INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE STUDIES
Vol 7, No 1, 2015 ISSN: 1309-8055 (Online)

INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS AND THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

Dr. A.J. van Niekerk
University of the Free State
Senior lecturer
niekerka@ufs.ac.za

–Abstract–

Inclusive economics (IE) or economic inclusivity is fundamental to the global challenges of inequality, systemic risk and fair governance in addressing global economic disparities. The sustainability of the global economy is developing into arguably the highest global priority. As the world become ever more a 'global village', inclusive economics is seen as an avenue that has potential for steering globalisation and global economic governance (GEG) decision-making towards greater sustainability. But IE comes with significant implications for the economy, if better understood, as it is not simply a perfect fit to the profit-driven market system. This necessitates adjustments within the international economic order.Pressure from the global civil society is increasingin order for the global economy to become more socially responsible and less purely profit-driven (capitalistic). It is therefore of critical importance to investigate what IE is – even as it evolves – and what its implications are. The question at the heart of the issue is how to advance economic inclusivity globally, as a central priority for the international economic order,in a way toensure genuine economic progress?

Key Words: Inclusive economics, globalisation, global economic governance, capitalism, inequality
JEL Classification: F02, F63, F64, P11, Q01

1. INTRODUCTION

"Economists used to think of there being a trade-off: we could achieve more equality, but only at the expense of giving up on overall economic performance. Now we realize that, especially given the extremes of inequality… and the manner in which inequality is generated, greater equality and improved economic performance are *complements*" (Stiglitz, 2013). This 'complementary-ness' is the subject of investigation in this study. The growing concern about inequality is its resultant economic exclusion – in both developing and developed countries. It raises questions about the sustainability of the current economic system. Together, modern capitalism, globalisation and global economic governance (GEG), chiefly shape and determine today'sinternational economic order. Entrenched in the neoliberal doctrine, all three are a strong influence in most economies. Although not underestimating their value and significance, these three 'shapers' have, in varying (and intensifying) ways, contributed towards generating global instabilities and inequalities, thus worsening economic exclusion (Stiglitz,2003:34). While it is an ideal, economic inclusion, instead, is not so 'straight forward' either since it introduces significant changes to current economic arrangements. However, inclusion is becoming a kind of'non-negotiable' since there are increasing limitations to current capitalism (Dierckxsens, 2000:18). The new emphasis on economic inclusivity or inclusive economics (IE) is worth exploring, especially as the quest for identifying the key drivers of genuine global economic progress is underway in a post-global financial crisis (GFC) milieu.

In light of this, the research question this paper *begins* to answer is: What does IE/ economic inclusivity mean, and what does it imply for the international economic order? The inclusivity-exclusivity paradox lies at the heart of why the global economy has 'progressed' in the past 30 years in an alarmingly unsustainable manner. The need for placing humane priorities at the center, which is the essence of economic inclusivity, is now perhaps greater than ever. Realistically, as the paperexplores, it means the need for more economic inclusion must be balanced with the equal need for growing economies – global– benefitting everyone.

2. WHAT DOES INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS COMPRISE OF?

As literature suggest, IE is more a framework of understanding than a concept that can be defined, with it mainly being an alternative discourse intrinsic to what genuine human well-being and progress should involve (Pouw& McGregor, 2014;

Daly & Cobb, 1990; Goudzwaard& De lange, 1995). In light of growing concern about the ability of the dominant neoclassical model and practice to renew/correct an economically unequal global society, IEis an attempt – as a priority focus-area – to broaden the scope for dealing with issues relative to economic exclusion. This is critical in a world where the global and the local are ever more interconnected (meaning higher shared risk and return). According to Goudzwaard& De Lange (1995: ix), these issues of exclusion are (among others): “poverty, which is spreading like a cancer in many areas of the world; ominous forms of pollution and environmental degradation; and ongoing losses in both the quantity and quality of work. Together, these realities voice an urgent appeal for reflection and for a bold new economic practice.” This is part of the motivation for more inclusive thinking in economics. Moreover, one of the key challenges is that currently the market does not value two of the most important *assets* of humanity: a supportive local (and global) community, and a healthy, productive natural environment (Daly & Cobb, 1990). The loss in community is shown by the breakdown of social cohesion due to increased crime, vandalism/rebellion, drugs, corruption, terrorism, etc. The loss through environmental degradation is leading to a resource crisis for humanity. Hence, both the threat *to human security* (in communities) and *human survival* (resources) are not recognised by our economic system. Our two main assets, community and the environment are not priced on the market. They are simply taken for granted and very often ‘wasted’ through socio-economic inequality and resource depletion. This exclusion from the market is what IE identifies and attempts to correct as it sees true economic progress as identical with an inclusive global economic order. IE brings these two assets that are essential to a sustainable economy back to the economic equation by giving it value. Whether the market does it or not, it needs to be factored into the agenda of economic priorities – as part of inclusive decision-making.

The meaning and interpretation of IE is still at an early stage of development, but it is clearly led by a reprioritisation of what should be valued in the economy. Two key developments since the 1990s are key stimuli for this discourse to advance: (1) a “growing concern in economics that presently dominant frameworks of thinking are no longer adequate to fully address and analyse the problems of today’s globalising and rapidly changing economies” (Pouw& McGregor, 2014:6); and (2) that an increasingly integrated global economy is becoming a ‘global village’ as international trade and capital flows intensify, and as technology connect people over vast distances (e.g. communication technology and the internet). The second development’s increased global interdependence as well as the limitations related to the first development opens the door for more and new ‘inclusive thinking’ in economics – which is much needed.

2.1 ECONOMIC INCLUSIVITY AND WELL-BEING

Inclusive economics (or economics of inclusion) has no specific definition as it is an evolving framework, attempting to broaden the scope for meaningful economic participation and recognition. Some descriptions and new emphases seek to give context to this ‘broadening’. For instance, as Stiglitz (2007:18) states: “it is about broadening the growth base; about addressing the social characteristics and economic fundamentals of human well-being, not just welfare.” Whereas welfare mainly refers to income, well-being is a more holistic concept, as Coulthard*et al.* (2011:6) defines it: “an outcome that is continuously generated through conscious and sub-conscious participation in social, economic, political and cultural processes.” The *shift to well-being* is central to IE and coincides with a new emphasis on values in the economy. However, a distinction need to be made since not all values have a positive impact on well-being. Kasser (2011) explains that such values are ‘extrinsic and self-enhancement’ (or materialistic values) and include wealth, possessions, status, image, etc., and are features of today’s profit-driven economy. It is also associated with more discriminatory attitudes and behaviour – especially towards the poor. Contrary to this, humane values that improve well-being and is ‘intrinsic/self-transcendent’ values, are based on personal freedom, affiliation and community (strong relations with family and friends), and acting for the benefit of the common good, and genuine progress and well-being. As Kasser (2011) stress, these values encourage empathy, solidarity and care for others and the environment. This set of values IE sees as a central requirement to an equitable and sustainable economy. A realignment at the level of values must bring about a drastic change in particularly the development paradigm. This means an enhanced understanding of development in terms of the interplay of individuality and sociality, of individual initiative and social integration, of individual autonomy and social cohesion (Verstappen, 2011). This is an economics of well-being that is inclusive (even of the unpaid economy) and where *reciprocity* functions as a key allocation mechanism.

With IE, therefore, the three dimensions/types of individual and collective well-being – material, cognitive/subjective and relational (e.g. community) – are holistically assimilated in a value-driven economy, geared towards reducing the trade-offs between the different types of well-being. Synergies (between collective and individual well-being) and empowerment (better decisions for better quality of life) become primary goals. Verstappen (2011:6) also identifies family relationships, work, friends, health, personal freedom, and spiritual expression as all essentials of well-being. Stiglitz*et al.* (2009) concur with this multi-dimensional understanding of well-being, and adds to this list: education; political voice and governance; and reducing existential/survival-insecurity.Regarding IE from a business perspective, Vasudev (2013) underlines that "big business is not about profit but expansion; expansion is inclusion. Inclusive economics is a way of empowerment of the whole of humanity to participate in a robust and all-inclusive economic process (including quality education and health care)." The objective is to contribute to a *common good* in society that benefits the company and the whole community. The common good refers to what is in the best interest of humanity (or a community) as a whole; that which is optimal in the context of the 'shared interest' and holistic well-being (Daly & Cobb, 1990). As regards the 'global village', this is of specific application if steering the global economy towards greater sustainability is of highest importance. As the Stiglitz Commission's report (2009) proposed, a more encompassing welfare concept is greatly needed. This asks for a broader definition of the economy to capture and include the economic realities of people on the ground as well as what broader changes in the economy are required for genuine progress, not just growth.

2.2 INCLUSIVE GROWTH ESSENTIAL TO INCLUSIVE ECONOMICS

As Fourie (2014:2) highlights, the concept of inclusive growth – while being without a definitive description– "attempts to define a broader concept of economic growth that incorporate equity and the well-being of all sections of the population – notably the poor, with poverty being considered either in absolute terms (poverty reduction) or relative terms (the reduction of inequality)." Klasen (2010:15) identified two distinctive features for the inclusive growth process: it *must be* expressly non-discriminatory; and be expressly disadvantage-reducing. This is to ensure that no-one is excluded and that poor people experience a quicker rise in well-being than non-poor people. By evaluating the nature of growth and the process of growth, inclusive growth is essential to inclusive economics, although the latter is a wider concept that combines growth aspects mentioned, as well as inclusive development. Notably, IE also emphasises 'organic growth' in which the unique and significant function of all participants in the production process are valued and equitably rewarded. By way of illustration, Goudzwaard (1996:11) uses the analogy of a blossoming[1] tree (vs. a traffic tunnel that squeezes everything in one direction). Unlike the tunnel where every car tries to get to the end of the tunnel (profit) ahead of others as quickly as possible, a blossoming tree *does not* use exclusion to grow. All cells (e.g. economic agents,benefactors, etc.) are involved in the process of organic growth, and they assist in that process as their function is valued. Growth is in the form of *expansion* and well-being, not just one-directional (only profits). The natural, inbuilt 'formula' in the tree (community) ensures consistent growth and replenishing (sustainability).

Concerning this, Goudzwaard& De Lange (1995:56) assert that "what applies to the environment applies equally to human work, namely, that if we do not take care of it, if we treat it only instrumentally, then inevitably we have created a fundamental economic loss." Human labour is more than a means of production or just another economic object; it is an *object of care*. IE, through an economy of care, helps to curtail the profit-driven emphasis and redirect it towards organic growth principles in a shared responsibility economy. This means more than just investing in people (workers), it means including them in a participative process. Growth is pursued, but with a holistic human-centered focus, not a singular profit-centered focus. So, IE takes the discipline back to its roots toredisover/revisit its original purpose to help the global community refocus for 21st century challenges.

2.3 LEARNING FROM THE PAST – ORIGINS OF ECONOMICS

From an etymological viewpoint the word economics was originally derived from the Greek 'oikonomos' (15th century) and later the Latin of 'oeconomos'. The French gave its modern version, 'économie'. The original meaning of economics in the Greek means household/home (*oikos*) and management/distribute (*nemein*) (Daly & Cobb, 1990:141). It refers to how people earn income and resources and how it is spent on necessities, luxuries and comforts, with primary consideration for the household/community collectively. Over time, the description *oikonomos* was used for taking care of an economy as a whole – i.e. how a nation (like a household) take action to meet its needs and preferences with the aid of the resources at its disposal. For this stewardship of resources everyone takes

[1]Blossoming, Goudzwaard (1996:11) says, refers to "the possibility of including everyone in a meaningful form of labour; preventing the destruction of the environment; and creating the possibility of satisfying the real basic needs of people, both socially and culturally, with all members of community included."

collective responsibility (since it needs to be coordinated), but it was under central oversight (e.g. by the government/designated authority). Adam Smith, the 'father of modern economics', wrote the *Wealth of Nations* only later, in the 18th century (1776). The context he gave to the concept of economics was in emphasising the importance of the free market (Smith, 1776) and that the value of something (to be traded) is determined by its price, which moved away from the earlier meaning of *oikonomos*towards wealth accumulation and maximisation. The change is significant. In order to revitalise the science, IE re-emphasises its original meaning. *Oikonomos* underlines the importance of 'family' or societal belonging – a group-mindset in contrast to capitalism's 'individual-mindset'. Self-interest exists but not at the expense of shared interest as care is highly valued and practiced. Ironically, globalisation and neoclassical thinking with its interdependency tendencies have brought economics back to where, again, 'household-principles'*could be* adopted in the 'global village'. We have become a global community. Globalisationintensified global economic integration and have 'drawn closer' the functioning of, and relatedness within, the global economy. However, paradoxically, global interdependence increased but economic inclusion decreased due to inequality (Stiglitz, 2013). Modern-day *oikonomos* increases the need for shared values and principles that bring greater economic equality and participation. It challenges today's capitalism, because in a household, competition is not the main aim, collaboration for 'expanding' the common good is. Collaboration is favoured above hierarchy. In a household one is not better off when the rest are worse off; you are only better off when everyone is also better off – a result of caring, not competition per se. Greed is then seen as 'uneconomic' and not part of the 'economic framework', and thus unacceptable. Inclusivity (and the common good) is hereby advanced through a commitment to values like justice, good stewardship (and shared benefits), communal solidarity and environmental sustainability.

This original meaning of the word economics is a 'caring administration'. From this Goudzwaard& De Lange (1995:80) derived the concept of *care economics*, which naturally speaks of economic inclusivity. This type of economics explicitly takes as its first priority the real needs of people. The emphasis is 'pre-care' – which include an economics of the poor and of the carrying capacity of our environment (to sustain life on earth). It is an economy that puts care needs first on its priority list, which then determines the order of *what* needs to be produced. This is contrary to satisfying people's rising luxury needs (and greed) first, from which arguably higher profits can be generated (but which arguably adds to crisis-proneness due to debt implications). Care economics also redirects the focus away

from the pursuit of more and more material prosperity measured in money terms. Economic needs/ends include more than what production on the market can meet and therefore also include various forms of non-market production (e.g. in the unpaid economy). They also include, as part of the more holistic view of a person, minimum levels of care to ensure the sustainability of: the environment; human communities; and employment opportunities and quality of work (Goudzwaard& De Lange, 1995:88).
Significantly, these principles will involve a reprioritisation of basic subsistence needs over luxury needs within humanity. Goudzwaard& De Lange (1995:137) importantly point out that “a pre-care economy includes rather than excludes people; it internalises and takes responsibility for its effects rather than expels them to other sectors of society; and it practices restraint and replenishes rather than extracts.” We need ecological balance to go hand in hand with economic balance. In a care economy the classic principle of *reciprocity* is central and the most appropriate mode of exchange (Vel, 1994:247). This reciprocity is in the context of cooperative coordination where consumption, production and resource allocation occurs in a way in which a *sharing* takes place between personal interest and common interest (i.e. of the local community, nation and/or global community, depending in what context). It is the product of an economy of caring and sharing, which sees richness first and foremost, yet not exclusively, as a wealth of human interaction/relationships (the collective). Profits and wealth creation are encouraged in the context of generating mutual benefits for the ‘sharing’ of personal and common interest. This caretaking-mindset and principles then shapes the economic behaviour and decision-making of all economic role players in favour of the common good. The reciprocal accountability of every economic agent, with IE, must form the *basis* of any society oriented towards economic care and sustainability. Clearly, this introduces a challenging new set of values for the economy.

Growth and profits are promoted (in the market), but not at the expense of human value or environmentalruin. Here, importantly, an authentic economy of care, as with IE, relates to the concept of an *economy of enough*. This means there needs to be some level of ‘economic saturation’ by counting the cost (to humanity) of excessive production and consumption, and it needs to be vigorously reduced. Mechanisms/indicators that warn/protect against this ‘level’ should be key signposts in an economy of enough. Giving central priority to this is at the heart of economic inclusivity and accurately reflects the underlying principles of *oikonomos*. Maintaining the functioning of an economy in the space between the ‘level of saturation’ and the ‘optimum level’, should be a responsibility shared by all stakeholders. This is especially valuable in a small community context. For example, first, all activities which are needed are divided in such a way that everyone in the community can take part in it, so nobody is left out, unless some are unable to partake (Diwan& Lutz, 1985:82). The 'fruits' of the labour are then distributed equitably according to everyone's contribution. Hereby, equal opportunity leads to equitable profit-sharing and income. The opportunity 'creators' (entrepreneurs) are hence compensated by those making the most of the opportunity they took. This is an economy of inclusion orientated away from greed, towards need. Notably, this can be viewed and applied as a microcosm of the macrocosm – the global community. Goudzwaard(1996) underlines that an 'economy of enough' is based on some restraint: either the restraint of a restricted rise in the general level of income and consumption – as could be applied to the richest countries – or a restraint that requires a percentage of any potential investment to be used for purposes other than pure production. The emphasis here is for it to be used for the common good, benefiting all involved/affected. This negates the 'price' – a price paid by all for the excessive human material desires of only some (having theirs satisfied). In the global context this 'shared economy'-approach is even more meaningful.

Lastly, in clarifying the root-meaning ofeconomics and IE, it also needs to be clarified what is meant by 'inclusivity', and how does it apply to the international economic order? The Oxford Dictionary (2010) defines inclusivity as: "being part of the whole; not excluding any section of society; holistic approach; deals fully and inclusively with all issues; cooperating; incorporating (making part of); shared identity; shared concern." This points to an integrative mindset, but needs to be qualified in the IE-context. It means: developing equitable opportunities for participants during economic growth, with benefits acquired by every segment of society. In this way, sustainable economic growth thus requires inclusive growth. So, does inclusiveness mean equity? Empowerment? Opportunities? Satisfaction?Participation? One would perceive that it will continue to involve a combination of these, as the conceptual evolution of 'inclusiveness' in IEprogresses.

Notably, for the IE context, it must take account of the *interrelationships* among growth, inequality, poverty and human well-being. This should be in a way that it does not merely add more priorities to the economic 'heap', but that it helps to sequence priorities (based on values) and decision-making focused on building a truly responsible economy that takes care of everyone in an equitable manner – to the benefit of the whole of society. This operationalising of both the description of 'inclusivity' and the proper understanding of IE are crucial for policy objectives and for tangible change to be seen in the economy – both global and domestic. In terms of the international economic order, 'inclusivity' predominantly refers to: increased participation by countries in supra-national decision-making processes; equitable opportunities for market access; and non-discriminatory international trade and investment practices. This, of course, is part and partial of IE's *stewarding* view of resources within the global community.

3. TOWARDS A CAPITALISM OF INCLUSION

Inclusive economics indeed brings new principles and values to the modern market economy in order to function firstly, for the purpose of producing sufficient common goods, and secondly, for producing to provide for the more specific needs of individual consumers and investors. Profit-drivenness is thus organically steered towards satisfying shared needs above (but not at the expense of) luxury wants in society (Goudzwaard& De Lange, 1995:85). In a global economy context, the global community's shared needs should be the first priority of the market as it is valued the most – to ensure a drastic reduction in inequality/economic exclusion, and a more sustainable economic management of the two vital assets of (a healthy): community and natural environment.

More specifically, growth, profits, the market and other core features of the current economic framework is to be refocused and build around the human-centric principles of equity, sustainability and genuine progress (Dierckxsens, 2000:101). In becoming more and more like a 'global village' through globalisation and increased global economic interdependency, a change in the international economic order would be much like installing new 'house rules' (*oikonomos*). This, however, cannot be done overnight and needs to be phased in, having both, what is practical and what is important, to an equal degree in mind – in policy-making, economic planning, and economic decision-making. As we all know, a large ship turns slowly, which emphasises that the economic change IE intends to bring is *evolutionary* in nature, not revolutionary. This means that incremental but deliberate steps are taken to alter what drives the economy in order to reconstruct a healthy, sustainable economy. Notably, this does not imply the abolition of the market, competition, or of economic growth as a key priority. Rather an optimisation of themis intended – oriented towards genuine economic progress – of which greater economic inclusivity is integral.

4. A SHARED GLOBAL ECONOMIC GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

While it has been a challenge for the institutions of GEGto steer globalisation due to its multi-dimensionality, still a more inclusive and effective framework was expected (Stiglitz, 2003:55). The Bretton Woods-institutions – the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) – have had limited success with their structural adjustment programmes, while the trading regime taken ‘forward’ by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) since 1995 has also not been successful at garnering a truly fair trading landscape (Stiglitz, 2003:69). These are subjects that sparks severe reactions from civil society and non-governmental organisations around the world, particularly due to the increase in global inequality and resource degeneration due to a profit-making global economy. In her well-researched book, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*, Naomi Klein takes capitalism as a system to task, as she states that: “our economy is at war with many forms of life on earth, including human life. What the climate needs to avoid collapse is a contraction in humanity’s use of resources; what our economic model demands to avoid collapse is unfettered expansion. Only one of these sets of rules can be changed, and it’s not the laws of nature” (Klein, 2014:21). It is up to the institutions of GEG and other supra-national bodies (including the G7 and G20) to steer the global economy and globalisation in the direction of making a truly sustainable economy possible. Inclusivity in decision-making and how the economy functions will increasingly become critical, and a participative global governance model non-negotiable. The question is not *if* but *how*; and this is where the principles of IE could become most valuable – if embraced by the global economy (i.e. the context within which GEG can function).

It seems inevitable that GEG will gravitate more towards a shared governance framework. Power is moving to the people and corporates. On the question of who will effect change in the economy, it should be noted that informed and motivated citizens (at the very least) are powerful agents of change – especially given the global civil society’s ever more organisedpressurising of governments and multinational companies (Verstappen, 2011:8). Each global crisis fuels a new and creative wave of social mobilisation, and is facilitated by social media and networks (Castells, 2010:365). Challenging the dominant discourse is becoming a common trend as the lack of political will – rather than wealth – is seen as the main reason why deficient resource-investment is directed towards the improvement of human well-being. That is why innovative global governance partnerships across sectors are essential for building a transparent and accountable governance structure. Conflict of interests in an inclusive GEG should be seen as an *opportunity* to find new ways forward.

A new TINA is arising as 'there is no alternative' but for the economic system to show more respect to society and the environment. Models, mindsets and goals have to adjust to the fact that quality of life can only be realised collectively – as a global community. This fits perfectly well with the underlying fundamentals of IE, which underlines care and taking co-responsibility for the economy – and the global economy. It is something GEG will rapidly need to adjust/reform to. This inclusive mindset is not just what globalisation has brought us to (a global village), but is what is now a minimum requirement for a sustainable economy. Sacrifices are inevitable, one way or another, but the sooner an inclusive economy of enough is implemented, the faster capitalism and global governance can be set on the right track, benefitting all.

5. CONCLUSION

Two critical realities the world need to come into full understanding in the 21st century is that we have now (1) become a global community, and (2) reached a point where environmental resources cannot sustain our 'supercapitalism' (Reich, 2007:149). IE is a systemic approach to economics that 'care-fully' employ the interdependency within the international economic order. A kind of symbiotic co-responsibility-taking is pursued in an effort to 'upgrade' the market system. Counterintuitively, IE synchronises well with the contemporary climate of modernisation and globalisation. This is especially given the organic formation of a 'global village' due to increased social and economic integration within human civilisation – interdependencies increase despite vast global inequalities. By reintroducing 'oikonomos', IE brings the economy back to an appreciation of two fundamentalactualities: that we are *social beings* (part of community) and that we are *natural beings* (part of nature, as we need it for survival). This responsible emphasis comes at a time when the world (and an unequal global economy) is most challenged yet most 'ready', having become a global village. Setting it apart from the current economic framework, IE/economic inclusivity speaks of more than just economic growth (GDP), but of genuine economic progress. IE is about more than just welfare; it is about well-being in its many dimensions, holistically.

IE goes beyond merely the dichotomy of poverty and affluence; it incites advancement towards a sustainable economy of care.This implies a more equitable and inclusive economy, where economic efficiency is based on humane values. While it is true that our human nature of selfishness (greedy self-interest)

lies at the root of modern-day problems we face with capitalism, it is also true that in human nature lies the answers to these problems. As IEbrings to the fore, we are also a *caring people* that make economic decisions in the interest of others – especially the group (family and/or community) we belong to/connect with – if it is truly valued. So the question is how do we bring back/integrate these values in our economic thinking and practice? Economic efficiency needs the balancing side of humane values – and this is the evolutionary thinking required in modern economics, which economic inclusivity brings to the table.
Human-centered values must guide a mechanistic economy towards a caring economy of inclusive co-responsibility. Economic policy choices cannot bepoliticised and have to remain purely economic. Economics and morality must now take hands to establish just values that ensure sustainable equity – not as a byproduct but as a fixed objective. No civilisation can call itself *moral* if it fails to defend the defenseless. If there are concerns about the economy having to make subjective value judgments in favour of one group above another by employing IE, then the answer lies in reclassifying it. For instance, as Goudzwaard and De Lange (1995:85) suggest: “instead of actually using ethical categories such as ‘right’ or ‘wrong,’ we must state that luxury needs tend to become *uneconomic* when we satisfy them at the expense of meeting the basic needs of others.”

Inequality is now becoming not just an economic issue, but also a moral issue (Klein, 2014). Hence, the economy, or economics as a science, should not just incorporate more humane values, it should take up its potential to now become an instrument of morality to restore rightful justice to inequity. With privilege comes responsibility. That is the essence of what *oikonomos* is about. New ‘house rules’ that take care. Any responsible economy requires an economy of care that does not rely on merely the ‘trickle-down’ effect of the market and inconsistent income redistribution, but one that actively advances individual and collective well-being though a shared responsibility model. This means not just growth, profits and a well-functioning market. More than efficiency is required. Efficiency should complement care-taking, and not overpower it, to ensure equitability in the economy. As the paper points out, an increasing number of economists (many, leading economists such as Joseph Stiglitz, Sen and Krugman) agree that a new economics that more holistically advances well-being is an absolute necessity.

The global village has also brought about a stronger interdependency between the levels of governance in the global economy –national, regional and supra-national governance. Good relationships are required for coordinating the implementation of IE-principles. Within this interlocking framework relationships become key as well as the functionality of caring- co-responsibility principles among participants. Hence, together with IE, the real challenge for GEG today is not just how to enable people to live well, but to enable us to live well together in an equitable 'global village' (collective well-being). This article has broken open only the top-level fallow ground as far as turning the economy's inequality-tendency around into greater inclusivity (as a corrective measure). It has also shown that our understanding of economic inclusivity, and how to integrate it into our economic models, is still quite limited. There is therefore, without a doubt, a great need for more research on how to achieve and measure genuine economic progress – especially in the context of inclusivity. This study attempted to identify key basic characteristics and contexts to *start* laying foundations for a more inclusive economic framework, which is vital for future economic sustainability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coulthard, Sarah, Derek Johnson and Alistair McGregor (2011), "Poverty, Stustainability and Human Wellbeing: A Social Wellbeing Approach to the Global Fischeries Crisis",*Global Environmental Change*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 453-463.

Daly, Herman and John Cobb (1990), For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Towards Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future, London: Green Print.

Castells, Manuel (2010),The Rise of the Network Society (2nd ed.), London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dierckxsens, Wim (2000),The Limits of Capitalism: An Approach to Globalization without Neoliberalism, New York: Zed Books.

Diwan, Romesh and Mark Lutz (1985), Essays in Gandhian Economics, London: Apt Books.

Fourie, Frederick (2014),"How Inclusive is Economic Growth in South Africa?"*Econ3x3*, September, pp. 1-8

Goudzwaard, Bob and Harry de Lange (1995), Beyond Poverty and Affluence: Toward an Economy of Care, Geneva: WCC Publications.

Kasser, Tim (2011),"Values and Human Well-being – Bellagio Initiative",*Institute of Development Studies Working Paper 435*, Illinois: Knox College.

Klasen, Stephen (2010),"Measuring and Monitoring Inclusive Growth: Multiple Definitions, Open Questions, and Some Constructive Proposals",*Sustainable Development Working Paper 12*, Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Klein, Naomi (2014), This Changes Everything: Climate vs. Capital, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Oxford Dictionary (2010), Oxford Dictionary of English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pouw, Nicky and Alistair McGregor (2014),"An Economics of Wellbeing: What Would Economics Look Like ifit were Focused on Human Wellbeing?"*Institute of Development StudiesWorking Paper* 436, London: IDS.

Reich, Robert (2007),Supercapitalism: The Transformation of Business, Democracy, and Everyday Life, New York: Vintage Books.

Smith, Adam (1776),An Inquiry into the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations, London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.

Stiglitz, Joseph (2003),Globalisation and Its Discontents,New York: Norton.

Stiglitz, Joseph, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi (2009), "Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performanceand Social Progress",*French Government*, pp. 1-292.

Stiglitz, Joseph (2013),The Price of Inequality, New York: Norton.

Vasudev, Sugi (2013),*Inclusive Economics Enabled by Inner Engineering*, https://www.ishafoundation.org/news/newsclips/Inclusive%20Economics.pdf, [Accessed 3.3.2015]

Vel, Jacqueline (1994),"*The Uma-Economy, Indegenous Economics and Development Work in Lawonda, Sumba*", PhD Dissertation, Wageningen: Netherlands.

Verstappen, Stefanie (2011),"The Bellagio Initiative Online Consultation: The Inclusive Economy",*The Broker*, November, pp. 1-8.