Learning Objectives

Students will be able to

1. Understand the concept of social equity and the effect of different definitions of social equity in international policy coordination and standardization.

2. Understand how different mechanisms for raising social equity concerns internationally operate.

Outline for In-class Discussion

I. Social Inclusion, social exclusion, and social equity.

A. Ask students to define each of the terms.

They should be able to differentiate between interpersonal exclusion and social exclusion.

B. Ask students to distinguish the two general notions of social equity

   1. Equality of opportunity – individuals should be able to make their own life choices and have equal access to opportunities to pursue education, occupations, and social life.

   2. Equality of result – individuals should enjoy roughly similar material conditions of life; differentials of wealth and income should be discourages from appearing and leveled if they do appear.
C. Move from the abstractions of philosophical theory to actual social practices by asking students to provide examples of how a particular society defines acceptable levels of social inclusion. Then draw out similarities and differences.

II. Mechanisms for international discussion of social equity.

A. Ask students where and how international discussions of social equity occur.

Students should be able to identify intergovernmental organizations, elite conversations such as the World Economic Forum, campaigns by transnational advocacy coalitions, and global social movements, including those participating in the World Social Forum.

B. Ask students what impact these discussions are likely to have on a particular society's practices.

Encourage students to provide examples of how transnational discussions influence national ones and to think about whether the influence promoted openness to change or hardened resistance to change in the country involved.

Notes for Instructor

This module is intended to increase students’ awareness of social inclusion and social equity, broadly defined, as concerns inspiring political action. Though most of the discussion and policy activity on matters of social inclusion and social equity occur within individual countries, transnational discussion of these issues has been increasing since the late 18th century. The increase in mass communications and dissemination of ideas and images across national borders mean that cultural influences flow more widely and more quickly today than in previous eras.

The contemporary belief, shared by increasing numbers of people around the world, that any form of social exclusion is inherently inequitable, rests on expansion of the Enlightenment era view that human relations should be based on the principles that all individuals have equal moral standing and equal right to pursue a self-chosen life course. This vision of human relations challenges all systems of social relations resting on principles proclaiming that the ideal society consists of a particular ordering of persons (the term “individual” or its equivalent is often absent or avoided) each of whom is born into a particular family with a particular role or “place in society.” A person’s life course is not self-chosen; each is expected to live the allotted role though does have scope for carrying it out well or poorly, honorably or dishonorably. In these conceptions of society, no one is “excluded” in the sense of not being admitted to equality because “inclusion” means participating in the activities appropriate to a person in that role or “place in society.” Enlightenment notions, and failures to live up to them, were spread from Europe to the rest of the world through expression and imperial expansion. For a time, the gap was explained away by theories of a racial hierarchy of talents, but that solution was hard to maintain in the face of stirring claims to human equality in the American and French Revolutions and the Workers’ Movement. Colonial limited the extent to which ideas of full human equality could be pursued, but did not keep them from spreading. With the weakening of Europe in two World Wars and the shattering of confidence in progress among large segments of the educated in the West, first in the trenches of World War I and then in the face of Nazi atrocities, the stage
was set for decolonization and a broad attack on the racist notions that had fed beliefs in white supremacy. The Cold War was a competition between two visions of social inclusion and social equality, with each side affirming that it was the more inclusive, egalitarian, and democratic version of industrial society; this similarity meant that most of the former communist countries could regard adopting Western principles of political, economic, and social organization as putting themselves on the surer road to inclusion, egalitarianism, and democracy.

The end of the Cold War transformed the discussions of social inclusion and social equality in the UN by replacing strident competition with search for common ground. Yet, it remained the case that transnational discussions of social inclusion and social equality still work from the outside. Elite conversations, consideration in intergovernmental organizations, transnational advocacy coalition campaigns and transnational social movements did not affect governments and societies directly or rapidly; the transnational discussions link up to domestic discussions. Each form of transnational discussion can generate pressures on governments to favor some practices and discourage others, but ultimately it is the people living in a particular society who define and redefine it through their own ongoing discussion of how their society should be organized.

As the discussion of “Asian values” shows, members of a society who perceive the values being endorsed by “outsiders” as contrary to their own social values will resist those pressures and urge others to do the same. When debates become particularly sharp, the local members of a transnational advocacy coalition or a transnational social movement will be portrayed as conscious or unconscious agents of outside cultural influence by those most resistant to the ideas. This can be very powerful if the outside ideas are perceived as “western” because of the continuing resentment of colonial domination in many parts of the world. However, these perceptions can be blunted if the outside ideas resonate with ideas already circulating within the culture. As Amitav Acharya has argued, the likelihood that ideas from one culture will be taken up in another depends very much on two conditions: existence of an overlap that makes the ideas fit together and willingness of locally-credible persons to identify that overlap, express it in terms persuasive to others in the culture, and lead a process of adaptation using that overlap to bring the outside idea within the local cultural framework.

Suggested Case Studies

“Access to HIV Treatments in Developing Countries.” IDEESE Case Study Series www.umass.edu/sts/ethics.

Recommended Readings for Students
For assignment prior to class discussion

1.) Background Reading 1: Social Inclusion and Social Equity [included in this module]

2.) Background Reading 2: International Forums for addressing social inclusion and social equity issues [included in this module]

3.) Case Materials [as determined by choice of case]
Recommended Readings for Instructors

1) Stefan Gosepath. “Equality.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

2) “Distributive justice.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*


Other Recommended Readings
*For students and instructors interested in social inclusion and social equity issues*

Literary explorations

Jorge Luis Borges, ” The Lottery in Babylon,” in *Labyrinths* (NY: New Directions, 1962), pp. 30-35. Vision of a society that defines benefits and burdens of each social role, then assigns persons to roles through a periodic lottery.

Readings


Partha Dasgupta, *An Inquiry into Well-Being and Destitution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993). Chapter 4 is a particularly thoughtful effort by an economist willing to adopt insights from other disciplines to develop ways to measure well being. Chapter 2 brings Indian philosophical and ethical traditions into discussions of social equity.

Resources Included with this Module


2) Peterson, MJ. (2009). *International Forums for addressing social inclusion and social equity issues*

3) In-Class Evaluation
I. Social Inclusion and Social Equity

The terms “social inclusion” and “social equity” refer to two distinct elements of the vision of an egalitarian society where differences in the range of community interactions and activities in which individuals may participate and in the range of material and non-material benefits that they can enjoy do not become too wide. Historically, the agendas of broadening social inclusion and reducing the differences between benefits available to the poorest and to the wealthiest are reactive; they developed out of challenges to social patterns of steeply unequal access and benefit that have existed in many human societies since consolidation of agricultural societies millennia ago. For centuries steep inequalities of access and benefit were accepted as part of the way of the world. Conceptions of human societies as composites of differentiated groups – “castes,” “orders” or “estates” – in which each group had its own particular place and prospects legitimated unequal access and benefit, though did impose some limits on how far inequality was taken through notions of duties to aid the poor or use wealth to provide festivals, gifts, or facilities to the community and through notions of a minimal level of regard owed to any fellow human.

Egalitarian ideals can rest on either individualist or communalist ethics. Notions of political equality are closely linked to individualist ethics because they arose together in 17th and 18th century Europe, and were propagated more widely in the wakes of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution. Both of these political transformations addressed inclusion more than equity by using ethical assertions regarding the basic equality among individuals to launch claims for political participation against the pretensions of a distant elite in 1776 or of an absolutist monarchy in 1789.1 The communalist2 ethics animating communitarians, socialists, and others inspired demands for equality going beyond political


2 Unfortunately a clunky word, but other derivations from “community” now refer to particular political movements: “communist” to the Leninist branch of Marxism and “communitarian” mainly to affiliates of the US-based Communitarian Network.
participation, insisting that a truly just society is one in which every person is provided with the necessities of life and with chances to develop and use their full talents. Thus, two very different ethical starting points can lead to conclusions that social equity and social inclusion are worthy goals.

It is common in the contemporary West to assume that social inclusion and social equity are closely related. Many regard participating as difficult if one lacks necessities, and securing a fair share as difficult if one is excluded from participating. Though Cold War era debates about whether political participation or broad distribution of material goods is more important led to writing two separate international treaties, one defining civil and political rights and on the other defining economic, social and cultural rights, the vision of a set of “indivisible rights” animating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was revived after the end of the Cold War.

Social Inclusion

Though social exclusion and interpersonal exclusion both impose limits on a person’s, household’s, or extended family’s ability to interact with others, they stem from different motivations and have different consequences. Interpersonal exclusion results from decisions by particular individuals, households, or families to avoid social or business interaction with some other individual, household, or family because of their actual or perceived character or behavior. Interpersonal exclusion blocks off interaction with the excluders but leaves open the possibilities of interacting with others and of participating in community activities. Social exclusion, in contrast, stems from collective patterns of avoiding interaction, with whole sets of persons, households, or families based on race, ethnicity, religious or spiritual beliefs, gender, parentage, socioeconomic status, or sexual orientation rather than their own particular character or behavior. Because many participate social exclusion simultaneously, those who are its targets have trouble participating in politics, community organizations and activities, business, paid work, education, or other social activities as well as forming personal friendships and connections.

Social ostracism lies in an area between the two since it involves refusal by all or most members of a community or group to engage in continued interaction with a particular individual or household (more typically an individual) formerly accepted as part of that community or group. It is typically punishment for conduct that transgresses what the community or group regards as a basic norm, such as acts of heresy or blasphemy in a religious community, homosexuality in a community regarding same-sex activity as degenerate, or association with members of a rival clan or group in places and times where inter-clan or inter-group hatreds run high. Though the motive for ostracism resembles that of individual exclusion in being based on the target’s own conduct, the effect can be like social exclusion if the ostracisers remain united because the target is effectively cut off from social life.

Ethicists and political philosophers have been more concerned with social exclusion, also known as adverse discrimination, because its effects are so widespread and its origins rest in the group affiliation of 

---


4 Discrimination on the basis of parentage includes such practices as treating the children of slaves as slaves, or determining a newborn’s position within the Hindu caste system.
target individuals, households, or extended families rather than in anything they personally have done. Human history displays a bewildering array of social exclusions, some particular to certain realms of life and some more general, some affecting small parts of a community's total population and some affecting a large majority. In many societies, multiple exclusions operated simultaneously. In the ancient Athenian democracy only adult males meeting wealth requirements could be citizens entitled to participate in political affairs, but all free adult males were able to engage in business, find employment, and participate in community festivals or athletic competitions. Thus the exclusion faced by non-citizen males affected only one part (though a very important part) of life. Women and slaves were excluded from a wider range of activities. Between 1948 and 1994, South African law largely excluded persons classified as blacks, “Asians” (mainly of South Asian origin), and “coloreds” from political participation and specified numerous restrictions on where they could live, work, and play. “Jim Crow” laws and practices directed against African-Americans in the USA between 1865 and 1965 were similarly comprehensive. Women have been restricted to household activities in many societies, and religious minorities often have been banned from certain professions and required to live in particular areas.

Though it is usual to think of comprehensive social exclusion as operating against “minorities” – groups comprising small fractions of the population – some forms of discrimination have excluded a majority of the population from one or more form of social interaction. The Athenian citizens comprised some 10% of the city’s total population; 90% were thus excluded from participation in political deliberations. The South African apartheid system restrictions also covered about 90% of the population. Gender discrimination typically affects approximately 50% of the population.

Inclusion emerged as an issue at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century because property requirements limited voting to the upper income groups. The 19th century demands for “universal suffrage” were a struggle for including lower income males in politics, and, through them, the concerns of lower income households. Only after World War I did including women on the voting rolls become common. The workers’ movements of the 19th century sought broader social inclusion, and divided sharply on the question of whether it was possible to secure fundamental social change through electoral politics. Women’s and civil rights movements of the 19th and 20th centuries sought inclusion for women and racial or ethnic groups.

Social inclusion remains a salient issue because a growing number of policy analysts and ethicists concerned about the situation of the poor are defining poverty in terms of social exclusion as well as bad material conditions. They claim poverty is not primarily a problem of low income or lack of wealth, but a problem of social exclusion because low income persons have far less access to good housing, educational opportunities, social services, recreational facilities, and opportunities to pursue self-enhancing avocations like artistic creation, musical performance, or local sport leagues. In policy terms, this is an argument that incomes policies – such as adoption of a “living wage” requirement or of a guaranteed

---


6 A policy prescription that the minimum wage should be defined in terms of how much money individuals and households need to meet basic shelter, food, and other needs in the area where they live.
minimum income—alone are insufficient to meet the needs of the poor. Concerted government action must be taken to break down residential segregation, universalize health care provision where this has not yet occurred, improve public schools, extend educational access, expand recreational facilities, and extend opportunities for self-enhancing activity.

Though the poor are numerous and their needs great, it is important to remember that even today social exclusion affects the non-poor as well. In many countries ethnic minorities excluded from politics have focused their energies on business enterprise and become wealthy. They are subject to continuing exclusion from politics and can become extremely vulnerable to other forms of social exclusion—or even death—if the less-prosperous majority becomes sufficiently resentful. In some situations physical handicaps or cognitive limitations become sources of social exclusion even for members of wealthy families. Though the internet reduces some forms of social exclusion by removing visual cues about a person’s race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and gender, it excludes if website designers fail to consider the different ways persons with limited vision, hearing, manual dexterity, or reading ability use computers.

Criticism of social exclusion, and converse demands for social inclusion, can be phrased in general and in issue-specific terms. General expressions focus on the condition of society as a whole. Issue-focused expressions typically operate within a context of more general claims but seek to point out the particular deficiencies of proceeding in some way when dealing with a problem where the social impacts of different choices are not immediately visible.

Issue-focused demands for social inclusion take more specific form. Demands that attention be given to the social impact of decisions and their implementation typically arise when the costs of the externalities of a current activity, of a proposed activity, or of implementing new regulations of an activity would fall most heavily on those least able to bear them and/or benefiting least from the activity or regulations. Such demands are very common in debates about where to locate hazardous activities or of facilities for storing or treating hazardous and toxic wastes. In many countries such activities are placed in remote, relatively

---

7 Provided through government-run transfer payment schemes using tax revenue.


9 This exclusion often started within the person’s own family; the “feeble-minded” and the “demented” were often sequestered within the household and seen only by family members and selected servants.

10 In a cartoon included in the *New Yorker* Cartoon Collection, artist P. Steiner depicts a dog working at a computer telling another dog seated on the floor that “on the internet, no one knows you’re a dog.”

unpopulated areas or, when that is not feasible for financial or technical reasons, in areas where populations are passive or unable to mobilize politically. In developing countries, poor people often come to live near hazardous industrial facilities because they have better electric service and other infrastructure than other areas on the fringes of cities.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Social equity}

Debates about social equity are complicated by the fact that equity can be defined in multiple ways. Fair distribution of society’s material and non-material goods could be defined by a number of standards, each of which is defended by sophisticated philosophical traditions. The possible standards include:

\begin{enumerate}
\item an equal share to each person,
\item a share based on each person’s particular need,
\item a share based on each person’s contribution of effort to social ends (including that of producing the material and non-material items needed for good human life),
\item a share based on each person’s contribution (which would allow rewarding such things as skill and efficiency as well as time and energy),
\item a share based on each person’s merit (however merit is defined), and
\item each person’s choices in free-market exchanges.
\end{enumerate}

Each of these standards is a variation on one of two broad ways of defining social equality: as equality of opportunity or as equality of result. Defining social equity as equal opportunity emphasizes removing barriers to activity so that the individual can make and act on autonomous choices. Removing barriers may mean dismantling systems and adverse discrimination, but it may also require providing certain facilities necessary to an individual’s ability to flourish. This need for certain facilities is the traditional argument in favor of public (that is, government) provision of education.\textsuperscript{13} Education, in this view, is so important to an individual’s ability to understand alternatives, choose among them, and act on that choice, to be left to the whims of households, religious congregations, or private clubs. Similar arguments have been made on behalf of programs to provide other things as well, such as minimum housing and food, since the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Advocates of laissez-faire economics and minimal states would reject such arguments, but advocates of human capabilities approaches argue that enjoyment of a basic material minimum is just as essential to choice and action as is education.\textsuperscript{14} As improvements in medicine have made it possible for

\footnote{12 For example, when it was started in 1978, Union Carbide India’s Bhopal chemical plant was built far from settlements. By December 1984 when the infamous toxic gas release occurred, however, thousands of people had moved into self-constructed shantytowns nearby. See MJ Peterson. 2009. Bhopal Plant Disaster. International Dimensions of Ethics Education in Science and Engineering. www.umass.edu/sts/ethics}

\footnote{13 Including the moral philosopher seen as the originator of market economics: see Adam Smith, \textit{The Wealth of Nations} (1776), Book V.}

\footnote{14 For instance, the essays in Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen eds., \textit{The Quality of Life} Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.}
physicians to cure an increasing number of diseases and repair an increasing number of injuries, similar arguments have been made on behalf of universal provision of healthcare.\(^{15}\)

Defining social equity as equality of results goes beyond notions of open opportunity and universal minimum to an assertion that all members of society should enjoy very similar life conditions. In a logically simple version, this ideal means a situation in which each member of society receives the same income regardless of the type of income-producing asset she or he possesses. Corrado Gini used this conception to define a statistical baseline from which the extent of income inequality in any society can be assessed, and results compared. The method begins with plotting a line on a graph having an X axis indicating the percentage of individuals (or households) running from 0 to 100, and a Y-axis, also running from 0 to 100 on which one plots the percent of total income in the society secured by each percentage of persons along the x axis. A society in which everyone had the same income would yield a line starting on point 0, 0 at the bottom left of the graph and running straight at a 45-degree angle to point 100, 100 at the top right. Using the same procedure for a society in which persons had different incomes would yield curved lines lying below and more or less close to the 45 degree angle straight line. The area of the part of the graph between the 45-degree line and the curved plot of a particular society’s income distribution is then used to calculate an index of income inequality, which can run from 0 for a society whose distribution exactly matches the 45 degree line to 1 for a society in which 1% have all the income and 99% have none. Thus, the higher the Gini score, the greater the income inequality.\(^{16}\)

Some utopian communities have sought to avoid income differentials by requiring each member to contribute all of his or her wealth and earnings to a common fund and then accept an identical share of the goods, services, and money possessed or produced by the community as a whole. That solution can work at a small scale but the difficulties of maintaining even fairly small communes suggests that it would be extremely difficult at the scale of a town, a province, a country, or the whole world. Marx and Engels acknowledged another difficulty, one stemming from the fact that different individuals might need varying shares of goods and services because of age, physical size, overall health, or other circumstance, in their maxim “from each according to ability; to each according to need.”\(^{17}\) Another possible method of reducing the impact of income differentials involves separating the flow of “necessities,” (however necessities are defined in a particular society at a particular time) provided to all through tax-supported programs, from the flow of other goods and services provided only to those who pay directly. With necessities assured, differentials of income and wealth would be less important in daily life than they are in societies where all or most goods and services are provided through markets.

The equal opportunity and equal result definitions of social equity focus the efforts of those who want to reduce inequality in somewhat different ways. The notion of equal opportunity is more compatible with an individualist outlook on life in which persons or households rely on those with whom they establish direct exchanges. The notion of equal results is more compatible with a communal outlook on life in which persons and households regard themselves as part of a larger social whole contributing to and relying on it.

\(^{15}\)E.g., the communitarian version in David R. Buchanan, *An Ethic for Health Promotion: Rethinking the Sources of Human Well-Being.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

\(^{16}\)Gini was one of several economists and statisticians paying attention to the problem in the early 1920s; his fully-developed method was published in Corrado Gini, *Variabilità e concentrazione.* Milan: Giuffrè, 1939.

\(^{17}\)Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848).
Individualists are more likely to see proposals for creating collective provision of needs as limiting individual’s liberty to shape their own lives; communalists are more likely to see them as providing the material basis necessary for a good society within which individuals realize their potential most fully. Yet, the contrast can – and often is – overdrawn. In most societies there is a mix of individualist and communalist impulses, and an effort to reach a balance between liberty and assuring fulfillment of basic needs.

**The Impact of Inter-Country Differences in Notions of Social Inclusion**

Even within countries individuals, groups, and organizations have different attitudes towards social inclusion, as any study of movements to abolish slavery, ameliorate the conditions of workers, end racial, ethnic, or religious discrimination, or end gender discrimination will confirm. Each society thus exhibits fluidity of inclusions and exclusions over time. Since particular societies move according to their own internal dynamics, it is not surprising that at any given moment there is significant variation in social exclusions and inclusions across societies. In 1500, Islamic societies were more tolerant of Jewish communities than were Christian ones; many a Jew being pressured to convert to Christianity in Spain after 1492 chose to leave for Ottoman domains instead. European traders seldom had business dealings with women at home, yet in other areas noble males left business affairs to their wives and Europeans traders had to transact business with them.

Today societies differ considerably in their inclusions and exclusions. In Europe, Canada, and New Zealand equity between members of different social classes has been a major concern, leading to social democratic politics, an expansive welfare state, norms of labor-management coordination, and less acceptance of large income differentials than in other parts of the world. Most people in the USA have accepted higher levels of inequality in wealth and income, and less extension of social services, though excesses of the original “Gilded Age” in the 1890s, the Great Depression, and excesses in the “new Gilded Age” of the 2000s inspired significant counter-reactions. It has been easier to make international comparisons (and compare impressions to systematically-collected data) since UN agencies began including Gini scores for each country in their statistical reports.

The situation of women also varies considerably around the world. In contemporary Western societies, norms about female participation in life include possession of civil liberties, participating in politics, rights to own property, running businesses, having professional careers and heading households. In France, rights to political participation have been taken to adding rules requiring that women be 50% of political party nominees for the National Assembly. In some areas of the Middle East and North Africa, female participation in social life is extremely limited. Yet, contentions about how to treat women are also strong in Islamic countries where fundamentalist interpretations vie for influence in societies that had begun to

---


accept greater gender equality. Treatment of women has been a source of contention among those supporting greater acknowledgement of indigenous peoples' rights because many indigenous traditions also include considerable limitation of women’s activity.

The recency of European domination over much of the world through formal colonial empire and informal spheres of influence and the historical fact that racist doctrines were justified most elaborately by extensions of Darwinian theories of evolution to relations among human groups in the later 19th and early 20th centuries mean that many people around the world identify racism with the West. In contemporary political discourse, the term is largely confined to instances of discrimination by whites against persons of other colors. This is an understandable response to power shifts that allow previously-dominated peoples more scope for independent political action. However, it has the unfortunate consequence of permitting discrimination by one group of “persons of color” against another (such as contentions between Pacific island-native and South Asian-descended groups in Fiji) to pass without much notice.

Differences in socially-accepted patterns of inclusion and exclusion become a problem only when members of different societies come into fairly close and repeated contact. Contemporary European habits of wearing little or nothing while sunbathing created frictions when taken to North African beaches. There was considerable outcry when some immigrants from the Middle East and North Africa committed "honor killings" in their new European homes of female family members whose relations with men from outside the household exceeded what their fathers approved.

Some differences can be accommodated by local physical separation: groups with different norms live by themselves in their own areas and adopt mutually-acceptable forms of conduct for their contacts in streets and public places. However, such systems can pose problems for social and political integration if cultural and economic cleavages reinforce one another, as in the Moslem suburbs around Paris.

The old maxim “when in Rome do as the Romans do” suggests another way of dealing with differences: those coming to a place should adjust themselves to its standards. This does not have to mean abandoning all of one’s own values: an individual could simply avoid those local activities she or he regards as abhorrent. Thus Moslems, Sikhs, and Buddhists lived in Hindu communities for centuries without adopting or interfering with the Hindu practice of suttee (a widow’s climbing onto her husband’s funeral pyre). Jews and Moslems can live in the USA without having to eat pork or any other food their

---


relational beliefs exclude as unclean, though arranging work hours to accommodate Friday or Saturday worship may be more difficult.

Claims by advocates of wider social inclusion that theirs are universally-valid standards provoke sharp responses among those who accept neither the individualist nor the socialist/communitarian arguments for comprehensive inclusion. Recent assertions of the superiority of “Asian values”25 are merely the most confident form of asserting that there are no universal ethical standards, and therefore each society should be judged by how well it lives up to its own standards, including its own ideas about who should be included to what extent. Those who find themselves excluded within their own society sometimes chafe at their situation, and seek inspiration from both resources within their own culture26 and ideas from outside.

Questions for Consideration or Discussion

1. What is the goal of social inclusion? How might it be attained?

2. What is the goal of social equity? How might it be attained?

3. Does knowing a country’s Gini index tell you everything you need to know to determine whether it has an equitable society?

4. Can you think of a way to measure social inclusion and develop an inclusiveness index? [Hint: the well-known measures of political freedom deal only with the political realm and use a combination of positive (e.g., what percent of adults are registered to vote) and negative (e.g., how many people are in jail for expressing opinions) observations.]

25 E.g., Anwar Ibrahim; Lee Kuan Yew, “Culture is destiny,” Foreign Affairs 73 (2) (1994). Amartya Sen, “Human rights and Asian values,” The New Republic, 14-21 July 1997 is typical of arguments that there is no single set of “Asian values” even among Confucians.

Background Reading 2:
International Forums for Addressing Social Inclusion and Social Equity Issues
MJ Peterson
Version 2; August 2009

Intergovernmental Discussion Forums.

Global intergovernmental organizations.

The United Nations has been the primary forum for discussion of social inclusion at the global level since 1945. The UN Charter lists promoting "fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women" and "social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom" in the statement of goals for the organization. Most UN deliberation about social inclusion and social equity occurs in discussions of human rights, social issues, and economic development. Each of these issues tends to be addressed primarily in a different set of UN bodies.

For human rights: General Assembly Third Committee, UN Human Rights Council, the “Treaty Committees” monitoring government efforts to implement seven multilateral human rights treaties developed under UN auspices, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the International Labor Organization.

For social issues: General Assembly Third Committee, General Assembly Second Committee, Economic and Social Council, UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), International Labor Organization.


29 UNICEF’s acronym derives from its original name, UN International Children’s Emergency Fund.
The UN also sponsors periodic global conferences on Women, Population, and Aging. The 1995 World Summit on Social Development, the 2000 Millennium Summit, and the 2005 “Millennium plus 5” Summit also addressed social issues.

For many years United Nations discussion of social equity in the development context was rather vague, consisting primarily of exhortations to reduce poverty. Adoption of the Millennium Development Goals in 2000 broke with that pattern: the MDGs were stated in quantitatively verifiable terms, such as reducing by half the proportion of people without regular access to safe drinking water and reducing the mortality rate of children under 5 by two-thirds.30

UN discussions of social inclusion and social equity in developed countries were inhibited during the Cold War by the strongly contrasting visions of priority in realization of goals presented by East and West. Both claimed to be the more democratic and life-enhancing system but saw the road to progress in very different terms. Debate was particularly stark between the USSR, which saw socialist revolution and suppression of former exploiters as key to progress, and the USA, which saw enlarging political inclusion and freedom as key to further social inclusion and social equity. With the end of the Cold War, the social democratic traditions of Western Europe, in which both political and social inclusion and equity were seen as an indivisible whole, came to the fore. This change was registered in the 1995 World Summit on Social Development and in the process of replacing the older Human Rights Commission reporting to the Economic and Social Council with the Human Rights Council reporting directly to the General Assembly.

Though their primary missions do not include dealing with social issues, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have not been able to ignore them. The inspiration for IMF and WTO attention has come mainly from outside: from demands by transnational NGOs, groups in developing countries, and social movements now coalescing into a broad anti-globalization movement that the organization pay greater attention to the social impact of lending programs that require governments to cut deficits through program retrenchment and/or privatization of state-owned enterprises (IMF) or of rules regarding trade in goods and services (WTO). The inspiration for World Bank attention has been partly internal – presidents and managers sensitive to social issues – and external – the same combination of transnational NGOs and social movements.

Each of the three deals with social equity concerns in different ways. The WTO operates at two levels – establishment of general rules for government treatment of imported goods and services and settlement of disputes between member states over application (or more accurately violation) of the rules. Particular trade disputes can have significant social dimensions: a ruling that a country has properly invoked the medical emergency clause allows it to affect drug prices by imposing compulsory licensing on a patent holder so local production of a patented drug may proceed, an action that typically entails lower than market-rate royalty payments. In general, however, the ministerial meetings where new rules or amendments to existing rules are discussed provide the forum for taking up social concerns. World Bank lending goes mainly to projects – construction of physical infrastructure or production facilities – that have a direct impact on people living in the area. Several World Bank financed dam or other infrastructure projects became extremely controversial in the 1990s because of their negative social effects. Strong pressures

30 In UN General Assembly Resolution A/55/2 of 8 September 2000. The full statement of goals is available at http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
from NGOs and social movements, backed by threats from the US Congress to withhold contributions to replenishment of lending funds, led the World Bank to adopt a number of policies regarding the handling of social issues and to create an Inspection Panel empowered to receive and investigate complaints from private individuals, groups, and organizations that a World Bank-financed project was being accomplished in ways that violate a policy. The IMF was slower to accommodate social issues, and even today maintains less direct interaction with NGOs and other non-governmental groups than the World Bank.

**Regional intergovernmental organizations.**

The extent to which regional intergovernmental organizations address social issues depends on what the governments of member states wish to discuss. This varies considerably in the different parts of the world.

Consistent with government and popular attitudes in the member states, concern with social issues is very strong in the European Union. The EU has a relatively strong bureaucracy since it is intended to coordinate and manage an ongoing regional integration effort having the ultimate goal of merging the member states into a larger political entity. One segment of this bureaucracy, the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities is specifically charged with developing regulations on social issues and monitoring member state compliance with EU Treaties, Directives, and Regulations addressing social issues.\(^3\) The EU has increasingly addressed human rights issues, and in 2000 the EU Council and Parliament agreed on the text of a Charter of Fundamental Rights\(^3\) to be included as Part II of the proposed treaty establishing a constitution for Europe which has not yet been adopted. The EU does not have distinct human rights bodies; the European Court of Human Rights and the European Commissioner for Human Rights are maintained by the Council of Europe, which was founded earlier than the EU (1949 rather than 1958) and until recently had a larger membership.\(^3\)

The transition from Organization of African Unity (OAU) to African Union (AU) in 1999-2003 marked adoption of greater regional integration as an explicit goal, but that project has not yet advanced very far. The major decisions are still made in the Meetings of Heads of State and Government (“African summits”), but the Union has added an 8-member Commission to develop programs and carry out Summit decisions. As in the European Union, each member of the regional commission has charge of a defined set of issues. One member’s mandate covers Social Affairs (defined as including health, children, drug control, population, migration, labor & employment, plus sports & culture), the member in charge of Human Resources, Science, and Technology deals with education and youth questions, and another’s mandate covers Rural Economy and Agriculture. To develop greater collaboration with civil society, the AU has also established an advisory Economic, Social and Cultural Council with 150 members drawn professional associations, social groups, and NGOs in various African countries.\(^3\)

---

31 See its web page at http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=656


33 The Court’s website is at http://www.echr.coe.int/echr/ and the Commissioner’s at http://www.coe.int/t/commissioner/default_en.asp (accessed on 13 August 2009).

34 See information at www.africa-union.org.
Members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have also moved from consultations to higher levels of joint activity intended to deepen connections among their societies after creation of the ASEAN Free Trade Area in 1992. Meetings of Heads of State and Government (“ASEAN Summits”) remain the primary decision-making body, but they have been supplemented by more frequent meetings of cabinet members in charge of various sectors of national administration. These include Health, Labor, Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation, Social Welfare, and Youth. ASEAN continues its traditions of operating by consensus and avoiding topics likely to intrude too much on any member’s internal affairs, but the ministerial meetings widen the range of discussions beyond the traditional political and economic affairs. Formal ASEAN consultations with NGOs are limited to professional and business organizations in major economic sectors.

The Organization of American States remains a forum for consultation and coordination among members; Western Hemisphere regional integration projects involve various groupings of members. The OAS maintains the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and related Inter-American Court of Human Rights. OAS members are currently working on a new Social Charter of the Americas that will emphasize eradication of extreme poverty. Social issues have received more sustained attention since establishment of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development and the OAS secretariat’s related Executive Secretariat for Integral Development. The OAS does not have a separate body for NGOs, but its Committee on Inter-American Summit Management and Civil Society Participation has been developing procedures for consultations in recent years.

**Other Intergovernmental Organizations**

The 30 industrial states belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) use its secretariat to assemble data and studies on a wide variety of issues related to government administration and macroeconomic management. OECD committees, working groups, and forums then bring together high government officials or officials and others to discuss experiences and suggest best practices. Recent considerations of social issues include a Forum on “Sickness, Disability and Work: Addressing Policy Challenges in OECD Countries” (Stockholm, 14-15 May 2009) where employment and social affairs ministers from 15 OECD countries discussed integrating sickness and disability policies into their wider efforts to deal with the global economic downturn and a High-Level Conference on Boosting Jobs and Incomes” (Toronto, 15-16 June 2006) where heads of government ministries, business leaders, academics and union representatives to consider the policy lessons to be drawn from an assessment of the OECD Jobs Strategy.

---

35 Information on ASEAN available at www.aseansec.org
36 See www.oas.org.
Other forums.

Elite conversations.

The privately organized World Economic Forum is the best-known forum for transnational discussion among members of economic elites. It began as a gathering of top executives from large European firms then expanded to include heads of firms in other parts of the world. Speeches by heads of government and other notables, presentations by academic experts, and conversations among members at its annual meetings in Davos, Switzerland include discussions of social concerns. It now supports a set of global agenda councils bringing together experts on various issues to identify trends, identify knowledge gaps, and suggest action for firms and a set of communities bringing leaders of labor unions, NGOs, religious establishments, women’s groups, and others into discussions with Forum members.39

Transnational policy advocacy coalitions.

Transnational advocacy coalitions involve loose cooperation among transnational and national NGOs, policy experts, and others who share a concern and agree on the broad contours of effective policies for addressing it. Human rights and environmental advocacy coalitions typically address issues on which international agreements lay out terms of policy coordination and seek either to pressure governments into carrying out their existing commitments or to encourage governments to make additional commitments.40 Others, like the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, address issues on which international agreements are vague or nonexistent and press for developing new agreements that will endorse the policy they advocate.41 Transnational advocacy coalitions employ various combinations of direct discussions with government officials, participation in IGO-sponsored forums, promotion of public petition or letter-writing campaigns to bring citizen pressure to bear on governments, media exposure, and nonviolent protests to advance their views.

Transnational social movements.

Transnational social movements draw together like-minded persons and groups from two or more countries. They tend to be even more loosely organized than transnational advocacy coalition, though the labor movement did spawn Marxist First and Second International, and a loose network of anarcho-syndicalist unions in the 19th century and several competing organizations including the Socialist International, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, and the Trotskyite Fourth International in second half of the 20th century. Today, the World Social Forum, named and organized as a counter to the World Economic Forum, has gone beyond holding a single annual meeting (initially in Puerto Allegre, Brazil) to becoming the hub of a global network of regional and local WSF affiliates providing meetings where, as their main page puts it, “social movements, networks, NGOs and other civil society organizations opposed


to neo-liberalism and a world dominated by capital or by any form of imperialism" can assemble to exchange ideas and encouragement, and organize together.\(^\text{42}\) Though all anti-globalization activists can rally around the WSF’s broad slogan “another world is possible,” they have trouble uniting on a more detailed program because some seek to create or recreate a more active state administration that will use government power to subordinate markets to democratically-chosen social goals while others regard governments with equal suspicion and seek a radical decentralization of politics and localization of social life. Transnational social movements tend to engage primarily in “contentious politics” – with extensive use of protests and civil disobedience to make their points,\(^\text{43}\) though the election of leftist-populist presidents in several Latin American countries have given the anti-globalization movement an opening into elite circles that it did not enjoy earlier.\(^\text{44}\)

**Questions for Consideration or Discussion**

1. Most advocates of social equity and social inclusion regard the EU as much stronger on these issues than either the UN or other regional organizations. Why is this the case?

2. How do the transnational advocacy coalitions and transnational social movements interested in social equity and social inclusion try to affect decisions?

---


\(^{44}\) Evo Morales of Bolivia, Lius Inacio Lula Silva of Brazil, Rafael Correa of Ecuador, Fernando Lugo of Paraguay, and Hugo Chavez of Venezuela attended the January 2009 WSF meeting.
Part 1: The following are some possible response you might have to the material in this Module. Please circle the response that is closest to your thoughts after this module.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I now realize that there is a lot more communication and interconnectedness between countries than I previously thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I do not think that it is very important for scientists/engineers to pay attention to the international aspects of their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I realize that my career will probably have some global or international aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I now realize there are more social implications related to my career than I thought about previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am more aware that the work I might do will involve ethical as well as technical choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am more aware now of the complications related to different ethical expectations in different countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel there should be one set of ethical guidelines developed that could be used to guide the work of scientists/engineers, regardless of the country in which they work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that each culture has its own ethical standards, and those standards should not be dictated by other cultures, countries or stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The definition of social equity is the same across all nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I think that international discussions of social equity influence how individual nations act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Your Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I now realize that there is a lot more communication and interconnectedness between countries than I previously thought.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I do not think that it is very important for scientists/engineers to pay attention to the international aspects of their work.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I realize that my career will probably have some global or international aspects.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I now realize there are more social implications related to my career than I thought about previously.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am more aware that the work I might do will involve ethical as well as technical choices.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am more aware now of the complications related to different ethical expectations in different countries.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel there should be one set of ethical guidelines developed that could be used to guide the work of scientists/engineers, regardless of the country in which they work.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel that each culture has its own ethical standards, and those standards should not be dictated by other cultures, countries or stakeholders.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The definition of social equity is the same across all nations.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I think that international discussions of social equity influence how individual nations act.</td>
<td>SA A UN D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: In this section, please identify one specific example that you remember as having the most impact on you. Please leave the line blank if nothing seems relevant.

1. Increased intercommunication that exists now between countries.

_________________________________________________________________________________

2. Social implications of work done by scientists and engineers.

_________________________________________________________________________________

3. Decisions about ethics in relation to different countries.

_________________________________________________________________________________

4. Any other specific ideas that were important to you from this module.

_________________________________________________________________________________