The Family Perspective in Sustainable Consumption and Development

Sue L.T. McGregor sue.mcgregor@msvu.ca www.consultmcgregor.com
Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, NS Canada
Coordinator of Peace and Conflict Studies Program
Professor, Department of Education

Author's note **- July 18, 2000 - This paper was written in haste but the message is no less sincere! Prints off to be 23 pages in 12 pitch and Times New Roman font.**

ABSTRACT It is my hope that this paper provides some exciting synergy between sustainable development, consumption and family well-being. New concepts (the human family, human responsibilities, human security, citizenship education) and old concepts (quality of life, well-being, justice and standard of living) have been combined in conjunction with a comparative analysis of the alternative approaches to the GDP as a way to bring together a collection of viewpoints to understand a family perspective in sustainable consumption and development.

This conference is about managing and measuring sustainable development. Sustainable development has two fronts - sustainable production and sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption addresses the demand side while sustainable development addresses the supply side. The demand side focuses on consumers' choice of goods and services to fulfil basic needs and improve quality of life while the supply side focuses on the economic, social, and environmental impact of production processes. Production is concerned with making sure that resources used to make goods and services consumed by families can be replenished in such a way that reduces the burden on the Earth's carrying capacity and does not impact negatively on intra and inter-generational equity. Sustainable consumption is concerned with decisions made by citizens in their consumption role. It is the fulfilment of basic human needs without undermining the capacity of the environment to fulfil the needs of present and future generations. Sustainable consumption encompasses sustainable management of resources, considerations for the natural environment and societal processes of change, the promotion of human dignity, quality of life and the perspective of interdependence referring to the interplay between people and environments and the relationships between economies, nationally and internationally.

This Open Informal Discussion Roundtable will be on the topic of extending the idea of sustainability to be a moral and ethical state, as well as an economic and environmental state, wherein **sustainable consumption patterns respect the universal values of peace, security, justice and equity within the human relationships that exist in the global village**. Put more simply, not only should consumers be concerned with the impact of their decisions on the environment but also on the lives and well-being of other people. Since one of the key functions of families as a social institution is to engage in production (selling their labour in return for wages) and consumption (using those wages to buy goods and services), the roundtable would examine the role of families as they impact sustainable consumption and development. To embrace a moral and ethical perspective, the family's function of production and consumption has to be discussed in relation to its other key functions, especially (a) socialization of children

into adult roles and (b) social control of family members so they are responsible contributing members of society. You are invited to browse www.consultmcgregor.com for copies of papers related to this topic.

The family function perspective will balance the good work that has been done already by the SWSD on measuring sustainability, and then opening up the roundtable to contributions from those in attendance. An analysis of the formulas used to measure the GESDI and the GSDP revealed the key components of quality of life, spiritual pathways, family stability, social justice, consumption, human rights, living standards, responsible citizens, and healthy families. I see this roundtable as a great opportunity to expand on what **some** of these aspects of the indicators mean and how we collectively understand them in relation to world sustainable development.

Human Family

From the moment we are born, we are destined to be in relationship with others (Jackson, 1990). My profession, home economics, has always been concerned with relationships but has often focused on intra familial relationships leading to strong individual family units (spousal, sibling and parent/child relationships). This focus needs to be expanded to include the *human family* which refers to the relationships between people comprising the world population - the collection of beings called humanity. Jackson notes that people desire to bond together, not only at the family level but, at the community level as well. Relationships with teachers, clergy, teams, co-workers, etc. build a sense of solidarity - an identity among members of a group. He takes this solidarity to a higher level, that of nations and cultures, urging those studying peace to extend it to the global level as well - the human family. Respect for the dignity of each person in the human family creates bonds between people. Jackson makes the interesting point that people tend to have less of a personal relationship with nationality and other cultures than they do with family members and close friends. It is this disconnectedness that needs to be mended if we are to nurture the human family as a whole. Our relationships with more distant members of the human family have to become personal because we all share a common destiny, that being to promote the common good. The common good is the totality of social conditions which make it possible for people to reach their full potential in a timely fashion. This common destiny means it is time for an ever-expanding sense of community so that all members of the human family can reach their fullest potential.

The home economics profession's general slogan for the 21st century could expand beyond *"the voice for strong families"* to include *"the voice for a strong **human** family"*. Figure 1 illustrates the creed for "The One Human Family" as set out on the One Human Family web site. This creed is especially poignant when one appreciates that "it is the diversity of the human family which gives it so rich a pattern of relationships. For every race and every culture has its own quality to contribute, its own note to sound, its own force to add to the whole of humanity's progress on the evolutionary path to completion of its destiny" ("The human family", n.d., web citation).

Figure 1 - The One Human Family Creed

As a member of our One Human Family, I choose of my own free will to treat all people with respect and dignity. I recognize that every person is my brother and sister in our human family regardless of what they look like, what they believe, how they choose to live, and whether I agree with them or not. I will do my part to help all people receive fair treatment and reach their highest potential. I will have the courage to help people when they are down or in harm's way, and the wisdom to let them learn for themselves. I will show empathy to those who suffer, forgive those who have wronged me, and be a friend to those who will let me.
This is my promise to our human family. http://www.1HF.com

Clay (1997) recognizes family, among education, work, play and religion, as one of the things that makes us all distinctly human. By extension, each family should be concerned for the world's human family. This is a profoundly exciting new direction for family and consumer sciences and builds on the emerging body of research on inclusion, diversity, community and the global education/perspective found in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, the Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education, the Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Yearbook and KON's Forum and newsletter, Dialogue. Everyone has a rightful place, and inherent responsibilities, in the world "family". The human family, the peoples of the world, should feel strong and connected to one another, and we all play a key role in guaranteeing these global relationships.

Quality of Life

NOTE that the information for the sections on quality of life, well-being and standard of living is from McGregor, S., & Goldsmith, L. (1998). Extending our understanding of quality of living, standard of living and well-being. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 90(2), 2-6.

Quality is life is "relative" and differs between individuals but it can be perceived as the level of satisfaction or confidence with one's conditions, relationships and surroundings relative to the available alternatives (Goldsmith, 1996; Jacoby & Olson, 1986). Toffler (1970) saw quality of life as something a person can attain by learning to cope with and take control of change and by guiding their own evolution. The concept of quality of life is multifaceted. Quality of life consists of, among other things: hope for the future, land, adequate food, clothing, shelter, income, employment opportunities, maternal and child health, and family and social welfare (Melson, 1980, p.2). Popcorn (1992) suggested that part of our quality of life is manifested in the physical infrastructures of our society (e.g. clean, neat, maintained and safe sidewalks, roads, streets, neighbourhoods, and parks).

Wallace (1974) identified four overarching indicators of quality of life, also evidenced in McKie's (1993) research: economic, social, environmental, and psychological. The authors would also add the conventional physical aspects of quality of life as well as political and spiritual, as did a recent Australian study (Henry, 1995). When discussing the quality of life of Canadians in Postwar Canada, McKie (1993) used such demographic indicators as: age, size of family, type of family, immigration, internal migration, superurbanization (most of Canadians live in one of three cities), suburban sprawl, stagnation of family incomes, the threat to universality of social welfare entitlement programs, the changing nature of employment, and the pervasive nature of technology. He conceded that the quality of life in other countries, especially

less developed countries, is declining rapidly and is in our living rooms each night on television. By association, our perception of a good quality of life is being eroded and this is impacting our feelings of autonomy, personal security and self-worth.

The concept of quality of life is indeed multi-dimensional, complex and very subjective. For instance, someone who has changed their consumption habits to better ensure that their choices will make a better quality of life for themselves, the environment and future generations, may be seen by others as having a lower or inferior quality of life since they have removed themselves from the materialistic mainstream characteristic of our consumer society. Someone may feel that an absence of violence and abuse in their life leads to a higher quality of living even though they have fewer tangible resources, money, or shelter; peace of mind and freedom from abuse has increased the quality of their daily life relative to what it was like before. Family-life professionals have a role to play in helping families help individual members identify, clarify and select values that may improve their quality of life (Fleck, 1980). Bubolz (1990) suggested that there are four universal quality of life values which lead to "human betterment" or the improvement of the human condition. In addition to the value of species survival (human and other living organisms), they include: adequate resources, justice and equality, freedom, and peace or balance of power.

Since quality of life is at the core of our professional mission, it must be better understood, especially in relation to well-being (Engberg, 1996). To facilitate this understanding, the following sections will elaborate on the concepts of standard of living, well-being and welfare since these are often used in conjunction with the discussion of the quality of daily lives of individuals and families.

Standard of Living

Standard of living is often equated with quality of life but it is not the same thing. An individual or family's standard of living is an actual measure of the goods and services affordable by and available to them (Goldsmith, 1996). One's expenditures on these goods and services make up the total amount of money spent to maintain (or try to maintain) a standard of living, which varies from person to person (Freudeman, 1972). Garman (1995) recognized that a great motivator of economic growth (national and personal) is our interest in increasing our standard of living. These expenditures or consumption decisions affect the present and future standard of living of families here in North America (Goldsmith) and in other countries (Lusby, 1992).

A standard of living is a way of life to which a group of people are accustomed. Some people's standard of living includes only basic food, clothing, shelter and safety (if that). Other people expect to eat at expensive restaurants, wear designer clothes, live in huge homes and travel extensively. Different people expect and want different things; they have different standards which are very much shaped by values, goals, money, past experience and socialization; in fact, many standards of living are accepted without conscious thought (Parnell, 1984; Poduska, 1993). Burk (1968) suggested that once an individual recognizes the standard of living of his own society, he or she embraces the societal value system as they consciously or unconsciously decide whether to accept these standards as the basis for making purchase decisions for goods and services. The person then chooses a level of living within a chosen life style but does not necessarily strive to stay there; their perception of their quality of life, resulting from their actual living standard, may drive them to increase their economic well-being. This is just another example of how integrated these four concepts are in our everyday jargon.

Standard of living is a standard of consumption, NOT income or wages (Anderson, 1997). It can be defined as "a grade or level of subsistence and comfort in everyday life enjoyed

by a community, class or individual" (Random House Dictionary, 1966). It is now being argued that a basic cost of living is one's birthright! This could be achieved through a guaranteed annual income thereby making sustenance a right. There is a movement in Canada to draft a Private Members Bill (Working title is the 7th Generation Bill, based on the indigenous model of considering the interests of the next seven generations whenever decisions are made). This Bill would help Canada change directions in the way it makes decisions within government such that the structures of society serve the goal of sustainability! Well-being, quality of life and standards of living are inherent in the development of this Bill as the GPI which takes into account non-monetary contributions to well-being (Nickerson, 1998).

Well-Being

According to the lexical meaning of the term, well-being is defined as the state of being happy, healthy or prosperous (Webster's Dictionary, 1969). A recent Canadian study on independence over the adult life course equated well-being with independence which was taken to mean ability to maintain control over one's life style (Marshall, McMullin, Ballantyne, Daciuk & Wigdor, 1995). "...Well-being is a state of being where all members of a community have economic security; are respected, valued and have personal worth; feel connected to those around them; are able to access necessary resources; and are able to participate in the decision-making process affecting them" (Marshall et al., p.1).

Fleck (1980) set out four functions of families related to the four traditional aspects of well-being: (a) provide physical necessities (food, clothing, shelter); (b) facilitate physical, intellectual and emotional development of members; (c) provide every opportunity for every family member to be happy and successful; and (d) provide a chance for every member to be contented and close to all other family members. Respectively, using Brown's (1993) model of well-being, these refer to efficiency in management and control over things in the home (economic and physical well-being), and to interpersonal relations and personality development within the family (social and psychological well-being). This multidimensional concept of well-being facilitates the holistic, interdisciplinary, human ecological approach that is advocated for analyzing policies and programs that affect individuals families (McGregor, 1996b). Each of the four conventional aspects of well-being will now be discussed.

Economic and physical well-being

Economic and physical well-being are concerned with the individual's and family's efficiency in management and control of things in the home. It embraces the physical and financial aspects of family life as they engage in roles of consumption, production, conservation, caregiving, and physical maintenance. For the individual and the family to be in an economically sound state and in control of things used or consumed in the home has long been an ideal upheld by home economists (Brown, 1993). Families can achieve this level of well-being by learning how to manage economic resources and household work and paid employment outside the home. Trying to meet the costs of everyday living involves decisions related to shelter, food, clothing, insurance, retirement and education and culture activities. Added to these costs are expenses related to health care, with all aspects of this range of expenditures affecting economic security and physical health and safety.

Economic well-being. Economic well-being is the degree to which individuals and families have economic adequacy and is one indicator used to measure quality of life. Each individual and family defines what constitutes economic well-being and an adequate standard of living for them (Goldsmith, 1996). The standard measure of economic well-being for a nation is the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the total value of all the goods and services produced in one

year in a country. The *real* GDP takes into account inflation since part of the economic value of goods and services includes the rise in cost of production (Garman, 1995). He suggested that a new concept, the net economic welfare (NEW), is a better measure of factors associated with *quality of life*, in addition to economic welfare measured by the GDP. NEW measures the effects of leisure, household work and urban disamenities (eg. lack of civility, courtesy and respect). This is an attempt to capture the measurable and immeasurable aspects of quality of life and well-being.

Economic security (well-being) in a family is the desire for protection against the economic risks people face in their daily lives (loss of employment, illness, bankruptcy, bank failures, poverty, destitution in old age). To achieve this goal, family members purchase insurance and save and invest their earned income. In their role as paid laborers, they negotiate with employers to ensure job security and pension benefits. Caregiving to elder relatives as well as to children and other dependents is becoming a great concern for employees and employers (Goldsmith & Goldsmith, 1995; McGregor, 1996c). Different levels of government provide social programs that contribute to economic security. In these times of fiscal constraint and austerity programs, community non-government organizations (NGOs) are being challenged to take up the cause of economic security where market forces and declining government intervention have left off (Rifkin, 1995).

Williams (1991) clarified that economic security is a function of many variables in combination including: money income, transfers and in-kind income, financial assets, human assets, community resources, durable goods and services, time, deferred consumption, attitude toward money, ability to manage, control over financial affairs and resources, values, insurance-risk management, ability to adjust to life transitions and life style decisions. Unpaid labor in the home is also a component of economic well-being. Although not counted in national accounts, unpaid labor accounts for over $16 Trillion worldwide, with women bearing 70% of the burden; that is, 11 trillion dollars are unaccounted for in the total world economy because so much of women's work is unpaid, underpaid or undervalued. Conversely, of men's total work, three fourths is in paid market activities hence valued and counted (McGregor, 1996c). Anything that compromises a women's ability to participate in paid labor or to recognize unpaid labor to ensure economic security is a concern for the profession: gender biases, cultural orientation, abuse and violence, war and civil strife, domestic and international policies, et cetera (Butcher, 1995).

Physical well-being. Concern with or preoccupation with the body and its needs is the focus of physical well-being; maintaining the integrity of the human body by protecting it and providing sustenance is the main objective. Physical well-being relates to the effects of people and substances on individual health and development, whether they be positive or negative. Threats to this integrity include, but are not limited to, unsafe and irresponsible personal conduct or the actions of a third party, illness, disease and malnutrition, lack of or inappropriate exercise, dangerous and hazardous products, adulterated foods, incompetent and irresponsible service delivery, and environmental degradation (e.g. depletion of ozone layer). Home economists concerned with physical well-being would advocate for instructions in the development and care of the human body including training in hygiene and systematic exercises, prevention and treatment of disease by physical, mechanical and nutritional means, and development of safe, injury free products with access to liability measures if necessary. Service delivery should be in the hands of competent, trained, ethical people whether it be airline pilots, day care providers, family life educators or mechanics.

Practitioners would work towards ensuring adequate and affordable housing for

protection against the elements or abusive partners; safe, durable, and comfortable clothing and textiles; and safe, healthy, edible food products and nutrient supplements. They could be concerned with the challenges experienced by families with persons who have physical impairments or disabilities. Issues such as sleep, tension and stress management relate to physical well-being. Concern with the integrity of the natural environment is a valid dimension of physical well-being, especially since cancer, deformities and illness are now thought to be triggered or caused by environmental factors, appreciating that it will be years before true cause and effect relationships can be substantiated.

     Wellness. The changing physical needs of infants, children, youth, adolescents, adults (mature and elderly) encompass the scope of physical well-being. *Wellness* is a relatively recent concept related to physical well-being (Henry, 1995). Wellness is a new *health* paradigm that replaces the old model of doctors, drugs, and treating symptoms. According to the <u>Ottawa Charter of Health Protection</u> (World Health Organization, 1986), health is defined as a state of physical and mental well-being. Wellness embraces a holistic approach to health wherein one deals with the body, mind and emotions as a whole by combining diet, exercise and rest and stress management. Instead of blaming the doctor for an illness and expecting insurance companies and government to pick up the health care tab, a wellness approach places personal responsibility at the core of the problem; managing oneself in a balanced approach lessens the need for the old model of health care to ensure physical well-being (Naisbitt, 1984). Marshall, et al., also related well-being to health and stated that "health is not merely the absence of disease, but a positive state of physical, emotional and social *well-being* [italics added] (1995, p.5).

Social and Emotional Well-Being

     To be concerned with the welfare of the family entails moving beyond conceptualizing the family as an economic unit, dealing with household work, economic management, physical maintenance and growth, and balancing family and work. We also have to conceive of the family as a social unit, meaning we deal with the mental aspects of the family under the rubric of interpersonal relationships (social well-being) and personality development (individual psychological well-being) (Brown, 1993).

     Social well-being. Social well-being is concerned with the social needs of the family played out daily in interactions in interpersonal relationships within the family group and with the larger community, including the workplace. It is the social space of the family as a group versus psychological well-being which is the emotional space of an individual in the family. Social well-being is affected by one's ability to form cooperative and interdependent relationships with one's fellows whether they be family members and kinship, neighbours or work cohorts. One function of families is socialization of members (The Vanier Institute of the Family, 1994). Socialization concerns the process of acquiring the ability to participate in society and includes enculteration, whereby individuals learn the ways of a particular culture, usually within which they spend their daily life (Darling, 1987).

     The crux of family activities and social well-being is interpersonal relationships. This involves developing an understanding of self and others, developing interpersonal skills, understanding love and romance, and relating to others. The internal dynamics of family members' interactions reflects the strengths and weaknesses of the family unit. Family life educators have to understand these dynamics including the: processes of cooperation and conflict, communication patterns and problems, conflict management, decision making and goal setting, resource management, stressors in the family, and families with special needs (Darling, 1987). Eichler (1988) identified six dimensions of familial interaction including: procreation,

socialization, sexual relations, residential (living arrangements), economics, love and emotional support. These closely parallel the six functions of families set out by The Vanier Institute of Canada (1994).

       Emotional well-being. Emotional well-being also deals with the mental status of family members. Emotions are strong, relatively uncontrollable feelings that affect one's behaviour with everyone experiencing a wide array of emotions. This aspect of well-being relates to a family member's feelings, impressions, sensibilities, sentiments, and meanings attached to life and how these emotions (stable or not) affect their daily lives and those of others.

       Each individual member of the family has their own unique personality which is profoundly shaped by family life. It needs to be nurtured, developed, enriched and allowed to grow and adapt to changing circumstances. Families contribute to this emotional growth through the development and stabilization of individual personality systems. Through socialization, children and youth internalize general cultural and familial values and societal norms ending up with their own personality. The structure of a person's personality, especially value orientations and need disposition, is partially shaped by the family and greatly affects their emotional well-being. It is developed through thought, speech and action as one learns language, knowledge, interaction skills and ego development (Brown, 1993).

       We talk of self esteem, self worth, self image, and self identity when we deal with emotional well-being. Concepts such as self-actualization, self formation and fulfilment, self concept and self expression are used to refer to emotional well-being. People need to feel that they belong and that they are connected with others (Henry, 1995). In this regard, peer pressure among teens and reference groups for adults are at issue. Consequences of attempts to gain and retain status, superiority, self respect and prestige relate to an individual's feelings of usefulness and accomplishment. Behaviour seeking reinforcement, ego-defense, independence and self control has to be understood and managed (Hawkins, Best, & Coney, 1989).

       Quite often, practitioners are concerned with the process of consumer socialization and with the impact of advertising and marketing on emotional well-being. They are concerned with how individuals process information and make decisions. Other home economists study the relationship between fashion and apparel and emotional expression. Some counsel individuals for emotional stability and growth since emotional well-being is associated with thought and reflection (or lack thereof). Practitioners can help people deal with grief, guilt, anger and jealousy. Family divorce mediators help family members work through a very painful process profoundly affecting emotional well-being. Child development, adolescent development, marriage and family counselling, and family life education are career paths focused on meeting the daily emotional needs of the individual in a family setting.

Social Justice

       Another concept relevant to measuring sustainable development is social justice, the kind of justice most often referred to when people say they are working for peace <u>and</u> justice. How would you determine if *justice* had been served? Justice is a multidimensional concept but it basically refers to the maintenance of something that is just (morally right and good) by (a) the impartial adjustment of conflicting claims or (b) the assignment of merited punishments or rewards (Gove, 1969, p.461). Obviously we need to move beyond the dictionary meaning of the word justice, but it helps us appreciate that justice helps maintain good relationships between people, communities and nations - a prerequisite for peace (O'Mahony, 1993) by righting wrongs and making things right. It is the habits or customs whereby by people serve the rights of

other people. Justice looks to the *good* of others. Social justice is a term that recognizes that people do not live in isolation but in community and have relations with other people shaping the *common* good (Ryan, 1999). The common good is "the common conditions of social life which guarantee and promote the recognition and fulfilment of man's individual and social rights" (Ryan, web citation).

Social justice is also a multidimensional concept. It is related to other types of justice: legal, commutative, distributive and vindictive (O'Mahony, 1993). Legal justice is exercised by those in authority so that laws in relation to the common good are upheld and fulfilled. Commutative justice regulates the private right to contract (e.g., buying and selling). Violations of this justice are often referred to as fraud, theft and damage. Distributive justice refers to income and wealth distribution and labour and involves the sanctity of property and contracts (just price, wage, profit). For clarification, distributive justice is based on the concept of "to each according to their contribution" while charity refers to "to each according to their needs". Distributive justice also depends on the principle of participation, in that every person be guaranteed, by society's institutions, the equal human right to make a productive contribution to the economy both through being a worker and/or an owner. Participation does not guarantee equal *results* from contributing to the economy (wages, benefits, etc.) just the *right* to contribute. Finally, vindictive justice involves restoring justice by means of punishment which is in proportion to the guilt (Center for Economic and Social Justice [CESJ], n.d.; O'Mahony, 1993).

Reardon (1995) also refers to social justice and to distributive justice. She says that social justice represents fair treatment and reflects the statement, "*you have no right to do that to me*". Fairness can mean imposing different rules due to different circumstances so that things are made right or different rules to serve the same purpose. Distributive justice refers to access to societal goods and services. Economic justice is part of social justice and refers to the moral principles which guide citizens as they design economic institutions (work, contracts, market place exchange rules) to help individuals gain material goods and possessions (CESJ, n.d.).

Figure 2 provides a summary of some of the issues classified as social justice issues. Social justice encompasses the struggles of people everywhere for gender equality, democratic government, economic opportunity, intellectual freedom (education), environmental protection and human rights. Social justice is concerned with oppression, equity, inclusiveness, diversity, opportunity, empowerment and liberation (University of Massachuset, 1999). Social justice emphasizes balance and harmony in the social life we all share. Equality and accessability are the conditions of a just social order, not the goal (Connell, 1993).

Figure 2 - Social Justice Issues	
children and youth	housing and shelter (homelessness)
community	labour and work (child labour, sweatshops, the
consumer issues	economy, jobs)
crime and punishment	poverty and low income (income security, pensions, tax
civil rights and liberties	issues)
human rights and responsibilities	race and ethnicity
education	violence and abuse
freedom and liberty	trade and global investment
gay and lesbian and alternative life styles	government budgets (debt, deficit and surpluses)
gender	health and safety

Finally, Ryan (1999) identifies six principles of social justice that help solidify the links

between peace, rights, responsibilities and security:

1. A human right is not the same thing as an individual advantage. The former is a something that someone is due based on their humanity and the latter is something that someone would like to have. Any action taken by society that does not respect human rights is *unjust* because it does not contribute to the four things people need to fulfil their human nature - work, own things for sustenance, have knowledge and love.

2. Social institutions (e.g., schools, church, family, economy, political system, labour market, marketplace, businesses) are supposed to serve the persons living in that society. Hence, a society or social institution that is not people centered is *unjust*.

3. We can only ensure that social institutions are people centered and serve human rights <u>if</u> the people affected have a clear voice in the operation of those institutions. Any institution that does not provide access for citizen participation is *unjust*.

4. There are times when respecting a person's human right has to be subordinated to the requirements of the common good, with the most obvious instances being the use of scarce natural resources and the accumulation of wealth and property rights, actions that can be detrimental to the common good.

5. Because people make up the human family, there must be institutions and international social structures to insure justice between nations and on world scale (these do exist yet).

6. Social structures need to change to accommodate the changing awareness of what constitutes the common good (changing worker rights, women's rights, children's rights, environmental integrity). The role of the citizens is to challenge what appears to be a lack of or failure of one of the conditions of the common good.

Human Responsibilities

Just as human beings have fundamental rights by virtue of their personhood (as recognized in the alternative indices), they also have human, ethical responsibilities. Indeed, the concept of rights often implies related obligations, duties or responsibilities (Küng, 1998). Obligation refers to legally or morally binding oneself to a course of action in a situation that is bound with constraints - binding in law or conscience. A duty suggests a more general but greater impulsion on moral or ethical grounds. Responsibility refers to moral, legal or mental accountability for one's actions, conduct or obligations (Gove, 1969). Küng further distinguishes between narrower legal obligations and ethical responsibilities in the wider sense like those prompted by conscience, love and humanity. The latter is based on the insights of the individual and cannot be compelled by the government through law.

It is a sense of responsibility that makes people accountable for their actions (Arias, 1997). But the concept of responsibility is complex. Someone can be said to "bear" responsibility for something meaning they sustain without flinching or they can be said to "accept" responsibility meaning they receive it with consent. Also, responsibility can be perceived as a negative thing, as a weight or as a positive, enlightening, empowering thing. The former implies culpability and the latter implies recognition of successes and the "attempt". Also, three conditions have to be present for someone to be act responsibly: (a) there must be a condition to which one perceives the need to respond, (b) the belief that it is in one's power to respond, and (c) the belief that responding is not only in one's power but is to one's benefit. Conversely, a person's lack of "response" -- "ability" could be a breakdown in any one or all of these steps (Jones cited in "Thoughts on responsibility", 1998).

When people think about human responsibilities they cannot turn to the United Nations

for guidance as they can for human rights because the UN does not have a declaration on human responsibilities. This gap may be redressed shortly given that an organization called the InterAction Council recently (September 1997) developed a proposal for a <u>Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities</u> (Küng, 1998). The InterAction Council hopes that a country will sponsor the Declaration so that it can be introduced to the United Nations for debate at the appropriate committee. As an aside, the InterAction Council, formed in 1983, is comprised of some 30 former heads of government or state from all continents and different political orientations. Their objective is to balance human rights with human responsibilities. They spent many years delineating the meaning of responsibilities relative to rights.

      The Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities developed by the InterAction Council (1997) is comprised of 19 articles, divided into six main topics: (a) fundamental principles of humanity (4 articles); (b) non-violence and respect for life (3 articles); (c) justice and solidarity (4 articles); truthfulness and tolerance (4 articles); mutual respect and partnership (3 articles), and, as with human rights, the final article says that no one can take any one of the responsibilities out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other responsibilities in the Declaration, and that every single person, group, organization and government is responsible for making the Declaration *work*. In more detail, the principles of humanity relate to treating everyone in a humane way and to the notions of self esteem, dignity, good over evil, and the Golden Rule (do unto others as you would have done to you). Non-violence and respect for life also encompass responsibilities related to acting in peaceful ways, and respecting intergenerational and ecological protection. Justice and solidarity encompass honesty, integrity, fairness, sustainability, meeting one's potential and not abusing wealth and power. Truthfulness and tolerance embrace the principles of privacy, confidentiality, honesty, and a respect for diversity and these apply to all people, politicians, business, scientists, professionals, media, and religions. Finally, the responsibility of mutual respect and partnerships includes caring for other's well-being, appreciation and concern for the welfare and safety of others especially when it comes to children and spouses but also to all men and women in partnerships (see Figure 3).

Figure 3 - **Initiative to convince UN to embrace Declaration of Human Responsibilities (1997)** *comprised of 19 articles, divided into six topics* (InterAction Council, 1997 - still waiting for a nation(s) to sponsor it at UN)

(1) fundamental principles of humanity (4)
> treating everyone in a humane way; notions of self esteem, dignity, good over evil, and the Golden Rule (do unto others as you would have done to you)

(2) non-violence and respect for life (3)
> acting in peaceful ways, and respecting intergenerational and ecological protection

(3) justice and solidarity (4)
> encompass honesty, integrity, fairness, sustainability, meeting one's potential and not abusing wealth and power

(4) truthfulness and tolerance (4)
> privacy, confidentiality, honesty, and a respect for diversity and these apply to all people, politicians, business, scientists, professionals, media, and religions

(5) mutual respect and partnership (3)
> caring for other's well-being, appreciation and concern for the welfare and safety of others especially when it comes to children and spouses but also to all men and women in partnerships.

(6) same as human rights (1)
> no one can take any one of the responsibilities out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other rights in the Declaration, and every single person, group, organization and government is responsible for making it *work*.

It is interesting that the Declaration of Human Responsibilities is part of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Culture of Peace Program, designed to support a global movement towards peace that is already underway http://www.peace.ca/unesco.htm. It is significant that UNESCO sees human's being responsible for their actions as part of the peace movement. A world in which everyone demands rights but does not accept responsibilities for their actions can never be at peace with itself. Article 29 of the Declaration of Human Rights refers to the *duties* that people have to their community because the community is where the person develops their personality and their potential. Fraser (1998) boldly states that the constant demand for rights alone, without better recognition of the *duties* referred to in article 29, means that we cannot achieve the human rights we strive for to achieve peace. Indeed, the final clause of the Human Rights Declaration states that we cannot ignore one clause to advance another. We are in fact guilty of calling for rights but not responsibilities and have seen the results in the lack of peace, security and justice in the global human family. The Declaration of Human Responsibilities is the long awaited extension of article 29 in the Declaration of Human Rights (Fraser). It would apply not only to governments (like human rights) **but also** to corporations, institutions and individual people, even families. Without this well-balanced responsibility, a civilized, humane society could not operate and the well-being of individuals and families would be jeopardized significantly.

For clarification, the InterAction Council is not the only group struggling with the gap between rights and responsibilities, although it is the only one intending to take its proposal to the United Nations. Other groups are developing their declarations of responsibilities. The Astro Temple has a link to the InterAction Council site but it has developed its own Declaration of a Global Ethic which can be found at http://astro.temple.edu/. The Action Coalition for Global Change has developed its Declaration of Human Responsibilities which can be found at http://acgc.org/ethics/adeclar.htm. The Hart Centre in the United Kingdom has developed a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities for their site

They advised me that they were aware of the InterAction Council initiative and have been in touch with then but wanted a simpler declaration to stimulate discussion at their center on the issue of responsibilities versus rights. Even the World Economic Forum, held each year in Davos, Switzerland, has embraced the idea of a universal declaration of human responsibilities and hopes to have one drafted and approved by the 2000 meeting. This is an interesting development since the Forum is comprised mainly of American corporate power brokers who are adamantly against the InterAction Council's declaration even though Hans Küng is working on the Forum's draft and the Council's version (World Economic Forum, 1997). The Alliance for a Responsible and United World also has a declaration which it calls Platform for a Responsible and United World at http://www.echo.org/.

This collection of actions calling for human responsibilities is especially germane to practitioners who are embracing Human Reflective Action Theory because this call for responsibilities is based on ethics, duties and accountability. RHA stresses ethical sensibility, being true to oneself (authenticity) and spirituality (inner strength for the common good). If we embrace the RHA leadership style, we cannot ethically ignore this component of peace education.

Citizenship Education

Citizenship is defined as the ongoing contribution of citizens to solving community and public problems and creating the world around us (Boyte & Skelton, 1998). Abala-Bertrand (1996) identifies two different sources of the concept of citizenship. First, republican citizenship stresses three main principles: the sense of belonging to a political community, loyalty towards one's homeland, and the predominance of civic duties over individual interests. Second, the liberal tradition of citizenship focuses on individualism and the central idea that all individuals are equal and have inalienable rights (e.g., human rights) that cannot be revoked by the state or any social institution. Both views prevail today and will be reflected in this discussion.

There are three elements to citizenship education: the civil, the political and the social (Abala-Bertrand, 1996; Kerr, 1998). The civil refers to community involvement, learning about and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of one's community, including learning through community involvement and service to the community. The political refers to learning about, and how to make one's self effective in, public life. This learning encompasses realistic knowledge of, and preparation for, conflict resolution and decision making, whether involving issues in local, regional, national, continental or international affairs. The social refers to social and moral responsibilities wherein people learn self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour at work, play and at home - behaviour towards those in authority and towards each other.

Abala-Bertrand (1997) identifies four other dimensions of citizenship education: human rights; democracy; human development and a sustainable development ethic; and, peace at the national and international levels. The inclusion of a human rights component in citizenship education is based on the assumption that all humans are created having equal dignity; all humans have the right to belong to a social and political community; and, that all rights - political, social, civil, cultural and economic - are universal, indivisible and interdependent. Educators should include the dimension on democracy in citizenship education because any legitimate political power emanates from individual citizens, more so if they have been socialized in the skills of preparation, enforcement and improvement of the rule of law (political, legal and judicial institutions). Citizens need to be exposed to skills suitable for their personal,

social, economic and political development if human rights and the rule of law (democracy) are to be sustained. Finally, human rights, democracy and sustainable development of humans cannot be attained if peace is not in place, assured and nurtured.

Bahmueller (1998) tenders another conceptualization of a framework for teaching citizenship, comprised of five parts http://www.civiced.org/framework_doc.html#one:

1. The world   -   the transnational context of human rights, an open society and political order (humanitarian versus political);
2. The people   -   the foundation of civil society (the people) and the political community;
3. The polity   -   the ordering of civic life, politics and political systems (distinguish between government and NGO's and civil society);
4. The government   -   public policy and participation in the formal institutions and processes of public affairs (national, provincial/state, municipal); and,
5. The citizen   -   the principal actor in relation with the world, the people as a whole, the polity, the government and other individual citizens.

This approach brings a holistic approach to citizenship education placing the individual person in the world, national, regional and community context.

Cotton (1997) discusses the attributes of a person who has been socialized to be a prepared citizen. She says they will have gained or developed: (a) respect for the 18 values inherent in the US Constitution; (b) respect for the common good; (c) knowledge and understanding of a nation's founding, current government structures, political processes and global context; (d) higher level thinking skills; (e) social process skills (communication, management, consensus, cooperation); and, (f) the attitude and belief that people have an obligation to participate in civil society.

Human Security

The home economics profession has always been concerned with family well-being and security (McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998). A recent focus in the peace education field is the notion of human security, as opposed to national security and is relevant to this roundtable. The latter is concerned with national defense, war and peace keeping initiatives of a nation while the former is concerned with the well-being of the citizens within the nation and within the human family. In more detail, national defense is traditionally concerned with protection of the nation-state, defense of territories and boundaries and the preservation of political sovereignty. After the end of the Cold War era, security expanded to include the personal well-being of individuals and their ability to feel secure in the basic needs that affect their day-to-day existence: food, health, employment, population, human rights, environment, education , etc. (Ayala-Lasso, 1996; Nef, 1999).

Security, simply put, is protecting oneself, other people or society from threats and challenges to safety and existence. Being secure means that risks (exposure to harm or danger) have been reduced or eliminated - feeling insecure means the risks, or the reality, of harm are still there (Nef, 1999). The concept of human security is multidimensional and these many dimensions are set out in Figure 4.

Dimension of Human Security	Main theme of each dimension	Symptoms of insecurity (risks) for each dimension of human security
Environmental	right to preservation of their life and health and to dwell in a safe and sustainable environment	- death of rain forests - thinning of ozone layer - air pollution and acid rain - freshwater contamination and depletion - land degradation and erosion - food insecurity - damage to oceans - epidemics and disease - threats to the genetic pool - dangers to the Green Revolution - hazardous waste
Cultural	preserving and enhancing the ability to control uncertainty and fear	- crisis (not crash) of civilizations - mindless incrementalism (short term fixes) - hegemony of neoclassical economics - crisis of learning and crisis of ideas - impractical pragmatism (short term fixes) - abandonment of politics (no voice, laws that favor transnational corporations) - lack of moral obligations and human responsibilities - Westernization - telecommunications, transportation, information technology, media control
Political	right to representation, freedom and autonomy, participation and dissent combined with empowerment to make choices with a reasonable probability to effect change. This includes protection from abuse, access to justice and legal-juridical security.	- spread of conflict - terrorism and counter terrorism - crime and counter crime - neoliberalism - neofascism

Figure 4 - Multidimensional concept of human security (extrapolated from Nef, 1999)

Social	freedom from discrimination based on age, gender, race, ethnicity or social status. This means access to information, freedom to associate and access to safety nets. Access to integrated and strong communities	- population growth - migration - refugee flows - hyberurbanization - decline of communities and civil society
Economic	access to employment and resources needed to maintain one's existence, reduce scarcity and improve material quality of life in community	- persistent and expanding poverty - crisis of economic growth - debt crisis - deteriorating terms of trade - down side of global competition - unemployment and underemployment
Personal	cooperation, cohabitation and personal responsibility for own, and collective security, leads to continuity of individual lives, transmission of collective knowledge, and provision of food, medical, shelter as well as physical protection from injury or death	- weapons of mass destruction - family in crisis or transition - violence in the home - isolation and disconnectedness from collective - excessive consumerism - illiteracy

The notion of human security should resonate loudly with those people attending the conference who are concerned with well-being. Fleck (1980) set out four functions of families related to the four traditional aspects of well-being: (a) provide physical necessities (food, clothing, shelter); (b) facilitate physical, intellectual and emotional development of members; (c) provide every opportunity for every family member to be happy and successful; and (d) provide a chance for every member to be contented and close to all other family members. Respectively, using Brown's (1993) model of well-being, these refer to efficiency in management and control over things in the home (economic and physical well-being), and to interpersonal relations and personality development within the family (social and psychological well-being). McGregor and Goldsmith's (1998) earlier discussion of well-being also included the spiritual, the environmental and personal autonomy - the political. These dimensions of family well-being are evident in Nef's (1999) conceptualization of global human security.

Spiritual well-being. Schneider (1994) and Redfield (1996) parallell three prevailing idealogies from which we "see the world and families": pre-industrial revolution (scriptures and elders), the industrial revolution (scientific method) and the post-industrial revolution (spiritual fulfilment and evolution). Spiritual well-being is an emerging aspect of family well-being that was originally intended to be part of our profession under the auspices of aesthetics and spiritual conditions (Baldwin, 1996; Brown, 1993; Bubolz & Sontag, 1988). It has not received much

attention but should no longer be ignored. It captures a layer of well-being, a sense of insight and ethereal, intangible evolution, hope and faith not readily imparted by either social or psychological well-being as they are conventionally defined. It also enriches the link between well-being and holistic wellness, which deals with mental, emotional and spiritual as well as physical health (Baldwin).

The spiritual aspect of well-being would encompass: the joy and sense of completeness associated with the holistic connectedness of the world, an appreciation of nature as a dynamic ecosystem, and the pure joy of living, peace and faith gained from insights and moments of growth and enlightenment (via organized Western or Eastern religion and other doctrines and creeds, New Age belief systems, even First Nation's aboriginal belief systems). While some would argue that spiritual well-being is not within the realm of home economics, others are beginning to see this aspect of well-being as central to what is missing in many families' lives hence central to home economics (Henry, 1995). Redfield (1996) and Taylor (1992) argued that humanity lost itself in creating an economic security to replace the spiritual one which it had lost, evidenced by families' attempts to fill "the gap" by resorting to over-consumption, materialism, addictions and violence.

True internal peace often eludes people because, in the hustle and bustle of day-to-day living, it is easy to forget to tend to the most private, most important part of us, our spiritual self and soul, appreciating that we all need to broaden our view of what spiritual means (Cassidy, 1995). Cassidy continued by noting that, if individuals and families derive meaning and purpose in life from "doing" and "having" rather than "being", they are in trouble since they tend to focus on themselves all the time rather than others in the home or in the larger local and global community, a sentiment espoused by Schneider (1994) and Taylor (1992). Even though the profession has skirted the subject of spiritual well-being, it may be time to consider the merits of bringing this aspect of family life into our realm of thought, if not immediately into our daily practice.

Political (personal power) well-being. Another new aspect of well-being is the personal political dimension with political referring to family and individual *empowerment and autonomy* based on moral and ethical freedom rather than, or in spite of, political government activities (Brown, 1993; Engberg, 1996; Henry, 1995; Marshall et al., 1995). Political well-being, or an internal sense of power and autonomy, is construed as being in control of one's life, being able to and having the freedom to make decisions, being aware of and able to anticipate the consequences of one's actions on one's self and others and having the skills to act on one's decisions. We equate this with empowerment and self formation in our mission statement. When this dimension of well-being is achieved, individuals no longer accept unquestioningly those practices in society that are frequently taken for granted, those practices which reinforce inequality and injustice (Henry). A concern for social and moral ethical issues are beginning to re-emerge in our practice and this has been called, by Henry, political well-being; witness the call for a contextual, moral, global holistic approach to practice espoused by Engberg (1988), McGregor (1996b), Vaines (1980) and others.

Using the human security label is a sign that governments have begun to recognize the importance of the well-being of citizens as well as the security of the state and the nation. Heinbecker (1999) elaborates further, noting that human security complements, but does not substitute for, national security; that individual human beings and communities, *rather than states*, are the measure of security; that the security of states is necessary, but not sufficient, to ensure individual well-being. This approach to family well-being places families at the forefront

of policy and government programs, dialogue and deliberations since their interest is now also in focus along with deficit, debts and military might.

Comparative Analysis of Indicators for Measuring Development

The final part of the paper shares a comparative analysis of the alternative approaches to measuring development as a way to illustrate that the family perspective, both the family as a social institution and the human family, are integral components of measuring development and must continue to be integrated into the formulas designed to capture human and social development.

ECONOMIC INDICATORS measure economic well-being and wealth- Money is the only measure of well-being recognized by conventional economies - the price of something is a measure of its value. When countries join the UN, they have to subscribe to the *System of National Accounts*. These accounts are used to measure the GDP. The **Gross Domestic Product** is the *primary indicator* or measure of economic production within a country (growth and development). It is the total dollar value of all of the goods and services made within one year. The global GDP in the mid 90s is $26 trillion and a 4% annual growth is considered alright. The GDP does NOT measure:
1. health
2. infant mortality
3. morbidity
4. suicide rates
5. crime
6. poverty
7. environmental health

Criticism - as the GDP increases, well-being does not necessarily increase along with it. We cannot assume that things are getting better (improved life conditions) just because more money is spent! Check out www.rprogress.org for a graph that makes this point.

SOCIAL INDICATORS - measure social well-being and wealth - Raising families, caring for elders, voluntary community work and much of art and culture contribute to well-being but often are done without being paid - people need to feel that their efforts are appreciated. SOCIAL HEALTH CANNOT BE MEASURED USING ECONOMIC INDICATORS. Governments resist this because many social indicators are OUTSIDE the direct realm of government influence.

Discussion of Some Alternatives to the GDP

1.   FORDHAM INDEX OF SOCIAL HEALTH - FISH http://www.ccsd.ca

2.   GENUINE PROGRESS INDICATOR - GPI http://www.rprogress.org

3.   UNITED NATIONS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDEX   UNHDI
        http://www.un.org

4. GROSS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRODUCT GSDP
   http://members.home.net/g.dufour

5. GROSS ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INDEX - GESDI
   (see above for web site)

Efforts to capture the *social* aspects

A. Fordham Index of Social Health (FISH)
Measures 16 socio-economic indicators:
1. infant mortality
2. child abuse
3. child poverty
4. teen suicide
5. drug abuse
6. high school drop-outs
7. average weekly earnings
8. unemployment
9. health insurance coverage
10. poverty among elderly
11. health insurance for elderly
12. highway deaths due to alcohol
13. homicides
14. food stamp distribution
15. housing
16. income inequality
   Since 1973, the FISH index has declined as the GDP increased in the US.
   In Canada, the FISH index has stayed constant since 1985 as the GDP increased.

B. Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)
GPI accounts for:
1. Unpaid work
2. crime
3. family breakdown
4. household work
5. volunteer work
6. income distribution
7. resource depletion
8. pollution
9. defense expenditures
10. environmental damage
11. changes in leisure time
12. life span of consumer durables and public infrastructure
13. dependence on foreign assets

Quality of life has deteriorated at an accelerating rate since 1970 - the GPI went down as the GDP went up in the US. In Canada, as the GDP went up, the GPI has not risen but has stayed constant.

C. Net Economic Welfare (NEW) Paul A. Samuelson (information not available at this time).
D. United Nations Human Development Index (UNHDI) www.un.org

<div style="border:1px solid black">

Efforts to capture the *sustainability* aspects

</div>

E. Gross Sustainable Development Product (GSDP) - measures the *cost* of growth and development
It is defined as the total value of production within a region over time and is measured using market prices for goods and services transactions in the economy. It is designed to replace the GDP. The GSDP measures:

1. economic impacts of environmental and health degradation or improvement
2. resource depletion, depreciation or appreciation or finding new resources (stocks)
3. impact of people activity on environment
4. impact of people activity on availability of resources
5. impact of people activity on economic development
6. the quality of environment, people, resources and development and impact of changes in these on the national income and wealth
7. impact of global concerns on the economy
8. welfare, quality of life and economic development of future generations
9. expenditures on pollution, health, floods, car accidents
10. the resource stocks and productive capabilities of exploited people and ecosystems
11. the impact of economic growth on biological diversity
12. impacts of social costs, health costs, on future generations and the nation's income

F. Gross Environmental Sustainable Development Index (GESDI) - **measures the *quality* of growth and development**

Over 200 indicators of non-market values (values other than money) are measure organized by four areas:

1. people - 111 (includes dimensions of social, economic, psychological, physical and spiritual indicators as well as literacy, rights, justice, diversity, community, peace and conflict, legal and political, etc)
2. available resources - 11
3. environment - 41
4. economic development - 70

The sustainability of a variable (the impact or the stress created) is comprised of:
1. the **U**rgency or need to find a solution to the stress in a reasonable period,
2. the **G**eographical context of the impact or stress,
3. the **P**ersistence or period of time that the impact will be felt at a significant level, and
4. the **C**omplexity (number of interactions) of impact between the four above quality systems.

Table 1 provides a comparative analysis of these indices and shows graphically that there is little

agreement on what to include in the measures, save for a few concepts. This does not make the work any less important, though. Also, there are other variables that are <u>not yet</u> measured in these indices, as recognized by originators of the indices:
loss of civility in communities
strength of communities
cost of commuting to work
human capital
genetic gene pool diversity
workplace environment
underground economy
life style induced disease
balance of family and work.

Table 1 - Overview of main concepts covered by alternative measures

	FISH	GPI	HDI	GSDP	GESDI
infant mortality	*		*		
child abuse	*				
child/elderly poverty	*				
teen suicide	*				
drug abuse	*				
high school drop outs	*				
unemployment and underemployment	*	*			
health insurance coverage	*				
highway deaths due to alcohol	*	*		*	
homicides/crime	*	*			
food stamp distribution	*				
housing	*				
income inequality/distribution	*	*	*		
unpaid work (household, volunteer)		*			
family breakdown		*			
resource depletion		*		*	*
pollution		*			
defense expenditures		*			
long term environmental damage		*			
changes in/loss in leisure time		*			
life span of consumer durables and public infrastructure		*			

dependence on foreign assets		*			
services (highways, streets, parks)		*			
life expectancy			*		
access to education/literacy			*	*	
achievements in health			*		
gender equity			*		
impact of current behaviors on future generations				*	
impact of people activity and economic development on environment, biodiversity				*	*
impact of current costs on future generations and nation's economy				*	
economic development					*
PEOPLE					*

References are available on request from sue.mcgregor@msvu.ca