

Ethics of Globalization: an Urgency for Dialogue

Ahmad Jalali

Globalization is a factor increasingly and irrevocably affecting the world we live in today, and one we ignore at our peril. Economic markets, information and technology, and cultural exchange are becoming irreversibly globalized, and many of the most pressing problems we face today, such as, for example, threats to our environment and to political security, also occur at the global level, rendering this an ever more urgent topic.

The force behind this phenomenon is primarily economic, as it can be seen as the consequence of the evolution of a single global economy, bolstered by the increasing power of trans-national corporations and the influence they can bring to bear in the world we live in. We, the citizens of the world, are becoming more and more interconnected not only at an economic level, but, as a result of the rapid advances in technology and in particular information technology, also at a cultural and political level.

Globalization has been heralded as a new dawn offering myriad benefits to all, be they increased wealth, economic growth, or enhanced access to information and consequently greater levels of development and enhanced quality of life. However, at the same time it undeniably has negative consequences. Its benefits are unequally distributed; less developed countries are in danger of falling behind as the industrialized countries forge ahead economically and with new developments in science and technology, with the result that the gap between rich and poor is continually widening, exacerbated by inequitable trade terms and access to international markets; this is a process which is also reflected in the phenomenon of the much discussed “digital divide.” Economic concerns appear to over-ride all others, a consequence of which can be seen in the perceived lack of moral values in the contemporary world.

Globalization is also widely recognized as posing the danger of a homogenization and standardization of cultures. While the loss of cultural diversity would be irrevocably damaging, the reverse side of this coin is the resulting reactionary fragmentation of culture which is visible in the marked rise in religious and ethnic tensions which we have witnessed in recent years. However,

When evaluating globalization it is important to remember that it is a human made phenomenon. It has not come down from heaven. This means: it can be influenced and changed.¹

The fact that globalization does not possess its own integral system of norms or ethics creates the profound need to establish one, a need which is becoming increasingly urgent

due to the rapid changes it is introducing to our world, if we do not wish to become mere victims of global market forces.

The endeavor to establish globalized ethics presents its own problems, due to the wide range of diversity or plurality to be found within this field, with people holding frequently widely divergent values. The danger lies in the imposition, or the perceived imposition, of one set of ethical values at the expense of others; globalization should surely not be able to become synonymous with Westernization.

As Kathinka Evers² has pointed out, universalism has historically been the property of a select group wishing to apply their values to other peoples. An example which springs to mind is that of the nineteenth century European colonialists, who both considered themselves to be ethical and believed the application of those ethics to other cultures to be beneficial to them. This attitude can perhaps best be captured in the phrase of the British writer Rudyard Kipling, who identified this quest as “the white man’s burden,” and the French adoption of the concept “*la mission civilisatrice*.” It goes without saying that as opposed to this subjugation of the other to the ethics of those holding the most power, we must endeavor to identify ethical principles which can be considered universal through their acknowledgement of human plurality in order to avoid simply globalizing the ethos of those with a dominant power.

Globalization needs to be counterbalanced by a recognition of cultural diversity; an awareness and respect of difference and plurality. It is this very awareness which can form the foundation of a universal ethic. This awareness could be fostered through dialogue among cultures and civi-

lizations, which is interlinked with concepts of universality and particularity, and identity and otherness. Cultures and civilizations must be perceived as open, rather than closed entities, and, once a pluralistic view of identity is established, the framework of a fruitful dialogue is assured.

Through dialogue, an inclusive concept of identity can be better elaborated, fostering a sense of global responsibility, which in turn forms the basis for the search for a consensus on basic human principles and values which are common or similar in different cultures. In order to develop such a global ethos we should strive for ever greater inclusivity, in which weaker or marginalized countries or cultures can fully participate in the assurance that their voices will be heard and that they will actively contribute to the process.

Of course, this search for a global or universal ethos is not a new one, finding its roots in antiquity through philosophy and religion; it is an ideal which has been striven for by many. While it is be utopian to believe that a complex code of ethics may be drawn up which would be accepted by each and every individual in complete global agreement, nevertheless the urgency of the situation compels us to articulate at least a minimal code of ethics which can serve to provide the world with shared moral reference points, without generalizing it to the extent that its content becomes diluted.

This project has been on the international agenda for some time now; in 1993 the Parliament of the World's Religions in Chicago adopted a Declaration toward a Global Ethics and in 1995 the World Commission on Culture and Development also stated this need. UNESCO, in its Medium-Term Strategy for 1996-2002, stressed that

In a multipolar world (...) it is more than ever necessary to look for the acknowledgement, or rather the emergence, of a common substratum of values which would make economically, ecologically, socially and culturally viable coexistence possible on a world-scale.

UNESCO's Universal Ethics Project has also carried out much work in this regard in recent years, reaching agreement that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in addition to its Covenants and other existing documents on universal norms, should be the cornerstone of a global ethos.

Inter-religious dialogue on the same topic has also proved fruitful. In the Conference on Global Ethics and Good Governance—Buddhist Muslim Dialogue³ it was noted that the Christian principle, “do unto others as you would have others do unto you” was reflected in Islamic principles of governance in which the Qur'an enjoins leaders to place the interest of the people above his own interest. In Buddhism, the respect and preservation of all forms of life can be seen as the starting point for ethics; the Buddha identified various principles for good governance, among which are meeting in harmony, discussing and preserving harmony despite holding different opinions, abiding by the law, creating a balance between modernity and tradition, safeguarding the practice of religion and being open to all religious and spiritual traditions, as well as protecting women and respecting elders.

The World Commission for Culture and Development have identified five “pillars” on which a global ethics should be based, namely: human rights and responsibilities;

the protection of minorities; intergenerational equity; commitment to conflict resolution by non-military means; democracy and the elements of civil society.⁴

It can thus be seen that different religions and value systems create no barrier to approaching this question; despite widely divergent religious or cultural backgrounds, it should be possible, through dialogue, to arrive at a consensus on global ethics when that consensus takes as its basis and focal point the individual human being and the rights accorded to it. This dialogue must be further developed in order to bear fruit and succeed in creating unity in diversity.

It is important to notice that industrialization and modernization has long been equated with Westernization, and many countries have been eager to embrace Westernization as signifying progress, even to the point of subsuming their own culture and value systems. However, Europeanization or Westernization is not the only guarantor of economic and industrial success. As noted by Amartya Sen,⁵ Nobel laureate in economics, values other than those of the West can work just as well, if not better, with regard to economic growth. Eastern values, particularly Confucianism, have been cited as contributory factors to the rapid economic progress of countries such as Japan. While the cultural values and traditions of Japan, including its business traditions, no doubt played a role in the development of its economic success, many other Asian economies are also enjoying rapid economic growth.

Rather than being specifically Confucian, this points to the fact that such success can be linked to various Oriental cultures and value systems which are not at all incompatible with economic progress. This is to be seen in Buddhist, Islamic and Hindu cultures, with Asian countries now enjoying greater growth in their GNP than Europe and the United States. Western ethics thus need not dominate the global economy.

While it is true that businesses are coming under increasing pressure from globalization, which can decrease accountability, and that it is improbable that ethical measures which lessen a business's competitive advantage will be adopted or adhered to, there is nonetheless a distinct need for a set of global ethics which can apply to increasingly globalized business.

As we have seen, these do not have to follow a purely Western model, but in fact stand a much greater chance of success if they are based on widely accepted principles such as human rights. A step in this direction was taken at the World Economic Forum held in Davos in 1999, with Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations, putting forward his proposal for a "Global Compact." The nine principles of the compact are primarily derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration of the International Labour Organization on fundamental rights and principles, and are as follows:

Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights within their sphere of influence; make sure they are not complicit in human rights abuses; uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right

to collective bargaining; the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour; the effective abolition of child labour; eliminate discrimination in respect of employment and occupation; support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges; undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

As the ethics of globalization is inextricably linked to the ethics of the economy, I shall now focus in more detail on UNESCO's approach to this subject.

At UNESCO's 31st General Conference, held between 15 October and 3 November 2001, it was approved that UNESCO launch a new interdisciplinary program, Ethics of Economy. This was designed under Strategic Objective IV of UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy (2002-2007) to promote principles and ethical norms to guide social transformation with a view to promoting "globalization with a human face."⁶ Within the context of the paradigm of "sustainable and shared human development" the concept of the Ethical Economy⁷ is currently used to cover attempts to promote and disseminate in economic life rules of the game, principles and ethical norms that are universally acceptable and are likely to promote in the medium term the reconciliation of economic, social and environmental issues and, in the longer term, ensure their joint impact on the ongoing process of globalization. It is a system of chains of responsibility linking people by a common exercise of rights and liberties, a system of interrelations based on general reciprocity.⁸

Using the valuable remarks made by a group of experts in an informal meeting in UNESCO, I can say that⁹ based on the principle of the inalienable right of all human beings to life and liberty,¹⁰ the Ethical Economy concept involves principles of economicity that have yet to be defined on a universal basis. Provisionally, for heuristic purposes, we can identify three principles:¹¹ the objectively beneficial effect,¹² the exclusion of destruction of services or goods that are of human benefit – whether they are produced by cultures or are gifts of nature,¹³ the full multidimensional development of all human beings.¹⁴

Respecting these three principles of economicity requires that all actors in economic life—governments of Nation States, the business world in general and transnational corporations in particular, civil societies, non-governmental organizations, international and regional intergovernmental organizations, the media, etc.—promote an ethic of responsibility and solidarity vis-à-vis present and future generations.

To pave the way towards a humanized globalization, we need to encourage dialogue on the challenges involved in the attempt to base the economic and social model on a fairer distribution of growth and on solidarity strategies. We also need to promote research, information on matters relating to the Ethical Economy and education, for example, through an overhaul of the curricula of the social science sectors of universities. The final report of the Task Force on UNESCO in the Twenty-First Century: “Towards peace and

security in the twenty-first century”¹⁵ provides us with a good framework for the paradigm of a sustainable and shared human development.

In order to achieve this we need to first define and then promote a clear and consistent strategy for the future orientation of the Ethics of Economics Program. Any preliminary step towards the humanization of economic globalization and the introduction of ethical values in economic life needs the present situations to be identified, understood, analyzed and systematized while we know that they are complex, fragmented, shifting and emergent. In the light of the decisions of its 31st General Conference, UNESCO organized a survey on this issue based on critical analysis of publications and articles from magazines, journals, and newspapers; critical analysis and synopses of information from the websites of research centers, NGOs, experts, IGOs, the media, etc. and via the participation in meetings and consultation, both informal and voluntary, of a small number of experts; and identification of the main concerns of Member States from the monitoring of the work of the Organization’s governing bodies, in particular UNESCO’s 31st session of the General Conference assessment in relation to the Ethics of Economy programme of the nine major events since 2001.¹⁶ This preliminary survey has enabled UNESCO to:

- a) define the concept of the Ethical Economy;
- b) identify, systematize and conceptualize Ethical Economy initiatives;¹⁷
- c) identify the main stakeholders and key actors involved in the Ethical Economy;

- d) gain a better understanding in order to turn UNESCO's comparative advantages in the sphere of Ethical Economy to good account;
- e) decide on areas of thematic discussion to guide the Ethics of Economy programme.

The next step would be the organization of a number of areas of thematic discussion to identify the state of the art in Ethical Economy knowledge and practice for use in the future orientation of the Ethics of Economy programme.

It should be mentioned that UNESCO Member States attached priority to the issue of the ethics and requested that a globalization of solidarity be promoted in response to the globalization of the economy.

Ethical Economy initiatives may be intellectual (theoretical economics, i.e. economic science), practical (real economics) or educational (education and ongoing training) in nature.

The complexity of the problems posed by economic globalization, the great number of concerns and people's increased expectations explain the abundance of Ethical Economy initiatives. These initiatives can be placed into three main categories.

The first category aims to provide specific responses to concerns relating to social inclusion, in both North and South, through the promotion of a "solidarity economy." A solidarity economy is a parallel economy¹⁸ encompassing the social or popular economy of the North¹⁹ and the informal economy of the South. It includes a North-South com-

ponent, for example in the form of fair trade²⁰ or support for the promotion of micro-credits to help those in the subsistence-economy sector into the market economy.

The second category of initiatives seeks to “civilize” the market economy by imposing upon it systems of self-regulation.²¹

The third category of initiatives, which is probably the most important in that it holds out great promise for humanity, aims to bring about a “global public economy”. Economists, NGOs and IGOs working to humanize economic globalization are behind the updating and revival of revolutionary concepts²² such as the “common goods of humanity” or global public goods and the “universal allowance,” which will enable ethical regulation systems to be introduced *de facto* into economic life on a global scale. The notion of public goods is of course nothing new, any more than is that of the common heritage of humanity, but the application of these concepts to aspects of the globalized market economy is. The current decommercialization of certain common goods of humanity should be considered a major advance towards meeting the cost of satisfying basic human needs and the humanization of economic globalization. One of the aims of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity which was approved in the 31st UNESCO General Conference could serve this purpose as it emphasizes that cultural goods should be separately dealt with in the world trade mechanism currently governed by WTO.

The main stakeholders in the Ethical Economy are: NGOs, IGOs, the private sector, trade unions, governments, academic circles and the media. At present it seems to be

civil society which is playing a leading role in the Ethical Economy. Initiatives of the other parties involved in this area, which are just as important, essentially fall into the following categories:

a) “Retroaction”, in that they seek to respond to the wishes of civil society in order to maintain their legitimacy and/or their power of action. Examples: (1) some governments and Bretton Woods institutions showing support for a solidarity economy; (2) the private sector drawing up codes of ethical behaviour, carrying out ethical audits and disseminating their results.

b) “Indirect” action in that they are carried out under the civil society banner. Examples: researches and teachers expressing their opinion or communicating their support for the Ethical Economy via freely formed associations (“personal” action renamed “citizens”” action) or via the media, under a pseudonym (“disguised” action).

In the absence of a global organization with supranational competence, new perspectives that hold out great promise for humanity are opening up to international organizations. Provided that they can grasp their opportunities, these organizations could play a major role in the Ethical Economy, in particular through firm and effective support for promotion of the global public economy. The concept of a “global public economy” was established by UNESCO’s Social and Human Sciences Sector to describe the different initiatives that herald this type of economy.²³ By focusing on its function as a laboratory of ideas, UNESCO could play a key role exercising its leadership in this area.

One of the main problems with work to humanize globalization is that there exists a clash of logic and priorities between the different issues to be addressed. How, for example, can the concerns of the North regarding compliance with social and environmental norms be squared with the concerns with the South about their right to development? How can the right to health be reconciled with intellectual property rights?

Given the complexity of the subject, coupled with the fact of its being currently “in vogue” and the abundance of initiatives to promote ethical values in economic life, it seems essential to start with a survey of the state of the art in knowledge and practice in this area to identify who does what, pinpoint the major issues thrown up by current trends and identify the key actors in the Ethical Economy. The results should allow us to identify for each category of Ethical Economy initiative the respective roles of the different parties involved in order to determine more clearly what could be done and how, for the sake of maximum impact.

This could be structured around three focal points for research: the market Ethical Economy, the public Ethical Economy and the solidarity Ethical Economy. Special attention must go to interfaces: links and interconnections; and interaction and synergy between the market-economy, non-market economy and non-monetary economy sectors.

It is vital that we distance ourselves from the effect of being “in vogue”; rather we should think of a proactive attitude that will allow us to identify emergent problems, such as the misuse of Ethical Economy initiatives for commercial

or power-enhancing purposes or, more serious still, the risk that “ethics” will become a new instrument of exclusion.

Thematic discussion should be sought on topics and subtle points such as the following:

- How can we rehabilitate heterodox thinking while updating pro/anti-development schools of thought as a response to the paradox of “sitting on the fence”?
- How can we review the issue of development of the South in the light of recent theories of international justice, namely the different views of justice on a global scale, i.e. distinctions between international economic justice and global economic justice; a global-scale review of the concepts of commutative justice, i.e. equitable international trade, and distributive justice, i.e. equitable international economic order?
- How can we review the debt issue in the light of the ethics of responsibility: the need to take into account human costs?

Are we entitled to invoke an “ethical threshold” for the repayment of a debt that has already been repaid several times over which examines the path from morality to ethics?

Are the “social and environment norms” prescribed by the countries of the North an obstacle to the development of the South or the social and environmental responsibility of transnational corporations established in countries of the South?

What can be done to ensure that minimal social norms are not seen by countries of the South as protectionist measures in disguise and environmental norms equated with “green” protectionism which examines the path from the ethics of conviction to the ethics of responsibility?

How can we proactively consider the new risks of exclusion? This will examine the path from the proliferation of norms to the need to take into account the concerns of the South in the guidelines for standardizing these norms.

What is fair trade if we want to examine the path from conflict to the reconciliation of ethical principles in North/South economic relations?

And if we think of economic globalization versus the globalization of solidarity and the possible future for a “global public economy”, then what is the possible scope and limitation of the idea of a universal allowance, or basic income, as a response to the problem of meeting the cost of satisfying basic human needs (the eradication of poverty) and respect for human dignity? And what is the possible scope and limitation of the concept of global public goods?

How we can face the issue of transferring knowledge from the domain of private discovery to the public domain, looking at the specific case of generic medicines, for example?

How can we proactively consider the risks of the commercialization of global public goods, looking at the specific case of the planned CO2 emissions allowance trading market? How can it be ensured that the quotas and pollution rights are not misused for commercial purposes? What is the possible scope and limitation of a policy of combating pollution based on setting up markets dealing in the right to pollute?

How can we critically consider alternative proposals for equivalent ethical taxation that could feasibly supply the proposed “global development fund”?

How can we increase the use of ethics as an instrument of regulation? In other words, do we see globalization as a factor which erodes States' decision-making powers?

Do we see regional regulation as an alternative to Nation States' loss of power?

Do States' initiatives to promote regional integration movements encourage the promotion in economic life of ethical values likely to humanize globalization?

Do we see local regulation as an alternative to less State intervention?

Should we support and encourage efforts to promote an alternative economy?

What does this alternative, "solidarity economy" consist of? Who are the actors in this economy? How does this economy tie in with the rest of the economy (are we contemplating three-speed economies)? What is the future of the "third sector"? Are we talking about a palliative solution or a remedy?

What are the solidarity economy networks? How can we manage the transition from business ethics to market-economy ethics having the increasing complexity of issues in the process of economic globalization?

What is the possible scope and limitation of private-sector initiatives designed to "civilize" the market economy by providing it with self-regulation mechanisms, i.e. its codes of good behaviour, ethical audits, ethical funds, ethical consumption, ethical trade, etc.? The Global Compact and other initiatives are voluntary, which cannot assure coherence of responsibility. Can we not transfer to private actors the obligations derived from legal instruments designed

for states? Or should we create specific legal instruments? Do we need another interpretation of international instruments to share responsibility between public, private and civil actors?²⁴

And finally, what would be a proactive examination of the risks of a booming “ethics market”?

In conclusion, it is dialogue that will enable us to promote and disseminate ethical values in economic life, thus contributing to the promotion of sustainable and shared human development as well as paving the way towards a humanized globalization, which is a matter of ever-increasing urgency in our world today.

Education in ethics should arguably be introduced to national curricula so that it becomes an integral part of formal education, thus widening the worldviews of younger generations. This would draw on all the traditions of our diverse world, so that no one world-view would dominate. In such a system not only would an awareness of cultural diversity and shared problems which are no longer limited to the local sphere be nurtured in the general public, but there would also be a resultant acceptance of global responsibility. In this way material development can be counterbalanced by ethical development; the integration of ethics into the varying aspects of our increasingly globalized lives will enable us to turn globalization to our good, rendering it a positive force and allowing it to fulfill its function of serving the people, rather than being served by them. In this way the “top-down” approach would be complemented by a “bot-

tom-up” development of the awareness of our responsibilities as global citizens. As Mahatma Gandhi once said, “Our greatness lies not so much in being able to remake the world...as in being able to remake ourselves.”

Notes

1. Viggo Mortenson, Dr. Theol., University of Aarhus, Denmark, “Globalization, Global Ethics and Interreligious Dialogue in a Multireligious Context.”
2. Kathinka Evers, research Director, Uppsala University, Sweden, “The Globalization of Ethics in Science.”
3. UNESCO, Paris, 5-7 May 2003.
4. World Commission for Culture and Development, “Our Creative Diversity,” Chapter One.
5. World Culture Report, Part One, Asian Values and Economic Growth.
6. The term “Ethical Economy” has been used instead of “Ecoethics” to avoid the risk of an exclusively ecological approach to the issue of the diseconomies generated by neoliberal globalization.
7. *Programme Ethique de l'Economie*, document de travail n. 4, Octobre 2001 (*Ethics of Economy Programme*, working document n. 4, October 2001. Available in French only).
8. Patrice Meyer-Bisch: *L'économie éthique: une contrainte méthodologique et une condition d'effectivité des droits humains*, 2003, (*Economie Ethique* n. 6, SHS-2003/WS/37).
9. Here, I am in fact offering a summary of the UNESCO document (SHS-2002/CONF. 603/3) entitled *Master Plan: Ethics of Economy Programme*. It was the result of an Informal Meeting of High-Level Experts held in UNESCO headquarters, 24-25 June 2002. With this in mind, I did not see the need to specify any direct quotation.
10. The cornerstone of the values proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

11. These three principles of economicity defined by F. Perroux have been updated in line with the paradigm of sustainable and shared human development defined by UNESCO's Executive Board (see *Final Report of the Task Force on UNESCO in the Twenty-First Century*; *op. cit.*).
12. It is of course not a matter of deciding what is best for people and imposing this on them, but of enabling people to decide for themselves on the basis of available knowledge.
13. Which presupposes that the environment on which the existence of all human beings depends is preserved and cultural diversity respected and promoted.
14. Which means that the cost of satisfying basic human needs must be covered, as a matter of priority.
15. *The Final Report of the Task Force on UNESCO in the Twenty-First Century*: Towards peace and security in the twenty-first century: the challenges and opportunities of the humanization of globalization, UNESCO Executive Board Document 160 EX/48.
16. 1. The first World Social Forum of Porto Alegre versus the traditional World Economic Forum held in Davos in January 2001 (emergence of an international civil society).
2. The G-8 Summit in Genoa in May 2001 (acknowledgement by the G-7 of the concept of the "global commons" and the need to humanize globalization).
3. The Durban Conference in September 2001 (acknowledgement of the historical contribution of slavery to the expansion of world capitalism).
4. The tragic events of 11 September 2001 (their consequences in terms of demands for the humanization of globalization and their impact on the most disadvantaged sectors of the world economy).
5. The Climate Conference in Marrakesh in November 2001 (progress made in the plan to establish a CO2 emissions allowance trading market).
6. The WTO meeting in Doha in November 2001 (conflicting ethics in the humanization of globalization; de facto acknowledgement,

via the specific case of generic medicines, of the primacy of ethical values over commercial values).

7. The announcement on 2 December 2001 of the collapse of the transnational corporation Enron (illustrating the limits of deregulation and “soft law”; re-examination of the rules of good governance, e.g. separating the functions of control and management and the functions of consultancy and auditing to avoid any clashes of interests).
8. The second holding in parallel of the World Economic Forum (WEF) in New York and the World Social Forum (WSF) in Porto Alegre, late January and early February 2002 (premise of the amorality of economics challenged by some neoliberal representatives present at the WEF; consolidation of the WSF, transformed from a protest body to one capable of proposing alternatives; strengthening of the World Parliamentary Forum by the establishment of an International Parliamentary Network).
9. The United Nations International Conference on Financing for Development held in Monterrey, Mexico, in mid-March 2002 (failure of the financial aspects of work to promote the globalization of solidarity; de facto support of the promotion of practices and policies aimed at strengthening neoliberal economic globalization and renewed legitimization of the principle of the economic role of the State).
17. See the French paper *Alternatives: du capitalisme sauvage au capitalisme ethique, comment humaniser la mondialisation économique* (*Alternatives: from Rampant Capitalism to Ethical Capitalism—How to Humanize Economic Globalization*) in *Programme Ethique de l'économie, document de travail n. 3 septembre 2001 (Ethics of Economy Programme, working document n. 3, September 2001—available in French only).*
18. Not to be confused with the underground economy, which is illegal and immoral.
19. e.g. Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS); mutual benefit societies; production and consumer cooperatives; solidarity finance as a

tool for the rehabilitation of the excluded and the casualties of the market economy.

- 20. Not to be confused with ethical trading.
- 21. Codes of ethical behaviour based on social and environmental norms, ethical investments, ethical audits, ethical funds, ethical consumption, ethical trade, etc.
- 22. Although less visible than for the exact and natural sciences, the contribution of the social and human sciences to improving people's living conditions is just as great.
- 23. *Programme ethique de l'économie*, document de travail n. 3, septembre 2001 (*Ethics of Economy Programme*, working document n. 3, September 2001). Available in French only.
- 24. Patrice Meyer-Bisch, *L'économie éthique: une contrainte méthodologique et une condition d'effectivité des droits humains*, 2003 (*Economie ethique*, n. 6, SHS-2003/WS/37).