



Tackling the 'Planned Lack of Care': Could a Right to Development Treaty Promote Universal Social Protection Systems?

Armando De Negri Filho¹

© Society for International Development 2022

Abstract

The opportunity offered by the adoption of a Treaty on the Right to Development could relaunch aspirations of sovereignty, self-determination and cooperative solidarity, breaking with the structural inequalities among and within nations. The aim of this article is to mobilize political actors in favour of the Treaty as a stepping-stone to achieve universal social protection systems.

Keywords Development-based human rights · Planned misery · Transformative social policies · Epistemic injustice · Radical needs

At the 51st Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) on 20 September 2022, the report of the Working Group on the Right to Development was presented. The Working Group Chair, Ambassador Zamir Akram from Pakistan, exposed the state of the debate and presented the recommendations related to the draft Convention or Treaty, a legally binding instrument of the Right to Development (RTD).¹ At the time of writing, the expectation is that the UNHRC will define the pathway for the possible adoption of the Treaty at the 2023 Human Rights Council Session as well as the procedure to submit the approved text to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). The adoption of the text by the HRC will certainly not be by consensus, since the political environment is deeply different from that one experience in 1986, when the Declaration to the Right to Development (DRTD) was adopted almost by consensus at the UNGA, with the solely vote against by the United States of America, eight abstentions and 146 favourable votes.

It is always useful to socialize the text of the 1986 Declaration on the RTD, as reported below, especially because the draft RTD Treaty proposal adopted the same general structure of the Declaration, including its further developments in terms of UN policies, particularly regards women's rights and environmental issues, as well as the mechanisms

to analyze the violations of the RTD and its consequences, particularly on the duty to cooperate and the prevention of imposition of interests by countries or block of countries over other countries which affect their right to development (which includes the effects of unilateral coercive measures).

'Declaration on the Right to Development. Adopted by General Assembly, resolution 41/128 of 4 December 1986. The General Assembly, bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations relating to the achievement of international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian nature, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, Recognizing that development is a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits resulting therefrom, Considering that under the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in that

✉ Armando De Negri Filho
armandodeneгри@yahoo.com

¹ CRIS - Center of International Relationships in Health / FIOCRUZ Brasil, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

¹ Report of the Working Group on the Right to Development on its twenty-second session (Geneva, 22–26 November 2021) Chair-Rapporteur Zamir Akram. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G22/390/80/PDF/G2239080.pdf?OpenElementA/HRC/51/38>.



Declaration can be fully realized, Recalling the provisions of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Recalling further the relevant agreements, conventions, resolutions, recommendations and other instruments of the United Nations and its specialized agencies concerning the integral development of the human being, economic and social progress and development of all peoples, including those instruments concerning decolonization, the prevention of discrimination, respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the maintenance of international peace and security and the further promotion of friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter, Recalling the right of peoples to self-determination, by virtue of which they have the right freely to determine their political status and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, Recalling also the right of peoples to exercise, subject to the relevant provisions of both International Covenants on Human Rights, full and complete sovereignty over all their natural wealth and resources, Mindful of the obligation of States under the Charter to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction of any kind such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, Considering that the elimination of the massive and flagrant violations of the human rights of the peoples and individuals affected by situations such as those resulting from colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid, all forms of racism and racial discrimination, foreign domination and occupation, aggression and threats against national sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity and threats of war would contribute to the establishment of circumstances propitious to the development of a great part of mankind, Concerned at the existence of serious obstacles to development, as well as to the complete fulfilment of human beings and of peoples, constituted, inter alia, by the denial of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, and considering that all human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interdependent and that, in order to promote development, equal attention and urgent consideration should be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights and that, accordingly, the promotion of, respect for and enjoyment of certain human rights and fundamental freedoms cannot justify the denial of other human rights and fundamental freedoms, Considering that international peace and security are essential elements for the realization of the right to development, Reaffirming that there is a close relationship between disarmament and development and that

progress in the field of disarmament would considerably promote progress in the field of development and that resources released through disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development and well-being of all peoples and, in particular, those of the developing countries, Recognizing that the human person is the central subject of the development process and that development policy should therefore make the human being the main participant and beneficiary of development, Recognizing that the creation of conditions favorable to the development of peoples and individuals is the primary responsibility of their States, Aware that efforts at the international level to promote and protect human rights should be accompanied by efforts to establish a new international economic order, Confirming that the right to development is an inalienable human right and that equality of opportunity for development is a prerogative both of nations and of individuals who make up nations, Proclaims the following Declaration on the Right to Development:

Article 1: 1. The right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized. 2. The human right to development also implies the full realization of the right of peoples to self-determination, which includes, subject to the relevant provisions of both International Covenants on Human Rights, the exercise of their inalienable right to full sovereignty over all their natural wealth and resources.

Article 2: 1. The human person is the central subject of development and should be the active participant and beneficiary of the right to development. 2. All human beings have a responsibility for development, individually and collectively, considering the need for full respect for their human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as their duties to the community, which alone can ensure the free and complete fulfilment of the human being, and they should therefore promote and protect an appropriate political, social and economic order for development. 3. States have the right and the duty to formulate appropriate national development policies that aim at the constant improvement of the well-being of the entire population and of all individuals, based on their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of the benefits resulting therefrom.

Article 3: 1. States have the primary responsibility for the creation of national and international conditions favorable to the realization of the right to development. 2. The realization of the right to development requires full respect for the principles of international law con-



cerning friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. 3. States have the duty to co-operate with each other in ensuring development and eliminating obstacles to development. States should realize their rights and fulfil their duties in such a manner as to promote a new international economic order based on sovereign equality, interdependence, mutual interest and co-operation among all States, as well as to encourage the observance and realization of human rights.

Article 4: 1. States have the duty to take steps, individually and collectively, to formulate international development policies with a view to facilitating the full realization of the right to development. 2. Sustained action is required to promote more rapid development of developing countries. As a complement to the efforts of developing countries, effective international co-operation is essential in providing these countries with appropriate means and facilities to foster their comprehensive development.

Article 5: States shall take resolute steps to eliminate the massive and flagrant violations of the human rights of peoples and human beings affected by situations such as those resulting from apartheid, all forms of racism and racial discrimination, colonialism, foreign domination and occupation, aggression, foreign interference and threats against national sovereignty, national unity and territorial integrity, threats of war and refusal to recognize the fundamental right of peoples to self-determination.

Article 6: 1. All States should co-operate with a view to promoting, encouraging and strengthening universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without any distinction as to race, sex, language or religion. 2. All human rights and fundamental freedoms are indivisible and interdependent; equal attention and urgent consideration should be given to the implementation, promotion and protection of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. 3. States should take steps to eliminate obstacles to development resulting from failure to observe civil and political rights, as well as economic social and cultural rights.

Article 7: All States should promote the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security and, to that end, should do their utmost to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control, as well as to ensure that the resources released by effective disarmament measures are used for comprehensive development, in particular that of the developing countries.

Article 8: 1. States should undertake, at the national level, all necessary measures for the realization of the right to development and shall ensure, inter alia, equality of opportunity for all in their access to basic

resources, education, health services, food, housing, employment and the fair distribution of income. Effective measures should be undertaken to ensure that women have an active role in the development process. Appropriate economic and social reforms should be carried out with a view to eradicating all social injustices. 2. States should encourage popular participation in all spheres as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights.

Article 9: 1. All the aspects of the right to development set forth in the present Declaration are indivisible and interdependent and each of them should be considered in the context of the whole. 2. Nothing in the present Declaration shall be construed as being contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, or as implying that any State, group or person has a right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the violation of the rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenants on Human Rights.

Article 10: Steps should be taken to ensure the full exercise and progressive enhancement of the right to development, including the formulation, adoption and implementation of policy, legislative and other measures at the national and international levels.

The 1986 Declaration was the culmination of a sustained political and normative effort by the United Nations, with successive resolutions of the UNGA all along the 20 years that succeeded the 1966 Covenant of the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in the broader political context offered by decolonization movements that followed World War II. Since the Conference of Bandung in 1955, the demand for the normative recognition of the right to development gained shape and content, also guiding the political struggles in favour of a non-aligned movement (created in 1961). Such a demand called for the full affirmation of the sovereignty of the nations and the self determination of the peoples, aiming for the elimination of inequalities among and within countries by means of an absolute accomplishment of all rights. It also demanded an active (re)distribution of wealth among all citizens, peoples and nations, with special attention to the sovereignty of nations with respect to their natural and financial resources as well as workforce. It was expressed as the need of a new international economic and political order, based in an intransigent struggle against all kinds of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism/coloniality (Timossi 2015).

The claim for the right to development, as the equal accomplishment of all rights, demanded and continues to demand, on one hand, the duty to cooperate among nations and peoples and, on the other, the right of defence from development policies imposed by countries or blocks of



countries that could harm or limit the development possibilities of other peoples and nations.

Since the adoption of the 1986 Declaration, the context of neoliberal political hegemony led to formal arguments about the sufficiency of the Declaration as a normative instrument, therefore denying the need for a Treaty and blocking progress towards the (re)politicization of the unfair international order and the full application of the right to development. Even in the context of the Millennium Development Goals, now Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the notion of the RTD has been avoided or treated in elusive ways, with the expected consequences of a ‘de-politicization’ process, where structural inequalities, so preserved by the hegemonic neoliberal order, remain unchecked and are constantly increasing.

The neoliberal hegemony built since then was and continues to be able to obstruct the reclaiming of power, which is necessary to recover, also through the RTD, a broader debate about the continuous concentration of wealth in the hands of very few people and corporations. Indeed, the so-called ‘1% owners’ of the global financial capital and physical assets, whose immense accumulation was largely built thanks to ‘unregulated’ markets, exercise uncontrolled power on the political scenes and benefit extensively from the ‘deprotection’ of the ‘99%’ continuously impoverished and indebted populations. Such a mutuality—between the increase of wealth of a few corresponding to the impoverishment of so many—reflects the hardcore of the current exploitative development model, offering political and economic clues that need to be centrally analyzed in all international relationships and international law studies, to expose and understand its mechanisms and build alternative narratives where the right to development, as a concept and as a system, could have a central role.

Historically, the right to development represents a concrete attempt to eliminate exploitation as the main aspect of the current political and economic hegemonic order. It is therefore essential to recognize the importance of the RTD in this very moment of multiple crisis affecting the survival of peoples and planet. Tackling unfair inequalities—the main ambition of the right to development—implies the struggle against all forms of domination, exclusion and exploitation as well as against the any forms of discrimination of social class, gender, sexuality, religion, race, and ethnicity. The RTD allows to embrace all these claims in a broader perspective—one that implies the universalism of rights within a comprehensive and egalitarian perspective that compounds the mosaic of the full respect of all interdependent rights.

It is therefore of fundamental importance to explore the ideological impact of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development through the lenses of the RTD. The so much needed (re)politicization of social life (in opposition to the technocratization of power and particularly of public social

policies) could find in the RTD the concept and the tool to promote the protection of the people from the abuses of the capital, which is treating a large number of people as disposable persons, pushing them at the margins of societies.

Such a massive social exclusion can be better understood as the consequence of the shift from development challenges to the poverty alleviation policies. After the disaster in Vietnam, the US Defence Secretary Robert McNamara evaluated the Vietnam debacle as a political defeat more than a military disaster. To avoid new defeats, he proposed, in his newly acquired capacity as President of the World Bank, a social policy counter offensive, that could control the claims for equitable development using targeted interventions against poverty—a way to protect the substantial interests of capital through the mitigation of the dramatic effects of the consequent social frailties. Such a shift weakened the move around the RTD as a right of the rights, intended to eliminate unfair inequalities, and opened the doors to the ‘eradication’ of targeted poverty as the main strategy of developmental social policy, eliminating the aspirations for either universal social security or social protections as tools for the fair redistribution of wealth. Targeted programmes, mostly represented by cash transfer schemes, rapidly displaced the concept of transformative social policies and undermined the more progressive, but yet complex, building of collective solidarity (Mkandawire 2005).

The extraordinary epistemic effort made by the World Bank Group, amplified through a large network of academic institutions of the Global North and a huge number of scholarships spread in all of the Global South, educated the new intelligentsia on the neoliberal model, always ready to propose magic solutions for fiscal equilibrium despite the high prices to be paid by the exploited populations. The sophisticated and persuasive approach proposed by the 1993 World Bank Report on ‘Investing in Health’ (World Bank 1993) and the more recent offensive (since 2010) through the so-called ‘Universal Health Coverage’ (De Negri Filho 2014), registered significant success, widely undermining social protection floors and system and facilitating the emergence of a cynical approach to social exclusion. Indeed, the World Bank promoted individual entrepreneurship along the promise of money in the pocket by cash transfers at the same time that the public and collective social protection systems were devastated. The ‘Science of Poverty’ that emerged proved to be more interested in cataloguing the ‘poor’ and establishing poverty lines than in eliminating the causes of the impoverishment; yet, it remains hegemonic and continues to block any significant attempt to challenge the interests of the wealthy and their financial capital.

The consequence of this situation is the reinforcement, even during the pandemic crisis, of austerity policies, reducing social expenditures, deepening loan-dependency and the political power of the indebtedment, opposing to



re-embedding of the economy as an integral component of the life of people, and maximizing the benefits of the wealthy and their capital accumulation as never before in the human history.

The introduction, by the World Bank in 2003, of the concept of the ‘social risk management’ (World Bank 2003), with the consequent adoption of the concept of ‘vulnerability’ to characterize the condition of individuals and human groups, eliminated the condition of subjects of rights, citizens, unemployed workers, social actors able to transform the cruel reality of our unequal societies. Under the neoliberal hegemony, the vulnerables became the common sense of our social policy debates, with the consequence that different social groups tried to classify as vulnerable instead of fighting for universal rights. The social risk management proposed to consolidate the historical ‘planned lack of care’, ‘planned scarcity’ and ‘planned misery’ that are essential to keep social groups away from their rights (Marks 2008, 2011). Since colonialism, Global South countries never achieved a social infrastructure able to warrantee the materiality of the social rights, and this continue to remain a persistent reality.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the asymmetries of health and social protection systems between North and South became more visible and also exposed the clear footprints of the colonial heritage. A single number reflects these asymmetries: the average number of hospital beds within OECD countries is 4,7 for 1000 inhabitants compared with the 1,5 beds per 1000 within the Global South.² Regarding the ongoing concerns on how to make national health systems more resilient, it is essential to consider that, in the context of the fragility, or lack of robustness, of existing systems, the search for the lost equilibrium (as resilience) may conduct back to historically scarce public service provisions.

In social policies, it can be affirmed that the existing hegemony promoted a progressive distancing from the human rights approach. This means that universalism was substituted by targeting; comprehensiveness was substituted by utilitarianism, represented by cost-effectiveness or cost-efficiency applied according to the economic capacities of the different social classes; and, egalitarianism was substituted by an ‘equity of exclusion’, which is functional to a targeting process, providing what is possible according to the capacity of each one or the capacity of the State to provide social insurances controlled by private financial capital (De Negri Filho 2014). The persistent coloniality of international policies was dramatically unveiled during the COVID-19 pandemic. Beyond the euphemism of resilient

social protection and health systems, one could observe the ‘planned lack of care’ or ‘planned misery’ that corresponded to a deliberated insufficiency, leaving behind the dreams of universal access with egalitarian results and defining the absence of robustness of the social policy services and systems.

What can be defined as a ‘planned lack of care’ is therefore the way adopted by the existing hegemony to render ‘natural’ the non-accomplishment of rights, using the argument of scarcity and always opposing the need for more resources to the claimed low standards of public services, which would impose extensive reforms prior to fresh resources being injected. This circular debate exposes a very opportunistic strategy to justify the cut of budgets and the delay to incorporate more resources.

The way forward is to ‘follow the money’ looking for full accountability, while also promoting the search for tax justice, the expansion of fiscal space and redistributive efforts in a combination of bigger taxation volume over capital financial flow and the progressive taxation of income and properties, including the taxation of big fortunes and heritages as well as customs and natural resources royalties that are right now insufficiently taxed. The exclusion of the private property of common goods of public interest, such as water and sanitation, education, social care and health services are essential public recoveries that needs to be widely implemented.

With no economic sovereignty and tax-based redistribution by means of public services there is no possibility of effective social protection systems. That is the reason that the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres proposed ‘Our Common Agenda’ (UNSG 2021), a blueprint for action where fundamental resources must be oriented for a strong social protection system through a new (eco)social contract (UNRISD 2021). However, it is necessary to be conscious of the significant obstacles which may arise, given the ideological and political resistance that will presumably be created, especially among mainstream academics, media, judiciary systems, professional corporations, and legislative bodies. Such an ambitious pathway would need to establish public, transparent but firm negotiations with all these institutions and social groups.

The relaunch of the interest on the RTD was promoted mostly by the dynamics of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the G77, with the permanent influence and power of China. China and the NAM were behind the initiatives related with the RTD at the HRC, in the way it was used to reinforce the creation and process of the Working Group on the Right to Development and its intention to produce a Treaty, the creation of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Development (2017) and the mandate of the Experts Mechanism on the Right to Development (2020). China is providing financial support to promote

² OECD. Hospital beds and discharge rates. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/0d67e02a-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/0d67e02a-en>.



five Regional Conferences (2022–2023) to engage in vibrant debates on the contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights (OHCHR 2022). The first Conference was celebrated at the beginning of September 2022 in Geneva, covering the European and the Middle Eastern Regions.

China is proposing, within its own territory as well as internationally, a strategy that combines market economic growth with active state regulation and (re)distribution of wealthy. The elimination of extreme poverty in China in February 2021 was a milestone of this policy, where the concept of Chinese multidimensional development looks for material expressions, including the right to existence (World Bank et al. 2022). Indeed, the Chinese concept of ‘development-based human rights’, which does not exclude and even embrace free market dynamics as a tool for development, opposed, or at least offered a direct critic to, the somehow liberal concept of ‘human rights-based development’ (Xigen 2021). China proposed the pursuit of the material expressions of rights (considering development as a critical condition to achieve human rights) and claimed recognition for models of political democracy beyond the western liberal dominant concept, asking for no international intervention within the internal political affairs of other nations. Such a development-based human rights approach opened wider perspectives on the possible scope for engagement of the HRC and called attention to the potential RTD Treaty as a mechanism to relaunch the political debate on how to promote development as a pathway to social and environmental justice.

Unfortunately, such a debate is seriously compromised by the persistence of policies of austerity which, in the context of states constrained by systems of indebtedness and hegemonic epistemic injustice, undermines and limits national capacities to overcome historic injustices and negative legacies of colonialism, slavery, discriminations of classes, cultures, ethnics, races, religions and genders. The concept of financialization of social policies, exposed by cash transfers and social vouchers, block the aspirations of universal systems as an affordable and sustainable alternative, due to the toxic combination of epistemic injustice sustained by testimonial injustice (as the absence of listening to the needs of the population) and hermeneutic injustice (with concepts and rules that are not accessible to the understanding and incidence of the citizens) (Fricker 2007).

All these elements of neoliberal hegemony control the aspiration of populations, and it is only within conditions of extreme conflict that is possible to admit other perspectives. The universal access to social policies and to the whole rights system needs a political power project to transform the current dire state of affairs. This conduct us towards the Marxian concept of radical needs, i.e., the ones that cannot be achieved without the transformation of reality and

therefore the policies, laws and rules that deny the possibility of those same rights (Heller 1976).

The Right to Development could offer a potentially critical framework to sustain such a transformative political power project. This largely unknown and less understood right can be defined as the right for everyone to benefit from the richness that is collectively produced; in this context, social policies are the tools to promote the redistribution of wealth even in the absence of economic growth, redistributing the accumulated richness and spreading its benefits to promote production and growth.

One important contribution of universal social protection systems came from the concept of social policies as expansion fronts of economies, rather than only considering them as public expenditures. The way to incorporate a political economy of the rights in our reasoning will permit to understand the map of power conflicts around those concepts, preparing the road for an inclusive development with social justice and environmental justice. But is a conflict-based approach, looking for an agonist democracy, to recover policy as the space for the antagonism expression (Mouffe 2005).

The RTD is essentially a field surrounded by essential policy conflicts, that could alone reconquer the possibilities of radically democratic politics. The RTD can lead the effort to eliminate the hegemony of austerity policies and the cyclic liberal pendulum of the maximum exploitation succeeded by periods of limited concessions of social protections. It is time to use the RTD debates for a deep change in our concept of social justice and environmental justice. The backbone of the austerity policies is organized in a combination of dependency imposed by a sophisticated architecture of loans and debts, imposed by the financial capital institutions and is sustained by an international epistemic community that occupies key spaces in all institutions and state powers, including academic centres and media. Those epistemic communities, built since the 80’s to sustain a sophisticated and seductive rationality, where the health of the capital is more important than the wellbeing of the people. This means the importance and the power of the private financial capital and its institutions (including the filantocapitalists) became fundamental, sustained by a narrative of competence and capacity in a comparison with the governments and the states, which are occupied by the epistemic communities of technocrats that respond to the interests of the financial capital, frequently believing that ‘due to the circumstances’ the only option is to open the global, regional and national spaces of decision making to ‘multistakeholders’ in an environment where the conflict of interests is no longer considered important.

To effectively support the RTD Treaty, it is fundamental to make it more known as a right and as a legally binding instrument. That deeper knowledge could avoid the



misleading visions that are present in many social movements that understand the development as necessarily the expression of the neoliberal or the neo developmentalist models, where economic growth at any price and the lack of wealth redistribution generated social and environmental damages with no real gain in terms of welfare and sustainability. A deeper knowledge of the right to development can clarify that its first and decisive application is precisely the self determination of peoples and the possibility to define which kind of development they want.

It would be necessary to create public spaces that generate the possibility to promote the importance of the sustained debate of the development options enhancing the social and environmental justice, possibly advancing in the domains of the reparative procedures and even the transitional justice facing the effects of the environmental and social destructions promoted by the neoliberal hegemony.

The social justice to be achieved will demand large and sustained investments in social infrastructure and work force development, which implies the already mentioned transformations of the debt architecture, the transformation of the concept of development financing through new development banks from South to South, and the reclaiming of full sovereignty over financial and monetary policies. In this very moment, China represents an economic powerhouse that needs to be understood in the context of the increasing number of countries in the BRICS group and the continuous economic and political expansion of the ‘new silk way’ (Belt and Road Initiative). While the opportunity to engage in a massive effort to reduce and eliminate the gaps on social infrastructure and production in the Global South is tangible, it is also necessary to avoid new debt traps and truly establish a transformative development cooperation effort (CFR 2020).

A deeper understanding of the political economy of the RTD and universal social protection systems as human rights systems, while also re-embedding the economy in the search for wellbeing could help to project the strategies to follow. That will oblige progressive movements to formulate and adopt the translations of the RTD within different national, regional and global political environments as well as scenarios on different thematic issues, enhancing active participatory processes.

We need more audace, as proposed by Riccardo Petrella—the audace to make poverty illegal as it was made with slavery in the nineteenth century; the audace to ‘definancialize’ the economy in favour of production and care, rather than finance accumulation; and the audace to disarm the war to block the militarization of our lives and societies (Petrella 2015). The first step within social movements and organizations that defend public interest would be that of impacting political parties and institutions of the wider civil society as well as state powers and institutions to

prepare the decision-making process that could lead to the adoption of the RTD Treaty and its ratification in each country. It will be the first battle or engagement, necessary to define the densification of the Right as an alternative perspective, a possible alternative hegemony beyond the limits of a merely counterhegemony still dominated by the limits of modernity. To achieve such an ambitious objective, it will be necessary to create and sustain public spaces that can break with epistemic injustice and generate real listening of the needs of most of our populations on the planet, looking for a well living democracy, peace and integrated belonging to the nature. The Right to Development can help us to tackle such a challenge.

References

- CFR (Council of Foreign Relations). 2020. China’s Massive belt and road initiative. Andrew Chatzky and James McBride. 28 January. <https://www.cfr.org/background/chinas-massive-belt-and-road-initiative>
- De Negri Filho, Armando A. 2014. UHC Universal Health Coverage: avanço ou retrocesso na luta pelo direito humano à saúde? Uma contribuição ao debate político-ideológico da guerra de posições entre comunidades epistêmicas no campo da saúde global. (UHC - Universal Health Coverage: forward or backward in the fight for the human right to health? A contribution to the political and ideological debate of positions war between epistemic communities in the field of global Health). 85 f. (Programa de Pós Graduação em Saúde Pública). Rio de Janeiro: Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública Sergio Arouca.
- Fricker, Miranda. 2007. Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. *Oxford University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>.
- Heller, Agnes. 1976. *The Theory of Need in Marx*. London: Allison and Busby Editors.
- Marks, Susan. 2008. Exploitation as an international legal concept. In *International Law on the Left: Re-examining Marxist Legacies*, ed. Susan Marks, 281–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511493720.010>.
- Marks, Susan. 2011. Human Rights and Root Causes. *Modern Law Review* 74 (1): 57–78.
- Mkandawire, P. Thandika. 2005. Targeting and Universalism in Poverty Reduction. Theme 23 of Social policy and development program paper, UNRISD, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/565413>
- Mouffe, Chantal. 2005. *On the Political. (Thinking in Action)*. Psychology Press.
- OHCHR. 2022. Resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council on 12 July 2021, 47/11. The contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G21/199/81/PDF/G2119981.pdf?OpenElement>
- Petrella, Riccardo. 2015. *Au nom de l’humanité – L’audace mondiale*. Éditions Couleur Livres.
- Timossi, Adriano José. 2015. Revisiting the 1955 Bandung Asian-African Conference and its Legacy, South Bulletin 85, 15 May. <https://www.southcentre.int/question/revisiting-the-1955-bandung-asian-african-conference-and-its-legacy/>



- UNRISD. 2021. A new eco-social contract. Issue Brief 11. March. <https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/2021-07/UNRISD%20-%20A%20New%20Eco-Social%20Contract.pdf>
- UNSG. 2021. Report of the UN Secretary General https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/assets/pdf/Common_Agenda_Report_English.pdf
- World Bank and the Development Research Center of the State Council, the People's Republic of China. 2022. Four Decades of Poverty Reduction in China: Drivers, Insights for the World, and the Way Ahead. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1877-6>. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/37727/9781464818776.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>
- World Bank. 1993. *World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health*. New York: Oxford University Press. ©World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/5976> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- World Bank. 2003. Social risk management: The World Bank's approach to social protection in a globalizing world (English). Washington, DC: World Bank Group. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/494981468762925392/Social-risk-management-The-World-Banks-approach-to-social-protection-in-a-globalizing-world>
- Xigen, Wang. 2021. Contribution of development to the enjoyment of all human rights. The United Nations Consultation Report, April. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Development/seminar-contribution-development/1st-study/WangXigen.pdf>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.

