

The "Newspeak" Dictionary of "Development": Deconstructing Development Discourse and Calling Things by Their True Names

David Lempert

Among the most ancient writings on human affairs, from both the Chinese and the Greeks, are those advising the use of correct terminology as the basis of actions in human societies. Ancient political philosophers believed that the key to good governance was to find and identify universal principles, define them clearly, and then to follow them. Indeed, this can be viewed as an ancient human family recipe for civilization.

Confucius' answer to the ruler of Wei in 485 B.C.E., when asked what the first step of good governance should be, was that it must be that of clear definition of terms.

If the terminology is not correct, then the whole style of one's speech falls out of form; ... orders cannot be carried out ... legal justice in the country will fail [and the people will be] at a loss to know what to do or what not to do. When a gentleman institutes something, he is sure by what terminology it should be called (Confucius, 1943, p. 59)

This is echoed by the Greek philosophers, particularly by Plato, in his works on politics, a century later (Plato, 380 B.C.E.).

Despite this goal of clarity, human cultures all use language in ways that reinforce shared beliefs and myths. Human activities that are violent, promote inequalities, involve risk, and that involve other contradictory values and impulses that violate universal aspirations for symmetrical treatment and affirmations of human life are among those most likely to be described and promoted with euphemisms and myths.

In contemporary societies, for example, government departments of War, to expand empire and threaten the colonized, are now uniformly renamed as departments of Defense. Police officers using violence on behalf of the state to enforce inequality and social control are increasingly described as "Peace officers" with work to promote state "security". Military planes in the U.S. now routinely perform air "shows" under the name of "Blue Angels". Where "peace officers" act "under law" to utilize "torture in forced confessions" they may describe it simply as "enhanced interrogation techniques" while killing of civilians in the name of "national security" in violation of international humanitarian law is simply discounted as "collateral damage".

Anthropologists are trained to look neutrally at human activities and to separate both the "etic" (what people say about what they do and the words they use) and the "emic" (what they actually do in concrete behaviors and impacts, behind the euphemisms). A routine part of work of anthropologists is to observe and listen to internal views (the "etic") and then to provide a parallel description of what is "really going on". The process of this decoding is generally referred to as "deconstruction".

The same tools that are applied to deconstructing the belief systems of indigenous peoples can also be applied to industrial societies as a way to understand the reality around us. We can decode and demystify the terminology used by specific institutions or by specific sub-strata of society, including elite groups, deconstruct the agendas that lead to the generation of myths and euphemisms, and translate it into plain English, intelligible to the common person outside of the "in-groups" creating their own usage of common terms that have established legal and professional meanings.

This article offers a short glossary of some common terminology used by governments, international organizations, economists and political scientists to describe their interventions with peoples and communities of unequal power that they currently call by the euphemism of "development".

As a practitioner in the "development" field for 30 years, the author has worked in more than 30 countries and with some 50 organizations that cover the spectrum in the field (international governmental organizations, government ministries and agencies at all levels, international and domestic non-governmental organizations, and businesses) in many different "sectors". In a recent series of articles started as a means of creating public accountability and measurements of compliance in the area of "development" spending and interventions (Lempert, 2008), the author has created a legal treatise and standardization of "development" and its goals based on international law, treaties, and social science and has generated screening and compliance indicators to separate out actual "development" from other hidden agendas. The author has now published eight of these indicators and has produced others under review that analyze key overall terms like "development" (Lempert, 2014), "sustainable development" (Lempert and Nguyen, 2008), and several categories of interventions clustered in areas such as human rights and democratization (area of "legal development") (Lempert, 2009b, 2011); capacity building ("capacity development"); and general areas of "aid" like "poverty reduction" (Lempert, 2015). These examinations have also included tests of whether "development" "aid" protects or erodes sovereignty and cultural integrity as required under international agreements (Lempert, 2009). They have also included analysis of various business interventions such as handicrafts and tourism (Lempert, 2012) as well as impact on different communities and on rural and urban segments (Lempert, 2010). This builds on several decades of previous work analyzing and criticizing development and goes farther in that it provides the specific tools and measurements to distinguish the objective legal and professional standards and linked goals for "development" from those actions and agendas of most agencies today working in the name of "development" but for very different purposes.

It is now easy to distinguish the "etic" terminology of governments and organizations that claim to be doing "development" but are promoting other agendas from the legal and social science standards of progress, cultural survival and sustainability, human survival, and promotion of individual human abilities and rights. Slightly more difficult is to define what is actually being done under the name of "development" so that its "emic" meaning; the description of the activities and consequences as seen independently by outside observers, can be determined and understood. However, there is already a vast literature of critical development studies and analysis that has measured the actual impacts of interventions under the name of development and the author's own field work and analysis, including study of the "deep structures" of "development" interventions can also be used to produce simple explanations of what "development" and its sub-categories actually does and how its actual agendas and results are understood by those carrying it out or affected by it.

This article addresses the distortion of language that is reflected by the divergence between the "etic" use of the terms for "development" and the objective, legal and professional meanings for the words. It goes further by offering plain English words to be substituted for what Orwell called the "doublespeak" or "newspeak" (1949) that most "development" actors now use today to promote hidden agendas under the name of "development" but that are not in fact "development"

as the law and professions understand them.

This approach offers several benefits to the public, to practitioners and to scholars and students and will save time and resources by standardizing descriptions in simple language that calls things what they really are and that should offer a quick consensus.

In order to exercise oversight of public spending, it is important for the public to have a way to translate this "newspeak" used by governments and their implementing agents into plain English. Similarly, for practitioners to meet their legal, ethical and professional obligations, they also must be able to see and call things as they are.

To help practitioners and the public to deconstruct and decode the misuse of the terms and to make the hidden agendas explicit, this article presents a glossary of development "newspeak" to distinguish the misuse from the long-term perspectives of both the mass public that is funding and the victims (currently referred to as "beneficiaries") of the interventions. A plain English dictionary of development "newspeak" is a step towards protecting cultures, human sustainability, international peace and security, progress, and the planet earth.

This piece offers some methodology on how anthropologists construct such glossaries, describes a number of the critiques of "development" that have already offered the basis for glossary terms and concepts that can be reaffirmed, describes some previous models for glossaries translating "doublespeak", and then provides a newspeak dictionary for the "development" field as well as some ideas for expanding the dictionary to other fields.

Deconstructing Discourse in General: The Anthropological Method

Generally, the glossaries that anthropologists create in order to take words used by a particular group and to make them intelligible to readers are translations from a foreign language into the anthropologist's working language, but when the group under study uses the same language, the same techniques are used. There is nothing magical about taking the "etic" (subjective perspective) of the use of English words by a specific group in an institution or profession or social strata or sub-culture and interpreting it from the point of view of the observer (comparing it to scientific or professional standards) and then trying to translate the words used by a specific group into plain English, the same way that an anthropologist would do this for a group speaking a "foreign language". The techniques of analysis are a standard part of "deconstruction" and "interpretation" that are essential features of the disciplinary method of anthropology.

The approach of recording a group's shared beliefs and the words they use in relation to those beliefs, and then "deconstructing" the beliefs by challenging the belief holders to explain their actions in ways that reveal their real motives, goals and relationships has been increasingly refined in the past few decades through the introduction of linguistic approaches such as Derrida's "grammatology" (1967). In work "studying up" with elite institutions and in the context of globalization, anthropologists often borrow from linguists, directly, such as Chomsky (1988). The analysis of "deep structure" combines linguistic and anthropological concepts with the goal of understanding actions beneath the words used to describe them in ways that show how actions fit into an underlying pattern that is part of the holism of that group (and culture's) being.

The creation of a glossary requires two steps.

- The first step is to record the use of terminology by a group under study and to describe it from their subjective ("etic") perspective. In the area of "development" this is easy. There are not only several international organizations working in "development" and producing descriptions of their work but there are also academics in economics and political science using the same terminology.
- The second is to try to set the actions and beliefs into a logic understandable from the observer's

viewpoint, to understand how it works in terms of an outsider's perspective. This is the "emic". One of the keys to understanding the logic is to reverse the assumption that any "mistakes" or "errors" or "failures" that seem to differ from the goals that are given as the "etic" interpretation are really "mistakes" and to see if they were really the actual goal that offered plenty of opportunities to correct. This is also easy to find in the area of "development". There are now several decades of studies and works from the perspective of the peoples being "developed" and a number of these have defined the "deep structure" of how "development" works. Knowing the actual goals, one can then take the words used in the "etic" perspective and offer clear plain English translations.

In dealing with terms used by a group in our own society, particularly those with power or claims of having specialized knowledge (like economists and political scientists), there is usually a reluctance to assume that words are not presented in their real meanings and must be translated to understand them. There is also a reluctance to accept the results of challenges and attempts to hold authorities and experts accountable for their use of language and to show that they are misusing the language. In our society, however, we also have strict definitions of terminology in legal documents as well as specific social science definitions of activities in competing social sciences. Thus, in the area of "development" it is possible not only to offer the viewpoints of those who are on the receiving end of "development" interventions and to see what really happens, or to closely investigate through participant observation and questioning the actual motives and belief systems of particular officials and particular academic disciplines. It is also possible to take established legal definitions and social science and professional standards and to hold them up against the use of those terms.

In the area of "development", there is a significant body of international treaties defining the "universal" agreement of the international community as to the goals of different actions between groups and establishing standards for what is allowed for what purpose. There are also very long established definitions for concepts like "sustainability" of human groups in their eco-systems, of "sovereignty", of "community" and of "rights".

Many authors have tried to look at "development" from the perspective of the native peoples who were on the receiving end of interventions to describe the impacts on them rather than to just record the claims made by those doing the "development" as to the purposes. In comparing the two perspectives over what have now been decades, in confronting the actors promoting "development" with the evidence of contradictions between their claimed objectives and the actual results, they have offered excellent models of the actual impacts and apparent intents of "development" beyond the rhetoric and they have also shown a cultural continuity from periods of imperialism and colonialism. With the change in rhetoric of the powerful countries and the emergence of new institutions performing the interventions ("development" agencies rather than "missionaries") even though in almost exactly the same spheres (hospitals, schools, technology transfer for export industry), they have termed the activity as "neo-colonialism" in describing "dependency" relationships (Frank, Cochroft and Johnson, 1972; Wallerstein, 1979; Chomsky and Herman, 1988).

In my work and for the purposes of this article, I have gone beyond the models and observations of other authors and have applied strict legal and professional definitions offered by the international community and by professionals in public administration and business administration (where I am also trained) to compare "etic" statements of those in the development community against existing standards that governments and development organizations, themselves, accept as the objective standards for their work.

I have also spent 30 years working within the context of "development" actors and with the targeted groups of interventions in ways that have allowed me to consistently question the goals of both sides and the outcomes so as to understand actual intents and impacts. I have been able

to present several other alternatives as well as to challenge actors to explain why they were not following existing legal and professional standards and why they substituted a different "etic" standard.

As an anthropologist, I have also had an opportunity to study the historic record of interventions in some 30 countries including that of the French, British, Spanish and Portuguese for at least a century and of the Americans dating back to the mid 20th century (longer in Latin America). In my work as an anthropologist in the Soviet Union and former Soviet Union and in Viet Nam, I have also been able to work directly in Russian and in Vietnamese to analyze the language used by government actors and in law that describe relations with and their views of "development" of their native peoples as well as their views as recipients of "development" interventions. I have compared statements about positions on both sides of "development" as well as historical statements made during periods under colonization and then when free of it (Lempert, 1996). I have also done this to a lesser extent in Latin America. In the case of Viet Nam, I have already offered a glossary to try to extricate the many tangled terms used today in Vietnamese, some of them taken from Han Chinese building blocks and others from Western languages (Lempert, 1999).

With colleagues, I have also sought to directly explain the logic of major actors that would otherwise seem illogical, using "deep structure" techniques. For example, I have been able to find the logic of why major powers seem to want global warming despite rhetorical claims of recognizing the dangers of human induced climate change (Lempert and Nguyen, 2009). Though the acceptance of "development" by governments of weak countries is also done with the recognition that it is destructive of their resources and cultures, I have also been able to find the logic of their action not merely on the basis of "dependency theory" but using the methodological framework of decisions under a "prisoner's dilemma". Leaders of small countries must rationally choose what will not be destroyed by major powers rather than to choose to follow international law and principles and to seek to preserve and protect their cultures and those of others, given the pressures they face for losing everything (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011).

"Doublespeak" of "Development"

It is easy to highlight the disparities between the claims and beliefs associated with "development" and the reality of its results as well as its detachment from objective legal and professional goals. The results that are most often seen in the name of "development" are those of colonialism continued under a new name and they show a clear cultural continuity with the history of imperialism of European powers and other empires such as ancient empires of China and Viet Nam. Euphemistic terminologies of "aid" and "help" today are similar to those used by empires like those of a "civilizing mission" probably in an attempt to gain sympathy and prevent empathy with the actual rights and inequalities and destruction that occur in its name.

Information found easily in newspapers suggests this. In response to being described as the 7th fastest developing country in the world by the World Bank in 2014, the Lao government's newspaper made the following explanation:

one of the main factors making these countries the fastest growing economies in the world is the exploitation of natural resources. Most of these nations export large quantities of natural resources, mainly mineral commodities, to other developing nations. Lao policy makers said no countries in the world see success in development without using natural resources. (Phouthonesy, 2014)

Indeed, rapid "development" seems to be a euphemism for rapid exploitation of resources if not looting of a country's wealth. It is interesting to take the World Bank's list and to compare it to

rankings for corruption (Transparency International, 2013) and oppression (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2012). Those countries described as the fastest "growing" and "developing" in the world are among the most corrupt and undemocratic; allowing for the most rapid exploitation of natural resources and labor.

Table 1: "Development", "Growth" and Reality

<i>Name of Country</i>	<i>Global Rank in "Growth" According to the World Bank</i>	<i>Global Rank in Perception of Corruption according to Transparency International</i>	<i>Global Rank in Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index</i>
Mongolia	1	83	69
Sierra Leone	2	117-119	106
Turkmenistan	3	168	165
Bhutan	4	31	104
Libya	5	172	125
Iraq	6	171	112
Laos	7	140	156
Timor Leste	8	117-119	42
Eritrea	9	160	154
Zambia	10	83	71
<i>Average Rank</i>	<i>5.5 out of 192 (leaders)</i>	<i>124.4 out of 175 (worst third)</i>	<i>110.4 out of 165 (worst third)</i>

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during her term in office (2008-2012) often called "aid" by the euphemism, "soft power diplomacy", indicating that the purpose of "development assistance" was not to promote the recipient but to achieve hegemonic results on behalf of elite interests. The suggestion was that these results would otherwise be achieved through harder forms of power such as military occupation, assassination, and threats of invasion that are the other part of the arsenal.

The logic of how "development" works (its "deep structure") is very simple. To understand it, one simply needs to understand what makes cultures sustainable: they balance their populations and consumption with their production within their resource base. According to professional and legal standards, true "development" requires establishing that balance and safeguarding traditional patterns of production and consumption that stay in balance within a culture's environment.

What actually happens under the name of "development" is the opposite, with no attention at all to this balance or to traditional choices. There is no attention to the sustainable development equation or local culture, and zero focus on reducing or maintaining population or consumption. "Development" as practiced works instead to ratchet up both populations and consumption in several ways: through health benefits, technology transfer for production, and promotion of higher imports and consumption in return for either direct extraction of resources or export production. The transfers and advice immediately work to destroy any prospects of self-reliance within a local eco-system and to focus on specialized production or sales of a resource in ways that generate short term incomes. By definition, that immediately breaks the cultures. The rise in consumption assures that the original cultures are broken and that the earlier balance with the eco-system can never be restored. That assures dependency on outside technology and paternalism. The inputs come with homogenization through state building, with national schools, "rights" approaches geared to move certain groups (particularly women) into the industrial labor force of

export industries, and to promote movement of people, goods and resources. It simultaneously promotes cultural genocide, resource depletion, dependency, social control, labor exploitation and unsustainability (Lempert and Nguyen, 2011).

Contemporary "development" "aid" rarely if ever restores cultures to sustainable balance by trying to fix something that was broken. It almost always is a mirror of the outsiders' determinations of what is civilizing and productive. The work is usually a kind of paternalism, in a "Santa Claus" transfer of gifts of technology or straight infrastructure or goods to treat "poverty" but never the symptoms in a band aid approach. It is often little more than money shoveling. The incentives of the "donors" are to speed up productivity and extraction in the name of "income" growth while depleting wealth (and assuring that per capita wealth falls). The "aid" agencies also have perverse incentives. They do not want to treat the root causes of the problems because that would put them out of business. They are co-dependent on continued poverty.

The system works to assure assimilation of some groups with continued economic exploitation of other populations that remain poor (for cheap labor and extraction of resources), cultural genocide and assimilation/globalization. Usually, "aid" also works to subsidize elites who would otherwise have to care for their own people, and whose allegiance may be purchased in this way. In many cases, where projects are sham and have no results at all past such transfers, they are pure public relations, used to advertise some non-existent goodwill. Where the projects offer no more than public relations on areas like "sustainability" or promoting "rights", professionals have already created some new words to describe what actually happens: "greenwash" (for environmental projects that "whitewash" real sustainability without results) (Matavelli, 2011) and "rightswash" for projects that claim to protect rights and promote democracy but do nothing more than treat a few symptoms for the purpose of publicity (Lempert, 2010).

Although the current terminology of "development" is relatively new, the policies underlying it seem to be a clear continuity from previous colonial approaches. Previous eras also had their euphemisms for colonialism/ imperialism and its associated violence. The ideology in the U.S. was of a single, linear trajectory of human development (Morgan, 1877; Rostow, 1960) that justified assimilation and destruction of cultural difference. Within the United States, even the war of the manufacturing class against the agricultural states was described as "modernization" and conducted to promote "rights" and "democracy". Though many writers have exposed it for what it was, and have focused on the brain drain and pillaging of the southern states in order to assure their dependency and assimilation, the conquest of the Native peoples of the Americas to exploit their lands followed by the victory of manufacturing over plantation agriculture has come to become the modern ideological framework of global "development". In the words of H.L. Mencken, "[i]t is difficult to imagine anything more untrue" than [U.S. President] Lincoln's statement "'that government of the people, by the people, for the people' should not perish from the earth." The "Union soldiers in that battle actually fought against self determination" and "sovereignty of the States" and not for full political equality of Blacks, women, Native Americans or even of free citizens or for protection of community and environment (Mencken, essay on Lincoln from May 1920, 1990, p. 80). The French referred to it as their "civilizing mission" and there were similar views espoused by the British of the "white man's burden" and the bringing of "civilization" to "primitive" "backward" "savages". Anthropologists long ago exposed this (Sahlins, 1960, 1972) along with others (Said, 1978; Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995).

The art of propaganda has become a feature of all modern societies and mythologies and mystification are used to shroud those government and elite actions that appear to support contradictory values (Bernays, 1928; Chomsky and Herman, 1988).

Previous Glossaries of "Doublespeak"

The idea of creating a dictionary to help reveal reality (or to satirize it) also isn't new. In addition to Orwell's dictionary, there have been Ambrose Bierce's "Devil's Dictionary" (1906), Flaubert's "Dictionary of Received Ideas" (1913), and Franz Fanon's glossary (1963). Several essayists have worked to dispel modern myths and to use frank terms to replace euphemisms, such as H.L. Mencken in the early 20th century (1990). More recently, William Lutz critically examined "the new doublespeak" and sought explanations for why it has emerged (1997).

In writing about contemporary notions of "progress", George Orwell helped draw attention to the constant need for contemporary glossaries to translate the euphemisms created by governments and elite ideologies to hide the reality (1949). Indeed, even the term "developed countries" is what Orwell would call "doublespeak" or "doublethink" because it is in the "developed" countries where "development" is actually still occurring while "development" agencies from these "developed" countries are not doing "development" in their interventions.

Orwell's famous examples of "doublethink" in 1984 were the slogans, "Freedom is slavery" and "War is peace". They are slogans that seem to be part of modern thinking in an era where there are constant "pre-emptive" wars that are undeclared in multiple countries in the name of peace and where "Lack of personal rights is security". "Homogenization is security. Freedom of thought is conflict." U.S. General William Westmoreland's famous declaration that the U.S. was "destroying this village [in Viet Nam] in order to save it" is perhaps the perfect example of contemporary "newspeak" and "doublethink". One might say the industrial era is one in which government agencies use language in the form of a "dictum deficit disorder" that stands to be corrected.

A Partial Glossary of "Development" "Newspeak"

To produce the clearest glossary for "development" "newspeak" we can start with each misused "etic" "development" term and the euphemisms or substitute "etic" words that are used to justify it, and can then present the probable results of interventions that currently fall under that heading that actually have the opposite meaning from the "etic" term and euphemisms describing it. From this table we can then try to come up with the single best plain English term to put in a glossary as the precise substitute for the misused "development" term.

Table 2, below, takes many of the most commonly used phrases including the word "development" and suggests the actual term that is being hidden and the actual result that may in fact be the opposite of "development". Note that these are simply suggestions to help the reader to rethink, expose, and challenge current usages of the term and to hold those who use the term accountable to the real meaning as defined by international treaties or to admit their real intent that their misuse of language seeks to hide.

Certainly this is not the first piece to expose the language of development and the tables below rely on terms and analysis that is offered by like-minded authors. For example, anthropologist Laura Nader and lawyer Ugo Mattei recently called "legal development" by the name of "plunder" (2008) while an earlier author referred to it as "legal imperialism" (Gardner, 1980). These concepts and words all help in helping to choose the most appropriate "translation" of the misused term.

Table 2: Misused "Development" Terms and their Actual Implications

<i>Context in which "development" is claimed ("Etic" word used by "development" actors)</i>	<i>More appropriate (less value laden) "etic" word describing the activities or other euphemism used by "development" actors</i>	<i>Probable or possible result, in plain English (often with exact opposite meaning)</i>
Development	Technology transfer to exploit a resource	Short term economic gain for those with power over technology and resources
International development	International determination of the market niche of a peoples and their resources	Economic integration and subordination for global exploitation of people and resources
Sustainable development	Sustainable business exploitation on an ongoing profitable basis	Continuing return on investment
Rural communities ("rural development")	Urbanization, industrialization	Rural elimination, Cultural genocide
Indigenous communities "development"	Equality, Opportunity, (State) Education	Hegemony, Conformity Homogenization and Erasure
Urban Redevelopment/ Renewal and planning	Corporate transformation	Community and heritage liquidation/ demolition
Agriculture "development"	Industrialization/ globalization of agriculture for plantation and monoculture/ cash crop export production	"War on the Peasants"/ Elimination of small farmer, self-sufficiency, sustainability, and culture (genocide); ecocide, land theft, water depletion
Finite resources "development"	Extraction and sale	(Asset) Depletion
Natural resources development	Monoculture and resource diversion	Ecocide (turning living things into dead things (products))
Human resources "development"	Job training	Erasure of traditional skills and economies ("proletarianization")
	Labor export and mobility/ Economic choice	Trafficking in humans, uprooting of communities
Handicraft development, promoting traditional production	Handicraft rebranding	Traditional design and practice elimination; Creation of sweatshops and company towns to exploit child and women's labor for global market
Cultural heritage and tourism development	Repackaging the landscape and rebranding the cultures	Cultural appropriation, including creating Human ZOOS

Community/ civil society "development" and restoration	Interest group and policy advocacy institutionalization	Traditional community elimination, social atomization, social control
Legal development	Legal harmonization; "Rights" promotion	Atomization, replacement of traditional law and culture; Plunder of communal resources; Hegemony; Lawlessness under "might makes right"
Capacity development	Training those without incentives or skills who remain in positions; Linking with counterparts; Subsidizing the workplace with vehicles and machinery	Dependency promotion or influence peddling

Table 2 just examines the word "development" in the many forms it is used. Note, however, that the context in which interventions from powerful countries occur includes many other words that seem to distort or invert their real meaning. In the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the World Bank's agenda of "privatization" of public goods was renamed "piratization" outside of elite circles to more accurately define what many saw was occurring. (In Slavic languages, both words have the same roots as in English.) What is called "fair trade" or "free trade" is also seen by many as its opposite, in which there is a price to be paid of destroying culture, environment and future sustainability.

The U.N. system, for example, uses euphemisms in its "legal development" projects for "rights", identifying groups as "duty bearers" and "rights holders" when what they really mean is "abusers and/or their enablers and abettors" and "victims" (Lempert, 2009b).

Using Table 2, we can then pick the best plain English words for the glossary. These suggested terms are shown in Table 3, translating "development" terminology from "newspeak" into plain English, and Table 4, offering some additional related terms. The goal of the glossary is to choose the word which seems the best fit, capturing both the results and the hidden agenda that is the real intention (either conscious or subconscious)

Conclusion

The glossary offered here for some 21 terms in the area of "development" is just a start to clarifying the misuse of professional and legal terms that are directly relevant to the global public as well as to practitioners.

Though the organizations that currently misuse terminology in the area of "development" are likely to challenge attempts to hold them to legal and professional accountability, they have the burden to demonstrate that they are not or are not doing what the glossary suggests they are. They act using public money or are publicly chartered with the status to operate and solicit funds for their work, and have the burden of proof to demonstrate their compliance with legal and professional standards.

We can be said to live in a topsy-turvy world, on the other side of "Alice's looking glass", where it is often difficult to see who is doing what to whom under what agency and how with what justification. It is often difficult to know enough to be able to call things by their true names.

Table 3: Translation of Development Terminology from "Newspeak" into Plain English

<i>Word Used by Government and International Organizations</i>	<i>Translation into Plain English</i>
Development	Resource exploitation
International development	Globalization
Sustainable development	Short to middle term resource exploitation
Rural development	Rural elimination (Industrialization or urbanization)
Indigenous community development	Cultural genocide
Urban redevelopment	Community demolition
Agricultural development	Industrialization of agriculture
Natural resources development	Ecocide
[Finite resource - e.g., oil, gas, mineral] development	[Finite resource] depletion
Human resources development	Human programming or Human engineering (Worker control)
Handicraft development	Handicraft mass commercialization
Cultural heritage and tourism development	Objectification, commodification
Community/Civil society development	Social control
Legal development	Routinized hegemony
Capacity development	Dependency promotion or Influence peddling

Table 4: Translations of Related Terms from "Newspeak" into Plain English

<i>Word Used by Government and International Organizations</i>	<i>Translation into Plain English</i>
Donors	(Neo)colonizers
Beneficiaries	Victims, colonized
Aid agencies	Colonial agencies; poverty businesses
Stakeholders	(non-beneficiary) Collaborators, clients
Evaluations	Colonizer and Collaborator Advertisements for Re-funding (Lempert, 2009c)
Action Plans	Sector fundraising advertisements (Lempert, 2014c)

Anthropologists using techniques to translate "newspeak" and "doublethink" into plain English play an important social role, helping societies to adapt so that society progresses rather than regresses. At present, a glossary like this one suggests that we live in a society where there is a deep cultural split and a fight over our future. On the one hand are those who adhere to law, ethics and professionalism in the belief of human progress and on the other are those who corrupt institutions and professions for short-term self-interest in ways that appear to be mal-adaptive and socially destructive, even though the "deep structure" of our society is what has enabled this paradox. If a glossary like this one forces social change and oversight of "development" so that it conforms to law and professionalism, glossaries like this one will simply become historical artifacts reflecting a time when institutions went out of control.

There are plenty of other areas of activity in contemporary societies where such glossaries would be useful, in quickly understanding modern economic and political institutions; social institutions; and including university disciplines. There are way more examples that can be presented in this

piece but some are offered as incentive to colleagues and readers to carefully produce additional glossaries.

One need simply open up a comprehensive dictionary to see that meanings of words like "democracy" and "private" now include definitions under the same heading that are direct opposites! How can "democracy" be both "direct" (by citizens, themselves) and "indirect" (with people given greater powers than citizens)? How can "democracy" be both "majority rule" (tyranny) and a safeguarded balance of all groups including minorities? Or does it simply now mean "openness to the power of concentrated capital" (Chomsky and Herman, 1998)? What do "equality" and "rights" mean when "corporate persons" that are legal fictions now have political rights and freedoms in proportion to their holdings of "capital" (a politically recognized number)? What is "free" speech? What is "free" trade?

The political "isms" that have been used to describe different societies also seem to have lost any sensible meaning though they continue to be used. Of "guild socialism," "State socialism", "national socialism" ("Nazism") and "democratic socialism" which one is socialism and which one isn't? (The Russians say that "Nazism" was "White Fascism" while "Communism" was "Red Fascism".) Of "communism" without "communitarianism" and without "communes" and without "communities" which one is something else? In Vietnamese, the word for "communism" is translated with Han Chinese blocks into "increased production" while "socialization" is something that is "privatized" activity done by people and capital rather than by the state. The Vietnamese now say they have "market oriented (State) socialism" which perhaps could be described as "corporatism" or perhaps "state capitalism". How is that different from where corporations capture the state? These terms now seem to represent little more than a jumble of nonsense, used only to suggest "otherness" of quite similar industrial (colonial) states. Rather than use these labels and "post-socialist", one anthropologist has already highlighted the nonsense and called for anthropologists to step in and define cultures and their systems on the basis of their true cultural names (like "Russian empire", "Chinese/Han empire", "Vietnamese/Kinh empire") and to describe their systems on the basis of anthropological terms and differences rather than fall prey to ideological labels (Duncan, 2012).

Education is supposed to help in calling things what they are and explaining how they work but perhaps today that has also become part of the problem of "why no one knows what anyone is saying anymore" (Lutz, 1997). If ideologies and elites have corrupted educational institutions such that "education" is no longer "education" but is, instead, "indoctrination, training and assimilation", a form of ancestor worship and promotion of political cults, it is no wonder (Lempert, 1995).

One reason the terminology on "development" may have taken so long to decipher and challenge is because the discipline of economics today may have become "production engineering" and part of the system of enablers of misguided "development". Political science may now simply be "theology" presenting the study of "isms" (Chomsky and Herman, 1998). Sociology may now have become "labor economics and labor engineering" to simply promote labor competition for women and minorities in a homogenized global system. Meanwhile, there are questions from some as to whether anthropology is up to the job. One recent critique persuasively described the discipline as having abandoned the scientific study of human groups in order to become a second discipline of film studies and international journalism, defined only by a journalistic methodology and by political self interest of different groups to promote their own "identities" and self-interests (Duncan, 2012).

References

- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths, and T. Toffin, ed., (1995). *Key Concepts in Post Colonial Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Bernays, Edward (1928). *Propaganda*, New York: Routledge.
- Bierce, Ambrose (1906). *The Devil's Dictionary*. Neale Publishing Company.
- Chomsky, Noam (1988). *Language and Politics*. Montreal: Black Rose.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Edward Herman (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Confucius (1943 [5th century B.C.E.]). *The Wisdom of Confucius*, Lin Yutang, ed., New York: Random House.
- Derrida, Jacques (1967). *Grammatology*, Paris: Les Editions Minuit.
- Duncan, Brooks (2012). "Post-Cold War Anthropology as Blog." *Journal of Developing Societies*, Vol. 29, No. 1.
- Economist Intelligence Unit (2012). *Democracy Index, 2011*. London: *The Economist*, cited in Phouthonesy (2014).
- Fanon, Franz, translated by Constances Farrington (1963 [1961]). *The Wretched of the Earth*, Grove Press.
- Flaubert, Gustave (1913). *Bouvard et Pecuchet, Dictionary of Received Ideas*, Paris: H.S. Nichols.
- Frank, Andre Gunder, James D. Cochroft and Dale L. Johnson, (1972), *Dependence and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Gardner, James (1980). *Legal Imperialism: American Lawyers and Foreign Aid in Latin America*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lempert, David (2014c), "Action Plans, Declarations, and Other Agenda Setting Documents in International Development: An Indicator to Assure Professionalism", *Momentum Quarterly*, Volume 3, No. 2, Summer 2014, page 58 - 74. <https://www.momentum-quarterly.org/index.php/momentum/article/view/77>
- Lempert, David (1996). "Building Democracy in the Former Soviet Union ... With Mirrors," *Legal Studies Forum*, Fall, Volume 19, No. 4.
- Lempert, David (2011), "Democracy Building Democratic Project Indicators for NGOs and International Organizations," *Global Jurist*, Volume 11, Issue 2, Article 4: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/gj.2011.11.issue-2/1934-2640.1385/1934-2640.1385.xml?format=INT>
- Lempert, David (2009a). "A Dependency in Development Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations," *Global Jurist*. Volume 9, Issue 2, Article 6. <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/gj.2009.9.2/gj.2009.9.2.1296/gj.2009.9.2.1296.xml?format=INT>
- Lempert, David (1995), *Escape From the Ivory Tower: Student Adventures in Democratic Experiential Education*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers/ Simon & Schuster
- Lempert, David (2009b), "A Human Rights Education Project Indicator for NGOs and International Organizations", *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy*,

- November, 2009 Volume 3, Number 1, 2010. <http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/view/617/713> and supplementary file. Also at: www.ried-ijed.org
- Lempert, David (1999). "Interpreting Vietnam: The Ideology and 'Newspeak' of Market Transition," *Legal Studies Forum*, Winter, Volume 24, No. 2.
- Lempert, David (2015). "A Poverty Reduction Accountability Indicator for International Organizations and NGOs", *Law, Social Justice and Global Development*, Issue 18: 1 (forthcoming).
- Lempert, David (2012). "A Quick Indicator of Effectiveness of "Income Generation" and "Sustainable Business Initiatives" in International Development," *Economology Journal*, Volume 2, Number 2. http://www.economologos.com/Lempert_EJ.II.Feb.2012.pdf
- Lempert, David (2014), "A Vision for International Development and a Tool for Comparisons," *Journal of Economics and Social Policy*, Volume 16, No. 2, 2014. <http://epubs.scu.edu.au/jesp/vol16/iss2/3>
- Lempert, David (2009c), "Why Government and NGO Projects Fail Despite 'Evaluations': An Indicator to Measure whether Evaluation Systems Incorporate the Rules of Good Governance," *Journal of Multi-disciplinary Evaluation*, Vol. 6, No. 13, pages 58-108. <http://survey.ate.wmich.edu/jmde/index.php/jmde.1/article/view/243/247>
- Lempert, David (2008), "Why We Need an International Development Donor Monitor," *Policy Innovations*, January. http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/policy_library/data/01464 Reprinted in "Forming a Donor Monitor NGO," *Ethics World News*, February 5, 2008. <http://www.ethicsworld.org/corporategovernance/nonprofitgovernance.php#donormonitor>
- Lempert, David (2010), "Why We Need a Cultural Red Book for Endangered Cultures, Now," *International Journal of Minority and Group Rights*, Fall/Winter, No. 17 (4), 511-50. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/search/expand?pub=infobike://mnp/ijgr/2010/00000017/00000004/art00001&token=008c101a6d622238325f66592c38587064726d29587227377766587b6a573d2570257070232b467a4072763547667c4e7247774f6d292275687b762c6b5f667d7810db6fe600> Short version in *Practicing Anthropology*, Volume 32, No. 4, pages 9-13, Fall 2010. Also available on Web: <http://david.dracula0.googlepages.com/home>
- Lempert, David and Hue Nhu Nguyen (2009), "A Convenient Truth About Global Warming: Why Most of the Major Powers Really Want Global Warming," *The Ecologist*, February. http://www.theecologist.org/pages/archive_detail.asp?content_id=2112 Reprinted in Mother Pelican: <http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n09page4.html>
- Lempert, David and Hue Nhu Nguyen (2011). "The Global Prisoners' Dilemma of Unsustainability: Why Sustainable Development Cannot Be Achieved Without Resource Security and Eliminating the Legacies of Colonialism," *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, Spring, Volume 7, No. 1. <http://sspp.proquest.com/archives/vol7iss1/1006-031.lempert.html> Reprinted in Mother Pelican: <http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n10page4.html>
- Lempert, David and Hue Nhu Nguyen (2008), "How to Tell if Development Projects are Doing Sustainable Development: An Indicator for NGOs and International

- Organizations," *International Journal of Sustainable Societies*, 1:1, 2008.
<http://inderscience.metapress.com/app/home/contribution.asp?referrer=parent&backto=issue,3,6;journal,1,1;linkingpublicationresults,1:121226,1> Reprinted at:
<http://www.pelicanweb.org/solisustv07n8page4.html>
- Lutz, William (1997). *The New Doublespeak: Why No One Knows What Anyone's Saying Anymore*, Perennial.
- Matavelli, Jim (2011). "A History of Greenwashing", February 12, available at:
<http://www.dailyfinance.com/2011/02/12/>
- Mencken, Henry Lewis (1990). *The Vintage Mencken*, New York: Random House / Vintage Books.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. (1877). *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*. Chicago: C.H.Kerr
- Nader, Laura and Ugo Mattei (2008). *Plunder: When the Rule of Law is Illegal*. Victoria, Australia: Blackwell.
- Orwell, George (1949). 1984, New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Plato (380 B.C.E.). *The Republic*.
- Phouthonesy, Ekaphone (2014). "Laos Named as One of the World's Fastest Growing Economies," *The Vientiane Times*, January 20, p. 1.
- Rostow, Walt (1960). *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Said, Edward (1978). *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1960). *Evolution and Culture*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ann Arbor Paperbacks.
- Sahlins, Marshall (1972). *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine Transaction.
- Transparency International (2014), *Corruption Perception Index, 2013*, Accessed on 22 January 2014, <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2013/results/>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, (1979). "An Historical Perspective: The Emergence of the New Economic Order." *The Capitalist World Economy*. New York: Cambridge U. Press.