"[131] and noting that basic education is a necessity "for any nation seeking to develop itself,"[132] because "all human persons have an inalienable right to education."[133] But Archbishop Migliore has also drawn attention to the UN's under-emphasis on the role of the family as the "natural environment for the growth and development of children." The family "should be given all the necessary protection and assistance." In the Holy See's perspective, "to protect the family means to protect children."

Migliore reminded the 58th Session of the General Assembly that there is an absence of an internationally agreed family policy "fully guaranteed by law."[134] He also noted the long involvement of the Catholic Church in providing education through its many institutions around the world. While the MDGs target universal primary education by 2015, he said such plans must "go beyond primary school" and address the needs of out-of-school children:

> Children are not in school because there is no school to go to or there is no money to pay the tuition fees or the teachers' salary; because they are forced to work for their own survival or to support their family; because they have been abducted and thrust into situations of armed conflict, with schools closed or destroyed; because they belong to religious or ethnic minorities; or simply because it is impossible for them to find a school within the range of their possibilities.[135]

Migliore concluded his remarks by saying education is a key to meeting the challenge of the MDGs: "Education for sustainable development is a means to achieving many, if not most, of the Millennium Development Goals. It will help create an environment that is 'conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty.'" This may take time but educational opportunities "will have an immediate, verifiable and measurable impact on the well-being of the people of the world and on their sustainable development."[136]

---

131 *Populorum Progressio*, #35.

132 Ibid.

133 Monsignor Ettore Balestrero of the Vatican's Secretariat of State, statement at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), October 12, 2006, *L'Osservatore Romano*, English ed., Nov. 1, 2006, 9.

134 Migliore, statement at the 58th Session of the UN General Assembly on Agenda Item 113: Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children, Oct. 20, 2003, http://www.holyseemission.org/20oct03a.html.

135 Ibid.

136 Ibid.

By focusing on the side effect of depressing the total fertility of women in developing nations through enhanced opportunities for education, Goal 2 risks becoming not an end, but a means for an unstated goal — population control. For example, a study conducted by the International Center for Research on Women averred that secondary education of women in developing counties was associated, amongst other side effects, with "higher age at marriage" and "low fertility."[137] Another UN study argued that education helps girls have fewer children, and reproductive health services help girls stay in school by enabling them to avoid unwanted pregnancies: "Reproductive health services reduce the withdrawal of girls from school related to sibling care burdens caused by unplanned pregnancies or due to adolescent pregnancy."[138] This same study repeatedly touts secondary education as a depressant of total fertility since it "increases the age of marriage, [and] lowers fertility rates"[139] and "increases contraceptive use."[140] As one observer notes, these efforts to enroll girls in the developing world in school may contain a hidden ideological agenda: "they use girls' education to change culture. Girls' education is not just about bringing girls to school, but about 'empowering' them, inculcate in them an awareness of their 'rights,' a sense of their 'freedom to choose,' their 'autonomy' and 'control' over their life and other values of the new postmodern ethic."[141]

Another problem with Goal 2 is that it attempts to increase primary school attendance and completion, but fails to note or strengthen the family as the primary educator in the lives of their children.[142] Jeffery Sachs goes so far as to single out religion and culture (nurtured and sustained primarily in the family) as a main ingredient of the "poverty trap." He says norms provided by religion and culture "may be an obstacle to development" by denying women

137 Geeta Rao Gupta, International Center for Research on Women, "Eliminating Gender Disparity in Primary and Secondary Education," *Achieving the Internationally Agreed Development Goals* (New York: Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, 2005), 122.

138 The Millennium Project Report to the UN Secretary General, *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*, Jeffery Sachs, Director (New York: United Nations Development Programme, 2005), 284.

139 Ibid., 286.

140 Ibid., 287.

141 Marguerite Peeters, *Globalization of the Western Cultural Revolution: Key-Concepts, Operational Mechanisms,* trans.Benedict Kobus (EU, Institute for Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics, 2007), 64.

142 *Familiaris Consortio*, #3, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio_en.html; *Charter of the Rights of the Family*, Art. 5, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_19831022_family-rights_en.html; *Letter to Families*, #16, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_02021994_families_en.html.

their "right to education," which most importantly cascades into "delaying or blocking altogether" the demographic transition of a poor country from high fertility to low fertility.[143]

On the contrary, the family serves as the "sanctuary of life"[144] and a sanctuary of culture. The international community must strive to ensure each child in the developing world "an education based on core spiritual, moral and ethical values [which are] an indispensable tool for his or her own integral development."[145]

Therefore, in the face of "an all-encompassing" and "globalized culture" that imparts "false values that would tarnish a truly human way of life,"[146] the MDGs approach to universal primary education may simply accelerate the marginalization of parents in the developing world and further threaten noble indigenous cultural values and practices.

MDG GOAL 2*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Achieve Universal Primary Education	***Target 2A*** Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling	2.1 Net enrollment ratio in primary education 2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5 2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

GOAL 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women

The third Millennium Development Goal aims to "Promote gender equality and empower Women." Although "gender" is left *undefined* in the MDGs and the MDGs Reports, "gender equality" is hailed as "a human right and at the heart of achieving the Millennium Development Goals." Gender equality has been described as "a prerequisite to overcoming hunger, poverty and disease. This means equality at all levels of education and in all areas of work, equal control over resources and equal representation in public and political life."[147]

143 Sachs, 60.
144 *Evangelium Vitae*, #92, http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0141/_INDEX.HTM.
145 Migliore, address at The Second Session of the Permanent Forum of the United Nations on Indigenous Children and Youth, May 21, 2003, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/2003/documents/rc_seg-st_20030521_indigenous-people_en.html.
146 Ibid.
147 *MDGs Report 2005*, 14.

In 2006, the range of women in the paid labor force outside of agriculture varied from 19% in Southern Asia to 42% in Latin America and the Caribbean. By comparison women in the developed world are 46% of the paid labor force.[148] Women provide more than 60% of the labor in family enterprises without pay and most of the chores in the home which are "also unpaid, often little valued and not reflected in national production statistics."[149] Women play a large role in the informal economy, but despite an increase outside of agriculture employment, they "remain a small minority in salaried jobs."[150] The MDGs Reports for 2005 and 2006 do not inform the reader of the percentage of men employed in agriculture in the various regions of the developing world.

Parity in education is critical if women are to enjoy the "security that comes from paid employment."[151] In the developing world, about 94 girls per 100 boys went to primary school as a whole in 2006, ranging from 89:100 in Southern Asia and Oceania to 97:100 in Latin American including the Caribbean and also 99:100 in Eastern Asia.[152] While a gap remains in Southern Asia and sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia, targeted interventions to help girls go to and stay in school include: "safe transportation to and from school, separate toilets for girls and boys, and removing gender stereotyping from the classroom." Gender stereotyping is not defined.[153] Gender disparity in education is more pronounced the higher the educational attainment that is measured: "Of the 65 developing countries with full data, about half have achieved gender parity in primary education, about 20 percent in secondary education and 8 percent in higher education."[154]

Women's participation in the political process (voting and holding seats in parliaments) has increased since 1990: "One in five parliamentarians elected in 2005 are women, bringing the percentage of parliamentary seats held by women in 2006 worldwide to almost 17."[155] Certain Northern African countries amended their law and now require that a percentage of seats in their parliaments are reserved for women. By the end of 2004, 81 countries had introduced similar measures that, we are told, "are crucial to assuring progress for women in the political arena."[156] Since the 2005 elections in both

148 *MDGs Report 2008*, 18.
149 *MDGs Report 2005*, 16.
150 Ibid., 14.
151 Ibid.
152 *MDGs Report 2008*, 16.
153 *MDGs Report 2005*, 14.
154 Ibid., 15.
155 *MDGs Report 2006*, 9.
156 *MDGs Report 2005*, 17.

Afghanistan and Iraq, women now hold 27% and 25% of parliamentary seats respectively.[157]

The Holy See has lamented the feminization of poverty and the fact that the work of women in the home in most nations goes unremunerated, but found hope in the growing number of women participating in the market.[158] Archbishop Migliore has commended the UN Secretary General for advances made in providing "educational opportunities for both girls and boys, as well as literacy programs that are essential in achieving development goals."[159] The Holy See delegation also emphasized that "progress for women is progress for all," and that the pursuit of human rights for women was linked to development, peace and security. It urged structural reform aimed at the true advancement of women that does not "insist on linking women's freedom, dignity and equality to unsound policies that have handicapped women's true progress in recent times."[160] And the Holy See drew attention to the success of micro-credit loans to women entrepreneurs in developing countries: "It is most encouraging to see poor women's patience, honesty and hard work rewarded in this way in many places, and it is to be encouraged by attention to the reform of structures that will in turn assist the spread and continued success of new initiatives in this field." Migrant women, women trafficked as "slaves in their work, and not infrequently in the sex industry," women and girls in armed conflict and, "victims of systematic rape for political purposes," must be the focus of "laws that will effectively defend them from such violence."[161]

The women's movement toward liberation, the Holy See concluded, has had its share of mistakes, but "has been substantially a positive one, even if it is still unfinished, as all people of good will strive to have women acknowledged, respected, and appreciated in their own special dignity."[162]

Returning to definitions, the UN General Assembly has defined "gender" twice. Once in an International Criminal Court document, saying gender "refers to the two sexes, male and female, within the context of society,"[163] and before that in the *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action,* saying gender is "commonly used and understood in its ordinary, generally accepted usage."[164]

---

157 *MDGs Report 2006*, 9.

158 Migliore, *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit*, October 9, 2003.

159 Migliore, address at the 61st Session of the UN General Assembly, October 12, 2006, http://www.holyseemission.org/12Oct2006%20NEPAD.html.

160 Holy See delegation statement at the 50th Session of the Commission on the Status of Women, March 2, 2006, http://www.holyseemission.org/02Mar2006.html.

161 Ibid.

162 Ibid.

163 UN document, A/CONF.183/9, art. 7, "Crimes Against Humanity," para.3.

164 Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, UN document, A/CONF.177/20/REV.1.

In the MDGs reports, however, the term "gender" has artfully been left undefined.[165] In its reservation to the use of the term gender in the non-binding Beijing outcome document, the Holy See said the term must be read in the context of the whole *Platform for Action*, which used the term "both genders" to refer specifically to "male and female," while excluding dubious interpretations based on world views asserting that sexual identity is an adaptable construct.[166]

Since Beijing, various UN agencies, as distinct from member States, have understood gender to be a changeable social construct.[167] For instance, a 2007 UNICEF report referred to more than two genders, and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) produced a "Gender Training Kit" to better "organize and coordinate gender awareness and gender analysis training sessions for country offices." The UNDP Gender Training Kit defines gender as "the social relations between men and women. It refers to the relationship between men and women, boys and girls, and how this is socially constructed.

---

165 Despite the presence of many attorneys and parliamentarians who understand the need for a clear definition of terms, crucial ideas in UN treaty and consensus documents go undefined. The outcome documents of the Cairo and Beijing conferences do not state unequivocally whether abortion is included within the meaning of sexual and reproductive rights; the Treaty on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities fails to provide a clear definition of "disability;" and "gender" remains a proverbial *mystery inside an enigma* in all UN documents, even when it is defined, as in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Gender Training Kit. One researcher posits that the ambiguity of key terms in UN documents reflects a philosophical commitment to Post-Modernist thought and mode of operation: "Postmodernity substitutes sociolinguistic constructions for reality... it creates a new language, whose objective is to transform what exists into a text to be interpreted — a text which can indifferently be interpreted in one way or another, since for postmodern ideologues, all choices are considered neutral and equal. Postmodernity makes of language a space for free interpretation, an instrument 'liberating' people from their personal commitment, from the reality of life and from 'obligations' tied to the content of reality... Poststmodernity runs away from the 'clear and distinct ideas' of Cartesian civilization and delights in semantic fog. Not a single one of the new paradigms which came out of the global cultural revolution is clearly defined. Clear definitions, so the experts say, limit the choice of interpretations, in effect 'impose' a single interpretation of language and thus contradict the central norm of the new culture: the right to choose," Marguerite A. Peeters, *The Globalization of the Western Cultural Revolution: Key Concepts, Operational Mechanisms,* trans. Benedict Kobus (EU, Institute for Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics, 2007), 35.

166 U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women, *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*, Reservations and interpretative statements by the Holy See, #6, in Spanish at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/archivio/documents/rc_seg-st_19950915_conferenza-pechino-riserve_sp.html.

167 U.N. Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, "Gender Mainstreaming Concepts and Definitions," http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsandefinitions.htm.

Gender roles are dynamic and change over time."[168]

Although Goal 3 does not define gender, it is already being interpreted by various UN agencies "in the spirit" of the Beijing *Platform for Action,* to mean changeable social constructs. The most alarming case is arguably the 2007 *Yogyakarta Principles: The Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. The "principles" claim that nations are already obligated to grant broad homosexual rights, such as the right to marry, based upon their re-interpretation of various UN human rights treaties. Eleven UN special rapporteurs and UN human rights treaty body members authored the document, and it was endorsed by former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour.[169]

The UN Inter-Agency Network on Women and Gender Equality said gender equality in Goal 3 is not limited to a single goal, but applies to all of the MDGs; nor should it be limited to instrumental actions aimed at achieving specific goals, but must be set within "a broader framework of action, of the kind set out at the 4th World Conference on Women in 1995." Therefore, it recommends targets conforming to the Beijing *Platform of Action* — but not included in any MDG — such as sexual and reproductive rights: "Legal and social programs, including for sexual and reproductive health and rights, give women and girls greater protection from violence and sexual harassment."[170]

Committees charged with implementing UN convention commitments also increasingly tend to read their value preferences into ambiguous texts, and then treat those preferences as super-obligatory or preemptive international norms that trump domestic laws to the contrary. For instance, the fact that abortion is not mentioned in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) has not prevented the committee charged with its implementation from censuring more than 60 countries for failing to include legal abortion services in their domestic laws. For example, Mexico was told to "review their legislation so that, where necessary, women are granted access to rapid and easy abortion."[171] The CEDAW Committee has already ruled that its understanding of "gender" trumps national expressions of religion and culture: "True gender equality [does] not allow for varying

168 United Nations Development Programme, *Introductory Gender Analysis & Gender Training Module for UNDP Staff* (2001), 9.

169 International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, http://www.iglhrc.org/cgi-bin/iowa/article/pressroom/pressrelease/414.html.

170 UNDP, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), UNFPA, WB, and the OECD/ Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Gender Equality, "*Gender Equality & The Millennium Development Goals,*" (July 2003).

171 UN document, A/53/38/Rev. 1, Part One, para. 426.

interpretations of obligations under international legal norms depending on internal religious rules, traditions and customs."[172]

The term "gender" appears innocuous in both the *Beijing Platform for Action,* which refers to "both genders," and Goal 3 of the MDGs, with its view to eliminate gender disparity in education, literacy rates, employment, and in national parliaments. However, this is no guarantee it will not be used by overreaching international agencies as a catalyst for social change, including an international push for abortion on demand and broad homosexual rights.

MDG GOAL 3*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	***Target 3A*** Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015	3.1 Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education 3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector 3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

GOAL 4: Reduce Child Mortality

Millennium Development Goal 4 aims to reduce the under-five child mortality rate by two-thirds by 2015. Child mortality is linked to poverty, so improvements in public health, such as safe water and better sanitation, are essential. The under-five child mortality rate improved in the developing world from one in five in 1960 to one in ten in 1990.[173] It has continued to decline in every region since 2000, especially in Latin America and the Caribbean, Southeastern and Eastern Asia and Northern Africa, where child mortality rates have annually declined by more than 3 percent.[174] Nonetheless, in 2006 for every 1,000 births, 157 children died in the sub-Saharan desert. Although better than in 1990 when 184 children died per 1,000 births, a child born in a developing country is 13 times more likely to die before age five than in a developed one.[175]

172 United Nations, Report of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, art 16, para. 135, UN document, A/49/38.
173 *MDGs Report 2005*, 18.
174 *MDGs Report 2006*, 10.
175 *MDGs Report 2008,* 21.

Five diseases — pneumonia, diarrhea, malaria, measles, and HIV/AIDS — account for half of the under-five deaths. According to the MDGs reports, low-cost prevention and treatment measures could save most of these children, such as: "exclusive breastfeeding of infants, antibiotics for acute respiratory infections, oral rehydration for diarrhea, immunization, and the use of insecticide-treated mosquito nets," as well as anti-malaria drugs and proper nutrition.[176]

Measles struck 30 million children in 2002 and killed 540,000 that same year.[177] Worldwide, three out of four children are now protected against measles. Still, measles killed almost half a million children in 2004. Routine vaccination and second dose coverage for measles has proven to be one of the most cost-effective public health interventions, while reducing child deaths from measles from 757,000 in 2000 to 242,000 in 2006.[178] The MDGs reports also find that when women receive a secondary education, the child mortality rates of their children are cut in half.[179]

While the UN acknowledges a link between maternal education and child mortality, it completely misses the link between strong families and healthy children. The Holy See draws attention to this missing link and urges that protection and assistance be given to the family — "to protect the family means to protect the children."[180]

Children have more standing in international law than families. Compliance with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child must be monitored, in part, because there is no treaty guaranteeing the rights of the family:

> The need for a set of norms to protect the various rights of the child is necessary also because of the lack of a real family policy that is fully guaranteed by law... efforts should be intensified to recognize the social role of the family which is irreplaceable for the common good.[181]

Pope John Paul II reminded children's rights advocates that respect for the dignity, well-being, and rights of a child is tied to recognition of the *first* right of a child — to be born into a real family:

---

176 *MDGs Report 2005*, 19.
177 Ibid., 20.
178 *MDGs Report 2008*, 22.
179 *MDGs Report 2006*, 11.
180 Migliore, Statement before the Third Committee of the 58th Session of the UN General Assembly on Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children (emphasis added).
181 Ibid.

> The Church's social doctrine constantly points out the need to respect the dignity of children. "In the family, which is a community of persons, special attention must be devoted to the children by developing a profound esteem for their personal dignity, and a great respect and generous concern for their rights.... *The first right of the child is to 'be born in a real family.'*"[182]

The Holy See insists that the MDGs are essentially about our future, that is, about our children, whose well-being depends in many ways on the support States offer families:

> When we speak about the MDGs we are addressing our immediate future and, thus, we are talking about children. Children are the most precious treasure deserving of the utmost love and respect, and they are given to each generation as a challenge to its wisdom and humanity. The well-being of the world's children depends greatly on the measures taken by states to support and help families fulfill their natural life-giving and formative functions.[183]

One fundamental problem with Goal 4 is who is included in the definition of the term "child." According to the preamble of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth."[184] While not legally binding in the way articles of the treaty are, the preamble determines the context in which the articles are to be interpreted and gives evidence that nations recognized the need for legal protection of the unborn when negotiating the treaty.[185] Subsequently, many argue that if it is, as the MDGs reports rightly point out, a tragedy for almost

---

182 *CSDC*, #244, quoting John Paul II, Address to the Committee of European Journalists for the Rights of the Child (January 13, 1979): L'Osservatore Romano, English ed., January 22, 1979, 5 (emphasis added).

183 Migliore, statement at the follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit.

184 *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, Preamble, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm.

185 One legal analysis of the Convention on the Rights of the Child argues that children in the pre-natal period of life before birth are human and have the same right to life and freedom from violence "as any other member of the human family." See Bruce Abramson, "Violence Against Babies: Protection of Pre- and Post-natal Children Under the Framework of the Convention on the Rights of the Child," NGO *Input Into the UN Study on Violence Against Children.* Submitted by: The World Family Policy Center, and The David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies, Brigham Young University, (Provo, Utah, 2005): 38.

11 million children to die every year from easily preventable diseases,[186] how much greater the tragedy that 26 to 31 million children a year suffer violence and are killed by legal abortion worldwide?[187]

The Holy See points out that recognition of the rights of children and concern for their well-being does not begin after they are born, but must extend to the first moment of their existence:

> In our day and age, the recognition of the rights of the child has undoubtedly made progress. But the violation of these rights in practice, exemplified by the many terrible assaults on their innocence and dignity, remains a cause for distress and, at the same time, calls us into action. *We must see to it that the welfare of children is always given priority during all the stages of their development, right from the moment of conception when they become individual human beings.* The international community should assure the well-being of children through political action at the highest level; for, in the end, the attention we give now for the well-being of the children is an assurance for the well-being of society, now and in the future.[188]

Thus there are two primary problems with Goal 4 as it is now promoted: a lack of attention to the family, which is the child's primary means of support; and an arbitrary discrimination against children in their earliest stages of life.

MDG GOAL 4*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Reduce Child Mortality	***Target 4A*** Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate	4.1 Under-five mortality rate 4.2 Infant mortality rate 4.3 Proportion of 1 year-old children immunized against measles

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

186 *MDGs Report 2005*, 18.

187 See for example Stanley K. Henshaw, "Induced Abortion: A World Review, 1990," *Family Planning Perspectives*, March-April 1990, 76-89, citing estimates by the Alan Guttmacher Institute.

188 Migliore, statement before the Third Committee of the 58th Session of the UN General Assembly on Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Children (emphasis added).

GOAL 5: Improve Maternal Health

Millennium Development Goal 5 aims to reduce maternal mortality by three-fourths. In 2000, the developing world's average risk of dying during pregnancy or childbirth was 45 per 10,000 live births. According to the UN more than half a million women died during pregnancy or childbirth that year.[189] The range of maternal mortality in the developing world varied from as high as 92 per 10,000 live births in sub-Saharan Africa to as low as 5.5 per 10,000 live births in Eastern Asia. In the developed world 1.4 women died during pregnancy or childbirth per 10,000 live births in 2000.[190] One major problem with the statistics given above is that, by the UN's own admission, they are not substantiated. Even the 2006 MDGs report acknowledges that data for maternal deaths in the developing world is "unreliable" with "wide margins of uncertainty." Thus, using the maternal mortality rate as an indicator of development is problematic.[191]

The 2008 MDGs report acknowledged that little progress has been made in saving mothers' lives between 1990 and 2005, with a decrease in maternal mortalities of less than one percent. Sub-Saharan Africa has improved negligibly with a reduction from 920 to 900 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births.[192] The report also states that the proportion of deliveries attended by skilled health care personnel rose from 47% in 1990 to 61% in 2006.[193] The presence of skilled attendants at delivery is "the most inequitably distributed among child and maternal health indicators," varying greatly between rural and urban poor or wealthier versus poorer counterparts.[194]

There is little argument about the fact that meeting Goal 5 merits attention as an important international achievement. But Goal 5 has become the most hotly contested MDG in recent years, as two opposing camps have emerged on the best way to combat maternal mortality. The first camp, which has the support of much of the UN bureaucracy and the international development community, believes the main emphasis should be placed on universal access to sexual and reproductive health, with promotion of "safe" abortion as the centerpiece. The first camp promoted its agenda at the Women Deliver conference in October 2007, which was co-sponsored by various UN agencies such as WHO, UNICEF and UNFPA, and supported by members of the UN Secretariat such as the Deputy Secretary General Asha Rose Migiro. The

189 *MDGs Report 2005*, 22.
190 Ibid., 23.
191 *MDGs Report 2006*, 12
192 *MDGs Report 2008*, 25.
193 Ibid.
194 *MDGs Report 2006,* 13.

unmistakable message of the conference was the promotion of abortion rights as the primary way to achieve Millennium Development Goal 5 of improving maternal health.[195]

The second camp hews more closely to international consensus, promoting the approach described in the MDGs reports, which emphasizes "skilled care at delivery" as the key to reducing maternal mortality.[196] This also includes "access to emergency obstetric care."[197] Notably, international consensus does not include abortion as part of family planning programs, in accordance with the 1994 Cairo Program of Action. The Cairo document states that, "Governments should take appropriate steps to help women avoid abortion, which in no case should be promoted as a method of family planning;"[198] and that "Any measures or changes related to abortion within the health system can only be determined at the national or local level according to the national legislative process."[199] Proponents of abortion rights have repeatedly failed to secure a new MDG for "universal access to sexual and reproductive health by 2015." The ongoing campaign to change the MDGs to include abortion rights is examined in a following section.

Critics of the first camp — or the camp that puts family planning with "abortion first," skilled care second, and emergency obstetrics third — point out several flaws with the emphasis on abortion. Dr. Susan Yoshihara argues persuasively that the "abortion first" approach to maternal mortality contradicts the consensus of the medical community which: emphasizes skilled care; acknowledges that legal abortion also contributes to maternal mortality; diverts necessary attention and funding from decent health care to promote a particular agenda; is based upon unsubstantiated and unreliable maternal mortality data; requires the undermining of the rule of law to advance an agenda, such as misinterpretation of UN human rights treaties by treaty monitoring bodies and UN agencies; and undermines health care standards and national regulations by deliberately bypassing national laws and medical regulations. [200] Specifically, it targets the institutions of church, family and culture, all of which have traditionally supported women's health, especially

195 Susan Yoshihara, "Six Problems with 'Women Deliver:' Why the UN Should Not Change MDG 5," International Organizations Briefing Paper No.2, November 5, 2007, http://www.c-fam.org/docLib/20080611_Women_Deliver_final.pdf.

196 *MDGs Report 2006*, 12.

197 *MDGs Report 2005*, 23.

198 *International Conference on Population and Development*, Cairo, 1994, para. 7.24.

199 Ibid., para. 8.25.

200 Yoshihara, "Six Problems with 'Women Deliver:' Why the UN Should Not Change MDG 5."

in nations without decent health infrastructure.[201] The WHO Maternal Mortality report of 2005 bears out this critique. It finds that Ireland, with one of the world's most restrictive abortion laws, has the world's lowest maternal mortality rate.[202]

In her role as Holy See representative at the Beijing +10 Conference and at the 49th Session of the Commission on the Status of Women in 2005, Ambassador Mary Ann Glendon, then a professor at Harvard Law School, twice urged delegates to consider "motherhood." She reminded the gathered delegates of the United Nations' founders, who insisted with equal vigor for "women's equality" and "on protection for the family, motherhood and childhood." She also spoke of the challenge in applying the "equality principle" to the "majority of women — mothers and others who give priority to caregiving roles."[203] In contrast, the MDGs and the MDGs reports for 2005 and 2006 never mention mother or motherhood.[204]

The MDGs reports sometimes focus narrowly on "reproductive health and family planning services" as a key to reducing maternal mortality and to many other related goals, "such as reducing child mortality, hunger and malnutrition and increasing primary education enrolment." The 2008 MDGs report credits increased availability of family planning as a major factor in reducing total fertility rates in developing regions, despite unmet demands by married adolescents for more contraception.[205] This, despite the fact that significant studies have shown the negligible effect of family planning programs on fertility rates.[206]

While MDGs reports cite the importance of contraception in preventing maternal mortalities, the Holy See approaches the issue from a holistic view of women and their "overall and comprehensive health care needs:"

> The Holy See continues to advocate a holistic approach to health

201 Ibid.

202 World Health Organization, "Maternal Mortality in 2005: Estimates developed by WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA, and World Bank," http://www.who.int/whosis/mme_2005.pdf.

203 Professor Mary Ann Glendon, President of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, statement at the Fourth World Conference on Women, 23rd Session of the UN General Assembly, March 7, 2005, http://www.holyseemission.org/7March2005.html.

204 The word "mother," in contrast to the term "gender," is used sparingly even when it would be most appropriate, as in the *Beijing Platform of Action* for the Commission on the Status of Women (1995), 17 times versus 218 times and is used in reference to "difficult context: 'underaged mothers,' 'teenage mothers,' or in the case of breastfeeding," Peeters, *The Globalization of the Western Cultural Revolution*, chapter 5, footnote 30.

205 *MDGs Report 2008*, 27.

206 Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* (Cambridge: Harvard Belknap Press, 2008): 374.

> for women which does not exclusively focus on a single aspect of a woman, but on her overall and comprehensive health care needs… Furthermore, women have the right to the highest standard of health care during pregnancy and the right to deliver children in a clean, safe environment, with adequate professional help.[207]

Rather than viewing pregnancy strictly as an indicator for increased risk to maternal health, Pope John Paul II reminded us that motherhood is not so much an indicator for maternal health risk, but a temporal and eternal blessing:

> The Motherhood of every woman, understood in light of the Gospel, is similarly not only "of flesh and blood:" it expresses a profound "listening to the word of the living God" and a readiness to "safeguard" this Word, which is "the word of eternal life" (cf. Jn 6:68). For it is precisely those born of earthly mothers, the sons and daughters of the human race, who receive from the Son of God power to become the "children of God" (Jn. 1:12).[208]

The Holy See has found it important to remind UN delegates of the Catholic Church's active support and concern for women's health issues and access to basic human rights to education and social services as a means of improving women's health: "For its part, the Holy See, through its world-wide network of schools and educational agencies, will continue to offer educational opportunities, and through its hospitals, clinics and health care facilities will provide for the holistic health needs for women, young and old."[209]

Fenny Tatad, researcher and president of the non-governmental organization Women of Asia for Development and Enterprise, expressed "serious reservations" about the promotion of chemical contraceptives as a means of achieving reproductive health in her country, for medical and social reasons. Commenting on a study conducted in her native Philippines, Tatad argues that chemical contraceptives have counter indications that, together with the moral condemnation of the Catholic Church, may prove a disincentive to their use by women in the Philippines:

---

207 Migliore, statement to the 60th Session of the UN General Assembly, Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World conference on Women, October 13, 2005, http://www.holyseemission. org/13Oct 2005 %20Women.html.

208 *Mulieris Dignitatem,* #19.

209 Intervention by the Holy See Delegation to the 23rd Special Session of the General Assembly on Women, October 9, 2000.

> Money is not enough. The WHO announcement regarding [birth control] pills as highly carcinogenic makes it totally unwise for the [Philippines Department of Health] DOH to push this method for spacing childbirth. The statistical increase in the incidence of cancer among women lends credence to the WHO findings and may just keep women away from using contraceptive pills. Aside from the medical and scientific arguments, the moral prohibition on the use of contraceptives among the faithful of the most numerous Church will also not help achieve the target.[210]

In this light, the UN must abandon its incessant project to push "reproductive health and family planning services" on women in the developing world if it is to remain true to "its faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person,"[211] the unified vision of the UN's founders who insisted with equal vigor on "women's equality"[212] and "protection for the family, motherhood and childhood." [213] Reducing maternal mortality in the developing world depends on meeting the holistic and comprehensive health care needs of women, not focusing exclusively on a single aspect of women living in poverty — their fertility — so as to impair it.

MDG GOAL 5*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Improve Maternal Health	***Target 5A*** Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio	5.1 Maternal mortality ratio 5.2 Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel

2 Source: MDG monitor at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml. The source contains reference to a second target to "achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health." The claim that such a target exists has been disputed by UN member states, as this paper examines in detail, and is therefore not included here.

210 Fenny C. Tatad, "Goal 5: Women's Health, Nation's Wealth," Leonor Magtolis Briones, editor, *Moving Forward with the Millennium Development Goals: May Pera Pa Ba?* (Manila, Philippines: Social Watch Philippines, UN Development Programme and University of the Philippines, 2006): 95.

211 Charter of the United Nations, Preamble, June 26, 1945.

212 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 2.

213 Ibid., Article 25 (1)(2).

GOAL 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases

The sixth Millennium Development Goal aims to halt and reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and other major diseases by 2015. Around the world, the number of people living with HIV/AIDS rose from 36.2 million in 2003 to 38.6 million in 2005. Despite greater access to anti-retroviral drugs, AIDS-related deaths rose to 2.8 million that same year. According to MDG reports, sub-Saharan Africa, where the epidemic is centered, accounts for 64% of all HIV-positive people and 90% of the children younger than fifteen years with the disease.[214] More than 20 million people have died of AIDS since it first appeared.[215] AIDS has left millions of children orphans; more than 15 million children have lost one or more parents to the disease, and in sub-Saharan Africa, more than 4 million children have lost both parents to AIDS.[216]

Malaria afflicts an estimated 350 to 500 million people a year; killing one million annually. In sub-Saharan Africa, more than 2,000 children die every day from the mosquito-born disease.[217] Most UN reports promote insecticide-treated mosquito nets as the best hope for a quick reduction in malaria infection rates.[218]

As for tuberculosis (TB), 1.7 million people die from the disease each year according to MDG reports. In 2004 there were nearly 9 million new cases of TB; 741,000 were among people living with HIV.[219] The number of new cases a year has been growing by 1% annually due in part to the emergence of drug-resistant strains of the disease, increases in HIV infected persons with lower resistance, and more refugees and displaced persons.[220]

The Catholic Church is arguably the largest contributor to the fight against the HIV virus and provider to those suffering from AIDS: 26.7% of HIV and AIDS treatment centers world-wide are Catholic-based.[221] The Church works with HIV/AIDS survivors "on the medical, social and spiritual levels," and the spiritual dimension is integral, as Pope John II witnessed in 2001 when asking that the "merciful love of God" be shown especially to

214 *MDGs Report 2006*, 14.
215 *MDGs Report 2005*, 24.
216 Ibid., 26.
217 Ibid.
218 *MDGs Report 2005*, p. 28; *MDGs Report2006*, 15.
219 *MDGs Report 2006*, 15.
220 *MDGs Report 2005*, 29.
221 Archbishop Javier Lozano Barragan, statement at the High-level Meeting and Comprehensive Review of the Progress Achieved in Realizing the Targets Set out in the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, June 2, 2006, http://www.holyseemission.org/02Jun2006English.html.

children orphaned by AIDS.[222] The Holy See's integral approach includes worldwide charitable institutions offering "wide-ranging services, from awareness campaigns to education towards responsible behavior, from counseling to moral support, from nutrition centers to orphanages, from hospital treatment to home and prison care for HIV/AIDS patients." The Holy See seeks to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS through "education on responsible sexual behavior" that emphasizes the virtue of chastity, "including abstinence and marital fidelity."[223]

Halting and reversing the incidence and spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis is akin to promoting the most fundamental human right — "that of Human Life itself," according to the Holy See.[224] The Church emphasizes the redemptive meaning of human suffering and insists that hospitals, clinics and aid centers "should not merely be institutions where care is provided for the sick or the dying. Above all they should be places where suffering, pain and death are acknowledged and understood in their human and specifically Christian meaning," giving "eloquent expressions of what charity is able to advise in order to give everyone new reasons for hope and practical possibilities for life."[225]

The Church's teaching on HIV/AIDS prevention is clear: the "best and most effective *prevention* is training in the authentic values of life, love and sexuality."[226] The 2006 MDGs report in part corroborates this: "several countries report success in reducing HIV infection rates through interventions that promote behavior change."[227] Nonetheless, the UN often attempts to link behavior change with contraceptive practice, which sends a mixed message at best:

> Recognizing that effective prevention, care and treatment strategies will require behavioral changes and increased availability of and non-discriminatory access to, inter alia, vaccines, *condoms*, microbicides, lubricants, sterile injecting equipment, drugs, including anti-retroviral

222 Barragan, 26th Special Session of the UN General Assembly, June 27, 2001, Statement of Interpretation of the Holy See on the Adoption of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_doc_20010627_declaration-aids_en.html.

223 Cardinal Claudio Hummes, address to high level plenary meeting of the UN General Assembly Special Session: implementation of the declaration of commitment on HIV/AIDS, Sept. 22, 2003, http://www.holyseemission.org/22sept2003.html.

224 Monsignor Silvano Maria Tomasi, C.S., Intervention at the 61st Session of the Commission on UN Human Rights on Access to Medication in the Context of Pandemics, such as HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis.

225 *Evangelium Vitae*, # 88.

226 Ibid. (emphasis added).

227 *MDGs Report 2006*, 14.

> therapy, diagnostics and related technologies, as well as increased research and development.[228]

Many, including the Holy See, are critical of linking behavioral change with sex using condoms to achieve HIV/AIDS prevention because the use of condoms is both immoral and ineffective:

> Nothing that the Holy See has done during the discussion leading up to the adoption of the Declaration of the Commitment on HIV/AIDS should be understood or interpreted as an endorsement of concepts it cannot support for moral reasons... The Holy See wishes to emphasize that, with regard to the use of condoms as a means of preventing HIV infection, it has in no way changed its moral position... Finally, the Holy See continues to call attention to the undeniable fact that the only safe and completely reliable method of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV is abstinence before marriage and respect and mutual fidelity within marriage.[229]

Senior Harvard scientist Edward Green has conducted extensive research on HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa and his findings led him to ask health officials to demote condom use in HIV/AIDS disease prevention to third place. He recommends the "ABC method:" Abstinence, Be faithful, or use Condoms if A and B are not practiced. He became interested in abstinence and faithfulness when he worked for the US Agency for International Development (USAID) in Uganda in 1993. Ugandan president Yoweri Museveni and his wife openly encouraged abstinence and fidelity from the time Museveni became president of Uganda in 1986. The results were unprecedented: HIV prevalence dropped by about two-thirds in the span of a decade, a result that has been largely attributed to the president's personal leadership on this issue.[230] The HIV incidence rate in Uganda has been declining since 1989, and has continued to decline.[231] University of California

---

228 Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, United Nations General Assembly, June 25-27, 2001, 11 (emphasis added).

229 Statement of Interpretation of the Holy See on the Adoption of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS. June 27, 2001, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seg-st_doc_20010627_un-aids_en.html.

230 See *PLoS Medicine,* "Was the 'ABC' Approach (Abstinence, Being Faithful, Using Condoms) Responsible for Uganda's decline in HIV?" Elaine M. Murphy, Margaret E. Greene, Alexandra Mihailovic, Peter Olupot-Olupot, http://www.plosmedicine.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030379.

231 "ABC Model of AIDS and HIV Prevention Detailed," *Harvard Public Health Now*, January 9, 2004, http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/now/jan9/abc.html.

at Berkeley researcher Malcolm Potts, Harvard's Daniel Halperin and a team of scientists reported in 2008 that "the largest donor investments are being made in interventions for which evidence of large-scale impact is increasingly weak," and that programs like Uganda's exhibit the strongest evidence:

> In Uganda, HIV prevalence declined dramatically following the extensive "Zero Grazing" campaign of the late 1980s. WHO surveys conducted in 1989 and 1995 found a >50% reduction in the number of people reporting multiple and casual partners. In Kenya, partner reduction and fidelity also appear to have been the main behavioral change associated with the recent HIV decline. Similar behavior change has been reported in DHS surveys in Zimbabwe, where HIV has also fallen, along with Ethiopia, Côte d'Ivoire, and urban Malawi. In Swaziland, the number of people reporting two or more partners in the past month was halved after an aggressive 2006 campaign focusing on the danger of having a "secret lover."[232]

Other African nations in this same time period, with an abundant supply of condoms and no emphasis on abstinence, have seen their incident rate for HIV/AIDS skyrocket:

> In many sub-Saharan African countries, high HIV transmission rates have continued despite high rates of condom use... No clear examples have emerged yet of a country that has turned back an epidemic primarily by the means of condom distribution.[233]

The foregoing evidence validates what Pope Benedict stated on the issue during his 2009 trip to Africa, in which he also offered the proper solution to the problem of HIV/AIDS:

> I would say that this problem of AIDS can't be overcome only with publicity slogans. If there is not the soul, if the Africans are not helped, the scourge can't be resolved with the distribution of condoms: on the contrary, there is a risk of increasing the problem. The solution can only be found in a double commitment: first, a humanization of sexuality, that is, a spiritual and human renewal that brings with it a

232 Malcolm Potts, Daniel T. Halperin, Douglas Kirby, Ann Swidler, Elliot Marseille, Jeffrey D. Klausner, Norman Hearst, Richard G. Wamai, James G. Kahn, and Julia Walsh, "Reassessing HIV Prevention," *Science,* Vol.320, May 9, 2008: 749-750.

233 Sanny Chen and Norman Hearst, "Condom Promotion for AIDS prevention in the Developing World: Is it Working?" *Studies in Family Planning Journal,* March 2004.

new way of behaving with one another; and second, a true friendship, also and above all for those who suffer, the willingness — even with sacrifice and self-denial — to be with the suffering. And these are the factors that help and that lead to visible progress.[234]

MDG GOAL 6*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Combat HIV/ AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases	***Target 6A*** Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	6.1 HIV prevalence among population aged 15-24 years 6.2 Condom use at last high-risk sex 6.3 Proportion of population aged 15-24 years with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS 6.4 Ratio of school attendance of orphans to school attendance of non-orphans aged 10-14 years
	Target 6B Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/ AIDS for those who need it	6.5 Proportion of population with advanced HIV infection with access to antiretroviral drugs.
	Target 6C Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases	6.6 Incidence and death rates associated with malaria 6.7 Proportion of children under 5 sleeping under insecticide-treated bednets 6.8 Proportion of children under 5 with fever who are treated with appropriate anti-malarial drugs 6.9 Incidence, prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis 6.10 Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course (DOTS, internationally recommended TB control strategy)

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

234 Jeff Ziegler, *Catholic World Report,* May 2009, pg. 25. [NB: the word "money" was subsequently changed to "publicity slogans" by the Vatican Press Office.]

GOAL 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability

Millennium Development Goal 7 seeks to ensure environmental sustainability by reversing losses of environmental resources while also reducing the rate of significant biodiversity loss. The goal aims to halve the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation by 2015 as well as an improvement in the lives of 100 million slum dwellers by 2020.[235]

According to the 2008 MDGs report, forests decreased from 1990-2000 by 2% in Oceania, 5% in South-East Asia, 2% in Latin America, including the Caribbean, and by 2% in sub-Saharan Africa.[236] In 2004 approximately 13% of the earth's land surface was designated as protected areas; a 15% increase since 1994. However, less than 1% of marine environments were protected. The MDGs reports express concern for biodiversity and express concern for 10,000 species under threat.[237]

The reports argue that energy efficiency is improving around the world, but the transfer of clean technology and fuels to the developing world is slow.[238] The consumption of fossil fuels contributes to carbon dioxide emissions which the reports say is leading to the gradual warming of the planet and climate change. The UN claims this causes "rising sea waters, more frequent and intense storms, the extinction of species, worsening droughts and crop failures."[239] Therefore, the UN lauds the Montreal and the Kyoto Protocols for galvanizing global effort to control carbon dioxide emissions, reducing chlorofluorocarbons by 90% and thereby reducing ozone depletion in the stratosphere.[240]

More than 40 percent of the world's population lives in areas where there is scarcity due to either physical or economic reasons. Much of the compromised areas lie in Northern Africa and Western Asia. Although sanitation improved in the developing world from 41% to 53% between 1990 and 2006, the goal commits nations to bringing improved sanitation to 71% of the developing world by 2015.[241] Rural populations represent more than 70 percent of people in need of improved sanitation, while improvements in urban areas are not keeping pace with growing populations.[242]

In 2007, for the first time in history, most of the world's populations lived

235 *MDGs Report 2008*, 36-43.
236 *MDGs Report 2005*, 30.
237 *MDGs Report 2005*, 31.
238 Ibid.
239 Ibid., 32.
240 *MDGs Report 2005*, 32; *MDGs Report 2006*, 17-18.
241 *MDGs Report 2008*, 40.
242 Ibid., 41.

in cities. The MDGs reports project that this will result in larger slums in the developing world.[243] Almost one billion people now live in slums "characterized by overcrowding, little employment or security of tenure, poor water, sanitation and health services, and widespread insecurity."[244] The UN reports improvements in the lives of slum dwellers when laws are passed protecting the poor from forced and unlawful eviction and policies are put in place providing access to credit, to invest in their home.[245]

The Holy See goes beyond the UN's primary focus on the number of poor and the state of their environs, insisting that authentic human development must also attend to the inner nature of the human person:

> Technical solutions, no matter how developed, are not helpful if they fail to take into account the centrality of the human person, who, in his spiritual and material dimensions, is the measure of all rights and therefore must be the guiding criterion of programs and policies.[246]

The Church maintains that the world was created *for* mankind, and not the other way around: "respect for creation stems from respect for human life and dignity."[247] Therefore, the MDGs must "eternally safeguard the conditions for an authentic 'human ecology.'"[248] The fundamental structure that provides for human ecology is the family, called to become a "sanctuary of life."[249] The Holy See emphasizes that, "Such an ecology will place the human person at the centre of environment concerns."[250]

That said, the Holy See speaks out strongly for human stewardship of the environment, calling environmental degradation a "silent emergency"

243 *MDGs Report 2006*, 20.
244 *MDGs Report 2005*, 34.
245 Ibid., 35.
246 John Paul II, Message on World Food Day, October 13, 2002, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/food/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_20021017_xxii-world-food-day_en.html.
247 Common Declaration on Environmental Ethics of John Paul II and the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I, June 22, 2002.
248 *Centesimus Annus*, #38.
249 Benedict XVI address to Roman Curia, Decenmber 12, 2008, referred to "an ecology of man" based on respecting the nature of the human person expressed in the two genders, masculine and feminine, which the order of creation or the "language of creation" demands. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2008/december/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20081222_curia-romana_en.html.
250 Migliore, Intervention by the Holy See at the 14th Session on Sustainable Development of the ECOSOC, May 11, 2006, http://www.holyseemission.org/11May2006%20Terrorism.html.

resulting in less biodiversity and fewer forests.[251] At the UN's Commission on Social Development, the Holy See asked members to direct developmental aid towards those programs that most immediately affect the poor, and not to those projects that affect the poor only indirectly by promoting "global public goods," such as money for the study of climate change. [252] At the 60th Session of the General Assembly in November of 2005, however, the Holy See agreed with the UN Secretary General's position, stating that climate change was a "grave question." Therefore, it recommended that climate change, together with the study of deforestation and desertification, be addressed as part of a "holistic and multi-sectoral" development plan that integrates "poverty reduction strategies" into "environmental sustainability."[253]

The Holy See considers climate change as part of the "cost of economic activity:" "In this context, one considers relations between human activity and *climate change* which, given their extreme complexity, must be opportunely and constantly monitored at the scientific, political and juridical, national and international levels. The climate is a good that must be protected and reminds consumers and those engaged in industrial activity to develop a greater sense of responsibility for their behavior."[254]

Pope John Paul II spoke of access to clean drinking water on several occasions in terms of rights: "Adequate levels of development in every geographical area will be legitimately and respectfully guaranteed only if access to water is considered a right of individuals and peoples."[255] He lamented a widening gap between "'new rights' being promoted in advanced societies... and other more basic human rights still not being met, especially in situations of underdevelopment. I am thinking here for example about the right to food and drinkable water...."[256]

The targets and indicators for Goal 7 support the Church's social teachings.

---

251 Migliore, Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit.

252 Monsignor Giampaolo Crepaldi, Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, Intervention of the Holy See at the 43rd Session of the UN Commission for Social Development, February 11, 2005, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/2005/documents/rc_seg-st_20050211_crepaldi-new-york_en.html.

253 Migliore, 60th Session of the General Assembly on item 52: Sustainable development, http://www.holyseemission. org/3Nov2005.html.

254 *CSDC*, #470 (emphasis in original).

255 John Paul II, Message on World Food Day, October 13, 2002.

256 *CSDC*, #365 citing John Paul II, Message for the 2003 World Day of Peace, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/peace/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_20021217_xxxvi-world-day-for-peace_en.html; John Paul II, Address to the participants in the International Congress on "Life-Sustaining Treatments and Vegetative State: Scientific Advances and Ethical Dilemmas," declaring the right of disabled persons to food and water, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2004/march/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20040320_congress-fiamc_en.html.

The Holy See supports the integration of principles of sustainable development into national policy; however, such policies must not undermine the principle of subsidiarity and cooperation between the smaller and lesser subgroups within national or international society.[257] The Church warns against using the links between demographics, poverty and environmental degradation as a "pretext for political and economic choices that are at variance with the dignity of the human person."[258]

One particular area for concern is that the UN reports view people as a burden, not a resource, implicating the fertility of the poor as part of the problem of poverty: "because of migration to the cities and additional births, about 100 million people are added..."[259] and "[g]rowing populations pose a challenge" to finding adequate drinking water.[260] The Holy See counters that the plummeting birth rates in developed nations signal their inability to renew themselves and that "demographic growth is fully compatible with an integral and shared development."[261]

A summary of the Holy See's perspective might be that a sound environmental sustainability must place nature in right relation to God and to man. Both the human person and nature are created by God and because God has no place in the MDGs there is a tendency for its targets to ensure that environmental sustainability will drift in ways that impoverish people, even while seeking to cure poverty:

> The attitude that must characterize the way man acts in relation to creation is essentially one of gratitude and appreciation; the world, in fact, reveals the mystery of God who created and sustains it. If the relationship with God is placed aside, nature is stripped of its profound meaning and impoverished. If on the other hand, nature is rediscovered in its creaturely dimension, channels of communication with it can be established, its rich and symbolic meaning can be understood, allowing us to enter into its realm of *mystery*. This realm opens the path of man to God, Creator of heaven and earth.[262]

Essentially, this is the difference between seeing humanity as the enemy of the environment or viewing human beings as the stewards of the environment.

---

257 John Paul II, Message to the Participants in the Sixth Plenary Session of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Feb. 23, 2000.
258 *CSDC*, #483.
259 *MDGs Report 2005*, 34.
260 *MDGs Report 2006*, 19.
261 *CSDC*, #483.
262 Ibid., #487 (emphasis in original).

MDG GOAL 7*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Ensure Environmental Sustainability	***Target 7A*** Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources	7.1 Proportion of land area covered by forest 7.2 CO2 emissions, total, per capita and per $1 GDP (PPP) 7.3 Consumption of ozone-depleting substances 7.4 Proportion of fish stocks within safe biological limits 7.5 Proportion of total water resources used 7.6 Proportion of terrestrial and marine areas protected 7.7 Proportion of species threatened with extinction
	Target 7B Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss	7.8 Proportion of population using an improved drinking water source
	Target 7C Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation	7.9 Proportion of population using an improved sanitation facility
	Target 7D By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers	7.10 Proportion of urban population living in slums

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

GOAL 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development

The Eighth Goal, to develop a global partnership for development, is measured in seven targets and sixteen indicators. To date, only five countries (Luxemburg, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands) have met the MDGs target of 0.7% of their gross national income (GNI). Since 1997, foreign aid to developing countries has increased to one-third of one percent of donor nations' GNI for a total of $106 billion in 2005[263] before declining to .28%, totaling $103.7 billion in 2007.[264] For the poorest countries, official aid and charitable donations are the main source of foreign financing, whereas trade ranks first for middle-income countries.[265] Money sent home by migrants working in foreign countries in 2000 accounted for $34 billion dollars in external financing for developing countries; this money directly benefits recipient families.[266] Although development aid is at an all time high in recipient countries, it remains at its lowest level as a percentage of donor country income since 1990.[267]

Debt relief accounted for more than half of the increase in foreign aid from 1997 to 2005.[268] Such debt relief, however, goes to countries that have already ceased debt repayments so the effect in terms of further poverty alleviation is nil, according to MDGs reports.[269] For 29 heavily indebted countries debt repayments have been reduced by $59 billion since 1998, bringing their debt service to less than 7% of their export earnings. For many poor countries, however, even the reduced repayments are too high. Thus, leaders from the Group of Eight industrialized nations (G8) agreed at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005 to cancel the debts of heavily indebted countries that meet performance criteria, including sound macroeconomic performance, avoidance of conflict, good governance and no payment arrearages.[270]

At the Millennium Summit in 2000, the Holy See Secretary of State, Cardinal Sodano, called for a "moral and financial mobilization" in order to obtain "a drastic reduction of poverty" that would be "directed to precise objectives." He provided three economic objectives: "incisive measures for the cancellation of the debt of poorer countries, an "increase of development aid," and "wider access to markets."[271]

---

263 *MDGs Report 2006*, 22.
264 *MDGs Report 2008*, 44.
265 *MDGs Report 2005*, 36.
266 Ibid.
267 Ibid., 37.
268 *MDGs Report 2006*, 22.
269 *MDGs Report 2005*, 37.
270 *MDGs Report 2006*, 23.
271 Sodano, Statement at the Millennium Summit, September 8, 2000, http://www.un.org/millennium/webcast/statements/holyssee.htm.

Five years later Cardinal Sodano reiterated these same three policy goals — access to markets, increases in aid and debt cancellation — as essential for any meaningful partnership for development:

> Much work remains to be done in order to achieve greater economic and financial solidarity. This must include a solution to the debt problem of the poorest countries and of average-income countries with serious foreign debt problems, together with the re-launching of public development aid (ODA, Official Development Assistance) and a generous opening of markets to assist poor countries.[272]

The MDGs global partnership for authentic development, as envisioned by the Holy See, is impossible if it is not animated by a "spirit of friendship" based on respect for human dignity, that is, "the exercise of solidarity" which is validated when "its members recognize one another as persons." The criteria are not new, but rather they apply to international relations and economics in general. Economic interdependence, in the Church's view, must be transformed into social and ethical solidarity, and nations must recognize that the "goods" of the earth were made for all, that the goods that human industry produces "must serve equally for the good of all."[273] The foreign relations of nations and the business practices of multinational corporations must be, as Pope John Paul II put it, infused with a spirit of social friendship: "International solidarity applies not only to relations between nations, but also to all the instruments of relations between nations, including those at the level of government and multinational companies."[274] The Pope also said, "Interdependence must now be met by joint responsibility; common destiny by solidarity."[275]

Moreover, some Catholic social scientists fear that any partnership for development envisioned by the United Nations for the New Millennium is principally intended to create a monopoly and expand its power exponentially by linking it more closely with big business and big government. Michael Schooyans has even argued that the UN's gradual drawing of power to itself is not incidental but intentional:

---

272 Sodano, Statement at the 60th Session of the UN General Assembly, September 16, 2005, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/2005/documents/rc_seg-st_20050916_onu_en.html.

273 *Sollicitudo rei Socialis*, #39.

274 John Paul II, Address to the Members of the Trilateral Commission, April 18, 1983 (emphasis in original).

275 John Paul II, Address to Agencies of the United Nations, August 18, 1985, quoting Paul VI.

> The UN is no longer satisfied to play a subsidiary role. It intends to place itself at the center of world power and to equip itself, little by little, with all the apparatus of control which it needs to exercise what it believes to be its mission during the new Millennium.[276]

But how can the UN garner power from nations if it is only an intergovernmental organization comprised of those nations? The answer lies in the expanding power of UN bureaucracies, powerful NGOs, and the select group of nations that fund them in order to advance a particular agenda. One timely and powerful example is the way a handful of UN officials have advanced the inclusion of a new MDGs target, sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights, over the repeated objections of the United States and other nations.

MDG GOAL 8*	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Develop a Global Partnership for Development	***Target 8A*** 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	
	Target 8B Address the special needs of the least developed countries. Includes: tariff and quota-free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced program of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction	

(continued on next page)

v276 Schooyans, 65-66.

MDG GOAL 8	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Develop a Global Partnership for Development	***Target 8C*** Address the special needs of landlocked developing 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)	
	Target 8D Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term	8.1 Net ODA, total and to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors' gross national income 8.2 Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation) 8.3 Proportion of bilateral ODA of OECD/DAC donors that is untied 8.4 ODA received in landlocked developing countries as a proportion of their GNIs 8.5 ODA received in small island developing States as proportion of their GNIs ***Market Access*** 8.6 Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and from LDCs, admitted free of duty 8.7 Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on

MDG GOAL 8	TARGETS	INDICATORS
Develop a Global Partnership for Development		agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries 8.8 Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as percentage of their GDP 8.9 Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity ***Debt Sustainability*** 8.10 Total number of countries that have reached their Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative) 8.11 Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative (IMF-World Bank) 8.12 Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services
	Target 8E In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries	8.13 Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis
	Target 8F In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications	8.14 Telephone lines per 100 population 8.15 Cellular subscribers per 100 population 8.16 Internet users per 100 population
	Not related to specific goal	***Other Selected Indicators*** Population Total fertility rate Life expectancy at birth Adult literacy rate Gross national income per capita

* Source: MDG Monitor, available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml.

Part VI: The Role of Special Interests in the MDGs — The "Phantom Goal" of Access to Sexual and Reproductive Health

No UN social policy issue is more contentious or more divisive than abortion. Since the 1994 UN population conference in Cairo, abortion proponents have fought to get abortion recognized both as an international human right and an integral part of international development programs. The MDGs are now at the heart of this controversy.

In fact, the attempt to include in the goals the term "reproductive health," vague enough to possibly include a right to abortion, stalled negotiations and threatened final consensus of the MDGs.[277]

The International Planned Parenthood Federation believes that the inclusion of the term in the non-binding outcome document from the 1994 Cairo conference guarantees a right to abortion:

> Abortion is not mentioned, but the wording "... the recognition of the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so ..." can be interpreted as including the right to abortion.[278]

In negotiating the MDGs, abortion proponents worked assiduously to include the term, first as a separate goal, and then failing that as a target under Goal 5, the reduction of maternal mortality.

Indeed, inclusion of the term has powerful backers. Jeffery Sachs warns his readers in *The End of Poverty* about what he refers to as "the demographic

277 See Crossette.

278 International Planned Parenthood Federation, *Access to Safe Abortion: A Tool for Assessing Legal and Other Obstacles,* 2008: 11.

trap." He would like to jump-start demographic transition — according to him "the lowering of the mortality-rate and birth-rate while countries benefit from improved healthcare and/or economic conditions"[279] — through education, law and social action that "empower women to more easily make fertility choices." Sachs claims "high population growth leads to deeper poverty, and deeper poverty contributes to high fertility rates."[280] He believes the lack of access in developing countries to "personal rights (for example, sexual and reproductive choices) and access to public services (education, health facilities, family planning services)" present cultural barriers to economic development.[281] Sachs further asserts that the concept of universal access to reproductive health is implicitly linked with the MDGs, and that achieving it is necessary to attaining the goals.[282]

Another abortion rights supporter, UNFPA director Thoraya Ahmed Obaid, contends that "ensuring universal access to reproductive health is critical to attaining the world's poverty reduction and development goals."[283] Obaid claims poverty, hunger, disease and environmental concerns cannot be satisfactorily confronted without addressing "issues of population and reproductive health."[284]

In fact, the UN Millennium Project insists access to safe abortion is essential to maternal health and achieving the Millennium Development Goals:

> Unplanned and unwanted pregnancies and unsafe abortions are serious public health problems in the developing world for which many governments and international organizations have not yet taken responsibility... These problems require increased attention and new actions by policymakers responsible for progress toward the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of reducing maternal mortality, promoting gender equality and empowering women, and eradicating poverty. Women's ability to regulate their own fertility

279 Pontifical Council for the Family, *Ethical and Pastoral Dimensions of Population Trends,* Libreria Editrice Vaticana (1994) 5.

280 Sachs, 65-66.

281 Ibid., 87.

282 Jeffrey Sachs, *Population, Reproductive Health and the Millennium Development Goals,* Introduction, http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/SRHbooklet080105.pdf.

283 UNFPA Press Release, "UNFPA Welcomes Millennium Project's Emphasis on Critical Roles of Gender and Reproductive Health in Poverty Reduction; Urges Speedy Implementation of Recommendations," January 17, 2005, http://www.unfpa.org/news/news.cfm?ID=548.

284 UNFPA Press Release, "Lawmakers from 70 Countries Gather at Canadian Parliament to Promote Reproductive Rights," November 21, 2002, http://www.unfpa.org/news/news.cfm?ID=41&Language=1.

> is critical to the achievement of these internationally agreed goals. Conversely, the persistence of unsafe abortion in many countries is a key obstacle to meeting the MDGs.[285]

A significantly large number of countries repeatedly rejected, and continue to reject, the concept of reproductive health in the MDGs. Over the objections of UN member states, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan worked to impose sexual and reproductive rights into the MDGs as one of his major personal priorities:

> When Kofi Annan asked Jeff Sachs to put together a team project, and asked me and a couple of people here to co-chair the maternal and child health task force, we immediately said, "The only condition [under which] we'll do it is if we build reproductive health back into it,"... "Jeff [Sachs] said, Yes, I have a commitment from the SG [Secretary General Kofi Annan] that we can do that."[286]

The collusion of Sachs, the UNFPA, Kofi Annan and others to force sexual and reproductive health into the MDGs has been unrelenting. On August 16, 2006 the Secretary General presented his annual report, *Report of the Secretary General on the Work of the Organization*. Therein item number 24 lists four new targets recommended for incorporation into the MDGs.[287] He then submitted his annual report at the 61st Session of the UN General Assembly. The United States and other countries vigorously opposed the inclusion of sexual and reproductive health as a new target for MDG 5 (maternal health) in September 2006.[288] Delegations made statements addressing the Secretary General's annual report on October 2, 2006. The Holy See reminded the General Assembly that "ensuring access to reproductive health by 2015... was seen by our leaders as a means of achieving the target of reducing maternal

---

285 Barbara B. Crane and Charlotte E. Hord Smith, "Access to Safe Abortion: An Essential Strategy for Achieving the Millennium Development Goals to Improve Maternal Health, Promote Gender Equality, and Reduce Poverty," background paper for UN Millennium Project, Feb. 2006, http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/Crane_and_Hord-Smith-final.pdf.

286 Crossette, 88. (Crossette quotes Allan Rosenfield, professor of obstetrics and gynecology and dean of the Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University, concerning his participation with the Millennium Project.)

287 See http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/sgreport2006.pdf?OpenElement.

288 Associated Press: October 13, 2006, "United Nations General Assembly adopts 'universal access' target for reproductive health," http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/ihsp/publications/pdf/Advocacy%20Package-FINAL-FINAL_eng.pdf.

mortality rather than being a target in and of itself."[289] In the end, the UN General Assembly decided to merely "take note" of the Secretary General's report, a neutral term which has previously been accepted by the UN General Assembly to "neither constitute approval or disapproval,"[290] and therefore did not approve of any new targets for the MDGs.

After failing to secure a new target on sexual and reproductive health, various UN agencies and NGOs decided to declare victory anyway, asserting that a new target indeed exists. For example, at the 5th International Dialogue on Population and Sustainable Development in Berlin on October 17, 2006, Thoraya Obaid, Executive Director of UNFPA made a triumphal announcement:

> I am pleased to inform you that Member States have recently supported the Secretary General's recommendation to establish a new target on universal access to reproductive health by 2015 under MDG 5 (maternal health). We are now developing indicators for it to assist countries in their monitoring of progress made in this area. [291]

Then, backtracking, Obaid announced at the Women Deliver conference in October 2007 that she expected UN member states to approve the new target in the upcoming session of the General Assembly. Adding to the confusion, in 2009 UNFPA and UNICEF both claimed that such a target was indeed created, but disagreed on when it came into being. UNFPA asserted it was created in 2008 because it was again included in the Secretary General's report as an unnumbered "target" under MDG 5. When adopting the report, the subject was not debated or even discussed, much less did it receive consensus.[292] In contradiction, the 2009 UNICEF report claimed that heads of state agreed on the target in 2005, creating "a specific target on reproductive health: Millennium Goal 5, Target B," seeking to "Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health" which includes indicators such as "contraceptive

289 Migliore, Intervention at the 61st Session of the UN General Assembly on the "Report of the Secretary General of the Work of the Organization," October 2, 2006, http://www.vatican.va/roman _curia/secretariat_state/2006/documents/rc_seg-st_20061002_un-work_en.html.

290 UN General Assembly Resolution 55/488, para. 29.

291 Thoraya Obaid, Executive Director, UNFPA Statement at the 5th International Dialogue on Population and Sustainable Development in Berlin, October 17, 2006, http://www.unfpa.org/news/news.cfm?ID=886&Language=1.

292 Susan Yoshihara, "UNICEF Report Ignores Child Survival, Focuses on Dangers of Childbirth to Women," *Friday Fax,* January 29, 2009, http://www.c-fam.org/publications/id.990/pub_detail.asp.

prevalence rate," and "unmet need for family planning."[293]

If the target is so controversial, why are its proponents so confident? Advocates of an international right to abortion base their claims on references to reproductive health in non-binding UN documents, in particular the 1994 Cairo and 1995 Beijing outcome documents.[294] In fact, there was no consensus in either the Cairo or Beijing outcome documents that abortion was included in sexual and reproductive health, much less that there was a "new" human right to abortion. Numerous delegations boycotted the Cairo meeting and others, including the Holy See, issued statements or reservations at both Beijing and Cairo that explicitly said their countries understood the right to life began at the moment of conception, and therefore did not recognize abortion as part of sexual and reproductive health. Even the US delegation, which was an architect of the new right to abortion under the Clinton administration, had to officially abandon such a goal. Thus, it has been argued that the US and UN campaign to leave the Cairo meeting with a new right to abortion backfired:

> Not only is there no such unambiguous world "consensus" statement from Cairo and Beijing establishing abortion as a reproductive right, but the abortion language that did gain inclusion in the documents was so successfully debated by conservative forces, and therefore so circumspect, that arguably it categorically and explicitly stops abortion from being deemed a right. There was simply no clarion call for abortion rights emerging from the conferences.[295]

The United States under President George Bush emphatically rejected the Clinton administration's interpretation of Cairo. In the General Assembly in

---

293 Ibid.

294 In the outcome document of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, 1994, *The Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development*, para. 7.6, states "reproductive health care" is said to include "abortion as specified in paragraph 8.25." In paragraph 8.25 it states: "Any measures or changes within the health system can only be determined at the national or local level according to the national legislative process. In circumstances where abortion is not against the law, such abortion should be safe." The *Platform for Action,* paragraph 95, of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, China, 1995, states: "Bearing in mind the above definition [i.e., Beijing *Platform of Action* para. 94 "reproductive health"] reproductive rights embrace certain human rights that are already recognized in national laws, international human rights documents and other consensus documents."

295 Douglas A. Sylva and Susan Yoshihara, "Rights by Stealth: the Role of UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies in the Campaign for an International Right to Abortion," *National Catholic Bioethics* Quarterly, Vol.7 No.1, (Spring 2007): 10.

September 2005, Bush's Ambassador to the UN, John R. Bolton stated:

> I do wish to make one point clear. The United States understands that reference [in the 2005 World Summit outcome document] to the International Conference on Population and Development and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, and the use of the phrase "reproductive health" ...do not create any rights and cannot be interpreted to constitute support, endorsement, or promotion of abortion.[296]

UN member States continue to reject any claim that "sexual and reproductive health" includes abortion rights, while proponents in the UN agencies, powerful NGOs and some member states such as those in the European Union, are working hard to include the term in as many UN documents as possible without defining it. In fact, the Obama administration has confirmed that it interprets reproductive health to include access to abortion. In her testimony before the U.S. Congress, Hilary Clinton stated that reproductive health includes abortion, which re-implements the policy that she pushed at the Beijing Conference as head of the U.S. delegation.[297]

In 2007 the EU and allies successfully inserted the term "sexual and reproductive health care" in the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.[298] During the ratification of the final draft of the *Disabilities* treaty, 14 nations, including the United States and the Holy See, declared their understanding of the term "sexual and reproductive health" in article 25 on health to not include the right to abortion. The Holy See, while affirming its abiding concern for persons with disabilities, nonetheless refused to ratify the treaty because "the living heart of this document lies in its reaffirmation of the right to life" and the inclusion of the term "sexual and reproductive health" threatens to undervalue or diminish the dignity and worth of persons with disabilities.[299] Affirming the Holy See's position is the preparatory work or

296 United States Mission to the United Nations (USUN) Press Release #159 (05), September 14, 2005.

297 Secretary Clinton confirms U.S. thinks abortion access is 'reproductive health'", Catholic News Agency, April 22, 2009, http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/new.php?n=15758.

298 The treaty obligates States parties to "Provide persons with disabilities with the same range, quality and standard of free or affordable health care and programmes as provided other persons, including in the area of sexual and reproductive health and population-based public health programmes." *Draft Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, Article 25, http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights/ahc8adart.htm.

299 Migliore, statement at the 61st UN General Assembly final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities. The statement

"travaux preparatoires" of the convention.[300] As with the Cairo conference, objection was so fierce that proponents had to publicly deny any inclusion of abortion rights. On numerous occasions during negotiations the chairman of the Disabilities Convention stated that "sexual and reproductive health" did not include abortion, and that no new human rights were being created in that treaty.[301]

A major critique of the inclusion of "reproductive health" in the MDGs, and state-sponsored fertility control in general, is that it is unnecessary and ineffective. Harvard economist Lant Pritchett demonstrated that it is the parent's desired family size and not population policies that determine fertility in a 1994 study sponsored by the Population Council.[302] In an exhaustive history of the population control movement, Columbia University's Matthew Connelly similarly demonstrated that fertility changes were strikingly similar

---

reads: "Finally, and most importantly, regarding article 25 on health, and specifically the reference to sexual and reproductive health, the Holy See understands access to reproductive health as being a holistic concept that does not consider abortion or access to abortion as a dimension of those terms... this article does not create any new international rights, and is merely intended to ensure that a person's disability is not used as a basis for denying a health service. However, even with this understanding, we oppose the inclusion of such a phrase in this article, because in some countries reproductive health services include abortion, thus denying the inherent right to life of every human being, affirmed by article 10 of the Convention [on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities]. It is surely tragic that, wherever fetal defect is a precondition for offering or employing abortion, the same Convention created to protect persons with disabilities from all discrimination in the exercise of their rights, may be used to deny the very basic right to life of disabled unborn persons. For this reason, and despite the many helpful articles this Convention contains, the Holy See is unable to sign it." http://www.holyseemission.org/13Dec2006.html.

300 United Nations document A/AC.265/2006/2, "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities on its seventh session," http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights/ahc7report-e.html. (Footnote 4 to this report states, "The Ad Hoc Committee notes that the use of the phrase 'sexual and reproductive health services' would not constitute recognition of any new international law obligations or human rights.")

301 "Chair's Closing Remarks" from the Seventh Session of the Ad Hoc Committee: "Turning to Article 25 on health, the reference to sexual and reproductive health services continues to be difficult for many delegations, although it is strongly supported by others. As I noted in my summing up of the discussions on that Article, however, there was agreement in the room that the paragraph has a narrow focus on non-discrimination, and that neither it nor the term "health services" would create any new rights or obligations at international law. Given the common ground on that point, it seems to me that the problem is not so much the phrase "health services" per se, but its potential for misinterpretation." http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/rights/ahc7chairclose.htm.

302 Lant H. Pritchett, "Desired Fertility and the Impact of Population Policies," *Population and Development Review,* vol.20, no.1 (March 1994).

in developing nations between 1950 and 2000 whether or not they were subjected to population control programs.[303]

Critiquing the "reproductive health" imperative from a cultural, medical and economic viewpoint, economist and UN observer Linda G. Valenzona argues that her native Philippines is simply a target as "advanced countries use development as their altruistic justification to impose their demographic imperialism on developing countries."[304] Conversely, too little emphasis is placed on the economic boon that children provide to poor families, not the least of which are remittances or money sent home from adult children who leave the country to seek better employment opportunities abroad.[305]

Likewise, Marguerite Peeters, founder of the Institute for Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics believes the MDGs have been hijacked to advance the ideological vision and interests of the developed world:

> Instead of focusing on the concrete and objective needs of poor populations, as one would hope, the MDGs and development cooperation continues to be hijacked and to give priority to ideological objectives. The 2005 UNFPA report... hammers the message that "gender equality" and "reproductive health" are "indispensable" for the realization of the MDGs... that without the integral implementation of the Cairo and Beijing programs of action, the MDGs cannot be attained, that reproductive health and gender deserve *absolute priority* in international, national and local development policies, investments and budgets — in other words that they should be put at the forefront of poverty reduction efforts.[306]

For its part, the Holy See warns, attempts to "create new targets, such as those on sexual and reproductive health, risks introducing practices and policies detrimental to human dignity and sustainable development, distracting our focus from the original goals and diverting the necessary resources from the more basic and urgent needs" of the poor.[307]

The Holy See takes into account population trends that have led many

303 Connelly, 374.

304 Linda G. Valenzona, "MDG: Development or Birth Control?" unpublished paper, October 24, 2006, citing Keith Montgomery, Department of Geography and Geology, "The Demographic Transition," http://www.uwmc.uwc.edu/geography/Demotrans/demtran.htm.

305 Linda Valenzona, interview with this paper's co-author Brian Scarnecchia, in Manila, Philippines, October 13, 2006.

306 Peeters, 134-35.

307 Migliore, statement to the 63rd Session of the UN General Assembly, High Level event on the Millennium Development Goals, September 25, 2008.

to push for abortion rights, but warns of "campaigns which create a fear for the future" waged by wealthy nations on the fertility and population of the developing world:

> Those promoting these campaigns have not understood the logic of long-term demographic mechanisms, and notably what population science calls the "demographic transition." Confronted by these campaigns, the Church is above all deeply concerned about promoting justice for the weakest. Certain groups encourage coercive population control by contraception, sterilization and even abortion. They believe that they see in these practices "the solution" to problems raised by the different forms of underdevelopment. When this recommendation comes from prosperous nations, it seems to express a refusal on the part of the rich to face the true causes of underdevelopment.[308]

Pope John Paul II put the campaign in the broader context of international politics when he warned that powerful nations use population control programs including abortion as a sort of "weapon of mass destruction" on the defenseless populations of developing countries:

> One cannot overlook the network of complicity which reaches out to include international institutions, foundations and associations which systematically campaign for the legalization and spread of abortion in the world... As I wrote in my Letter to Families, "we are facing an immense threat to life: not only to the life of individuals but also to that of civilization itself."[309]

The most serious caveats in the interventions of the Holy See on the MDGs have focused on latent features in them that pose threats to the indigenous culture and the economic capacity and fecundity of the developing world. The introduction of sexual and reproductive health into the MDGs threatens to transform the development project into a population containment project for the benefit of the developed nations.

An historical review of Holy See position on population control programs is instructive. Pope Pius XII in his Christmas address of 1941 to the Sacred College of Cardinals presented his plan for peace as founded on moral principles that rejected cultural, economic and demographic imperialism:

---

308 Pontifical Council for the Family, "Ethical and Pastoral Dimensions of Population Trends," *Libreriea Editrice Vaticana*, (1994) #87.

309 Ibid., #59, citing Pope John Paul II, *Letter to Families*, #21.

> In a new order founded on moral principles, there can be no place for (1) open or subtle oppression of the cultural and language characteristics of national minorities, (2) contraction of their economic capacities, (3) limitation or abolition of their natural fecundity.[310]

Pope Pius XII condemned the "narrow, selfish considerations which tend to monopolize economic wealth and raw materials in general use, to the exclusion of nations less favored by nature" and stated "selfish economic policy was at the heart of the world's current economic problems." [311]

In 2009 Pope Benedict XVI observed:

> Not only does the situation of poverty still provoke high rates of infant mortality in many regions, but some parts of the world still experience practices of demographic control, on the part of governments that often promote contraception and even go so far as to impose abortion. In economically developed countries, legislation contrary to life is very widespread, and it has already shaped moral attitudes and praxis, contributing to the spread of an anti-birth mentality; frequent attempts are made to export this mentality to other States as if it were a form of cultural progress.
>
> Some non-governmental Organizations work actively to spread abortion, at times promoting the practice of sterilization in poor countries, in some cases not even informing the women concerned. Moreover, there is reason to suspect that development aid is sometimes linked to specific health-care policies which *de facto* involve the imposition of strong birth control measures. Further grounds for concern are laws permitting euthanasia as well as pressure from lobby groups, nationally and internationally, in favor of its juridical recognition.
>
> *Openness to life is at the center of true development.* When a society moves towards the denial or suppression of life, it ends up no longer finding the necessary motivation and energy to strive for man's true good. If personal and social sensitivity towards the acceptance of a

310 Camille Cianfarra, *The Vatican and the War,* Literary Classics, Inc. (New York: E.P. Dutton & Company, 1944): 319-329. Quoted in Ronald J. Rychlak, *Hitler, The War, and the Pope* (Huntington, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor (2000), 165 (emphasis added).
311 Ibid.

> new life is lost, then other forms of acceptance that are valuable for society also wither away. The acceptance of life strengthens moral fiber and makes people capable of mutual help. By cultivating openness to life, wealthy peoples can better understand the needs of poor ones, they can avoid employing huge economic and intellectual resources to satisfy the selfish desires of their own citizens, and instead, they can promote virtuous action within the perspective of production that is morally sound and marked by solidarity, respecting the fundamental right to life of every people and every individual.[312]

Foregoing analysis on the MDG's in light of Catholic social teaching best leads to a number of policy implications in order to align the goals with a genuine pursuit of human dignity.

---

312 Pope Benedict, XVI, *Caritas in Veritate,* #28. Available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.

Part VII: Summary Critique and Implications

We asked at the beginning of this paper — are the MDGs a sign of "actively seeking a new social order in which adequate solutions to material poverty"[313] are provided; or are they a sign of "Messianistic" beliefs that sustain the illusion that it is possible to eliminate the problem of poverty completely from this world? To the extent the MDGs are imbued with the "logic of solidarity and subsidiarity," and able to overcome poverty and ensure the participation of every person and social group, they are a sign of the former.[314] However, in the measure they reflect a "relativistic logic" that refuses to "admit the truth about man and his dignity, to say nothing of the possibility of an ethics based on recognition of the natural moral law," they bear the mark of a Messianic belief.[315] Removing the MDGs and the human values they seek to advance from the "natural law inscribed on human hearts and present in different cultures and civilizations" would restrict their range and yield to "relativistic conceptions, according to which the meaning and interpretation of rights could vary and their universality would be defined in the name of different cultural, political, social and even religious outlooks."[316] The following critique points out where the MDGs reflect the interests of postmodern wealthy donors more than those of the poor.

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty — focuses on quantifiable results and technocratic models that lose sight of the poor as persons with ethical and spiritual, as well as economic and political, aspirations and needs. Not surprisingly such models tend to exclude the poor from participating in their

313 *CSDC*, #325.
314 Migliore, statement to the Economic and Social Council, 47th Session of the Commission for Social Development, February 5, 2009, http://www.holyseemission.org/5Feb2009.html.
315 Pope Benedict XVI, address to members of Catholic-inspired Non-Governmental Organization, *L'Osservatore Romano*, December 12, 2007, 5.
316 Pope Benedict XVI, Address to the 62nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, April 18, 2008.

own development; this violates human dignity, the principles of solidarity, subsidiarity and the universal destination of goods.

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education — stresses the value of education, especially the education of girls and young women, as a venue for depressing total fertility. The role of the family and that of parents in educating and forming their children, a right cited in numerous UN documents, is never mentioned except to suggest they would contribute to negative cultural attitudes that tie girls and young women to the home and child rearing.[317] In this respect education takes on the characteristics of indoctrinating children for an ulterior purpose, rather than opening them to truth. This tendency violates the fundamental values of truth, freedom and human dignity.

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empowering women — to the extent it serves to instill a false notion of gender as a changeable social construct corrupts respect for the natural complementarities of masculinity and femininity, attacks the family (the basic unit of society), and threatens truth, the dignity of the human person and the common good.

Goal 4: Reduce child mortality — is selective in that it excludes children before birth for protection from abortion violence. This is a serious omission, inconsistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child; a grave violation of justice, love and solidarity.

Goal 5: Improve maternal health — tends to emphasize only the risks of pregnancy, not the benefits. Fertility reduction through family planning services is seen as the key to reducing maternal deaths. This perspective is contrary to truth, love, the dignity of the human person and the common good.

Goal 6: Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases — links behavioral change with contraceptive practice. This essentially sends a mixed message urging people to be responsibly sexually promiscuous, promoting sexual permissiveness contrary to human dignity, freedom and the common good.

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability — can present a pretext for political and economic choices at variance with human dignity that curb human fertility to meet the needs of the environment. The environment is

317 For the rights of the family see, for example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article 16(3), http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html.

seen as a larger whole which absorbs the transcendence of the human person. Such a collectivist vision violates human dignity and the common good.

Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development — in addition to focusing on technocratic models that exclude the poor from participating in their own development in violation of solidarity, also tends to forge powerful alliances between the United Nations, big government and big business. The convergence of all three in supporting the inclusion of sexual and reproductive rights into the MDGs raises serious concerns for subsidiary groups, the common good, human dignity and freedom.

Conclusion

The substantive end of authentic human development rests upon a foundation of virtues that every person must acquire to be developed in a full integral sense. This foundation includes respect for authentic human rights based upon the natural law, together with the social dimensions of the virtue of justice which are oriented to the common good, the universal destination of goods, respect for subsidiary groups (especially the family and complementarity of the sexes) and a social life based on friendship or solidarity (not competition or survival of the fittest).

The procedural end of authentic human development is not fixed, but varies according to time and circumstance. Just as the Church proposes no one political model so, "no single economic answer to the challenges posed by poverty... no single economic model contains a totally adequate response."[318] However, a sound economic order will include the following mechanisms that maximize participation, initiative and equal access in the creation of wealth and human capital: a free market, good governance and a sound ethical juridical order, government oversight of the market, and fair trade practices. In the words of Pope Benedict XVI:

> Ideological rejection of God and an atheism of indifference, oblivious to the Creator and at risk of becoming equally oblivious to human values, constitute some of the chief obstacles to development today. A humanism which excludes God is an inhuman humanism. Only a humanism open to the Absolute can guide us in the promotion and building of forms of social and civic life — structures, institutions, culture and ethos — without exposing us to the risk of becoming ensnared by the fashions of the moment. Awareness of God's undying love sustains us in our laborious and stimulating work for justice and the development of peoples, amid successes and failures, in the ceaseless pursuit of a just ordering of human affairs.[319]

---

318 Holy See Delegation statement to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, June 30, 2000.

319 Pope Benedict, XVI, *Caritas in Veritate,* #78. Available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/

vThere is widespread agreement about the urgent need to address the needs of those suffering from extreme poverty. However, there is the danger of claiming that we can end poverty by merely *doing* something rather than also *being* something, that is, a friend in close touch with those most in need. Those who give only alms to the poor give too little, and widen the gap between the poor and the rich — the givers and the receivers. Worse yet there is the risk of viewing the poor as a threat to our prosperity. In attempting to keep their privileged place, the rich lock the door to their hearts and their markets and treat the outsider as a problem, such as an overpopulation problem, that must be managed so that others can gain or maintain prosperity.[320] The weak, the sick and those with fewer "talents,"[321] that is, the poor, will always be with us. But we dare not treat them as a problem to be solved or eliminated. All people have a transcendent dignity — with inalienable rights endowed by the Creator, as the American Declaration of Independence affirmed — because

benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html.

320 For an example of this kind of thinking, please see *National Security Study Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200)*, declassified in 1989, which argued that the real problem of strategic supply of vital mineral ores for the United States was not in their scarce physical supply, but in the political and economic issues of access, given the conflicts of interest between the developed and developing world. These conflicts of interest over the natural resources of the developing world would be less exacerbated under conditions of slow or zero population growth and the elimination of large, growing, unemployed and rebellious youthful populations. Therefore, *NSSM 200* urged that greater motivation for smaller family size be brought to bear on developing nations. However, because leaders in the least developed countries (LDCs) might see this as a form of economic or racial imperialism, NSSM 200 recommended that the United States promote reduction in fecundity in the LDCs as a vindication of the right of individuals to freely and responsibly number and space their children, and as the way of social and economic development for poor countries. To better motivate the masses of the LDC to embrace smaller family size minimal levels of education, especially for women, would be necessary in order to indoctrinate them in the desirability of smaller family size. *Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for the U.S. Security and Overseas Interests, National Security Memorandum 200,* #37, cited in Stephen D. Mumford, *The Life and Death of NSSM 200* (Research Triangle Park, NC 27709, 1994): 45-186. Cf. Michel Schooyans, *The Totalitarian Trend of Liberalism*, translated by John Miller (St. Louis, MO: Central Bureau, 1995): 57-58; Peeters, 115-16.

321 Matthew 25:14-30, Luke 19:11-27, *New American Bible* (New Jersey: Thomas Nelson, Inc.1971).

they are from, for and in the image of God.[322] Thus, the way nations approach and implement the MDGs, the way the rich respond to the poor, is truly a test of our collective humanity.[323] Without a course correction, the nations of the world are now in great danger of missing this historic opportunity to fulfill these noble collective goals.

---

322 *CCC,* #1934.

323 Christian tradition in this rvgard is based upon the words of Jesus: "You always have the poor with you, but you will not always have me." (Matthew 26:11; cf. Mark 14:7, John 12:8.) Christian realism, while appreciating on the one hand the praiseworthy efforts being made to defeat poverty, is cautious on the other hand regarding ideological positions and Messianistic beliefs completely from this world. According to this tradition, this will happen only upon Christ's return, when God will be with man once more, forever. In the meantime, *the poor remain entrusted to us and it is vthis responsibility upon which we shall be judged at the end of time* (cf. Matthew 25:31-46): "Our Lord warns us that we shall be separated from him if we fail to meet the serious needs of the poor and the little ones who are his brethren." *CSDC*, #183, citing *CCC,* #1033 (emphasis in original).

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
CCC	Catechism of the Catholic Church
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CSDC	Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DOH	Department of Health
DHS	Department of Health Service
EU	European Union
G8	Group of Eight Industrialized Nations
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIN	Gross National Income
GNP	Gross National Product
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
ICPD	International Conference on Population and Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
SG	Secretary General
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDSG	United Nations Deputy Secretary General
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USUN	United States Mission to the United Nations
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WSSD	World Summit on Social Development

Note: Many Catholic Church and related documents are numbered by section or paragraph. This paper uses the symbol "#" to denote both.

APPENDIX: Comparison of MDGs with Catholic Social Teaching

MDG GOALS	PROBLEMATIC IMPLICATIONS	CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING CHALLENGED
GOAL 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger	Lack of integral development — economic, political, *ethical and spiritual.* Not enabling the poor to participate in their own development	Human Dignity, Solidarity, Subsidiarity & Universal Destination of Goods
GOAL 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education	Education and indoctrination for women so they will have fewer children	Truth, Freedom & Human Dignity
GOAL 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women	Gender as a social construct that eliminates all distinctions and complementarity of the sexes	Truth, Dignity of Human Person & Common Good
GOAL 4: Reduce Child Mortality	Silence about violence against children before birth	Justice, Love & Solidarity
GOAL 5: Improve Maternal Health	Push for reduction of fecundity	Truth, Love, Human Dignity & Common Good
GOAL 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases	Promotion of condoms and permissiveness	(Anti-family), Human Dignity, Freedom & Common Good
GOAL 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability	Linking development with population (i.e. population control)	Human Dignity & Common Good
GOAL 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development	Overly technical model of economic development. UN linkage with big business and big government	Subsidiarity, Human Dignity, Freedom & Common Good

BIOGRAPHIES

D. Brian Scarnecchia is the founding President of the International Solidarity & Human Rights Institute (ISHRI). He is the Chairman of the Department of Humanities and Catholic Social Thought and the Director of the Legal Studies and the Human Life Studies programs at the Franciscan University of Steubenville. He is currently a Visiting Associate Professor of Law at Ave Maria School of Law. He is a member of the expert committee of the Rome Forum of Catholic NGOs (Non-governmental Organizations). Attorney Scarnecchia lectures nationally and internationally on the relation of law, culture, religion, human rights and development. He serves on the board of directors and is legal counsel for the Society of Catholic Social Scientists (SCSS) and is their main NGO representative to the United Nations. He has authored articles and books on law, moral theology and bioethics including *With Faith and Reason* (2002), *The Light to Choose* (2003), and *Family Matters: Bioethics, Law and Catholic Social Teaching* (forthcoming Scarecrow Press, 2009). He is a practicing attorney in the State of Ohio and has served as an Assistant County Prosecutor. He and his wife, Victoria, live on a farm in Bloomingdale, Ohio with their six children.

Terrence McKeegan is a Washington D.C.-based attorney and the co-founder and vice president of International Activities for the International Solidarity & Human Rights Institute (ISHRI). He was formerly Counsel for the European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) based in Strasbourg, for whom he covered UN and international legal issues. He earned his J.D. at Ave Maria School of Law and his B.A. at Franciscan University of Steubenville. A former assistant prosecuting attorney, he is an adjunct professor in the legal studies department at Franciscan University teaching courses on human rights, and has lectured and presented his work in the US, East Timor, the Philippines, Austria and Ireland. Mr. McKeegan worked as a research assistant for Dana Rosemary Scallon, former Member of the European Parliament for Ireland, studied international human rights and comparative health law in Rome, studied and worked in Austria and Ireland, lobbied and advised on legal issues at the European Parliament, the United Nations, and on Capitol Hill. He has provided legal briefs on human rights and international law to the United Nations and has addressed the UN Human Rights Council. He is admitted to the District of Columbia Bar.

PHOTO CREDITS

Louise Gubb, *World AIDs Day: December 1,* 2008, (cc), front cover.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/un_photo/3546062123/

Photo courtesy of ISAF Public Affairs, *090108-F-6426S-134,* © 2009 by ISAF Public Affairs, p. 1.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/isafmedia/3187801656/

Eugenia and Julian, *White Light IMG_9420,* 2005, (cc), p. 4.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/eugeniayjulian/24153825/in/photostream

Paul Evans, *Mother & Child with Doctor, Bbowa,* 2009, (cc), p. 14.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/rg-b/3243837872/

Giuliano Koren, *Indialquadratro,* © 2007 by Giuliano Koren, p. 20.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/klab/1051448995/

Tino Bao, *Change Lady,* 2007, (cc), p. 26.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/tinou/1333066749/

Dave Blumenkrantz, *Outdoor classroom,* 2009, (cc), p. 34.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/kioko/3683733860/in/set-72157620687672192/

Pierre Holtz, *Women and children at the health post of the Sam Ouandja refugee camp,* 2008, UNICEF, (cc), p. 72. http://www.flickr.com/photos/hdpt car/2530064313

Brendan Bannon, "*Do You See What I See?*", © 2007 by UNHCR, p. 84.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/unhcr/3482670147

Stitch, *Vigil Candles,* 2005, (cc), p. 88.
http://www.flickr.com/photos/stitch/8286222/

Note: The designation (cc) denotes Creative Commons usage.

IORG
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS RESEARCH GROUP

A Program of
C-FAM | CATHOLIC FAMILY & HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTE
NEW YORK · WASHINGTON, DC

866 United Nations Plaza, Suite 495 • New York, NY 10017
1100 G Street NW, Suite 450 • Washington, DC 20005