7.1.1. INEQUALITY

Equality of what and why has to be defined in ethical term. They are interdependent.

Dictionary meaning of equality is, as noun, the equality or state of being equal. We have to find out equality in economic terms.

Ethically, equality analysis should know by way of asking the question (1) Why and (2) What. The both parameters are separate in its' own nature but interdependent of each other. Equality of what is income, wealth, opportunities, achievements, freedom, rights etc. Why will be answered automatically in examination of the above parameters. Equality will be examined by way of standard of comparison. The poor man is considered for this examination. Equality of some thing requires the norms in theory for social arrangements. The subject matter of theory may be diverse and may clash with each other but it remains common in all theories i.e. equality.

Many economists gave thought on equality in political philosophy say John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin, Thomas Nagel etc. Some economists have disputed the case of equality on the other grounds. Robert Nozick, demands equality for libertarian rights, James Buchanan, thinks of equal legal and political treatment. Harsanyi gave same weight to all individuals' interests. Hare thought giving equal weight to the equal interest of all the parties.¹

Utilitarian considers equality as maximization of the sum-total of the utilities of all the people taken together. This means that the gain or loss in utility will be equal to all people. Here the equal weight meant for every one in terms of utility. Egalitarian believes in social, economical and political equality among human being. Utilitarian means the aims of actions or social policy

¹ Amartya Sen, inequality re-examined page.13.
should be the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Here the interest of both approaches coincides in to each other. In particular case, when we define equality in terms of some space than it is different to each other.

William Letwin argued against equal distribution of income as “In as much as people are unequal, it is rational to presume that they ought to be treated unequally—which might mean larger shares for the needy or larger shares for worthy”. Here the “need” and “worth” are in definition. Need is understood. Dr. Amartya Sen explains the worth as ‘equal treatment for equal worth’. Indirectly the equality is there in terms of equal treatment for equal worth.

Harry Frankfurt speaks about ‘equality as a moral ideal’. He disputed the claims of economic egalitarianism that it is desirable for everyone to have same amounts of income and wealth. According to him (1) equality is of no great intrinsic interest and 2) it leads to the violation of important values.

7.1.2. Impartiality and equality

The point of equality of what and equality of why are equally important. It is worth while to discuss the above thing even the theory may be vague. You may not get precise results. One may not be partial for equality on this very reason. The theory needs to be explained and defended for each case.

So many different theories of the ethics of social arrangements gives the answer for why and what. Ethical theories of social arrangement demand the equality of some thing. This equality can be discussed at different levels. Dr. Amartya Sen argues that at some level, reasoning of equal consideration for all is critical. In the absence of equality; theories will become discriminative which will be difficult to defend. It is better to discuss about many variables in terms of inequality. Ethical reasoning of social arrangements is a Kantian view in a sense personal obligations or commitments but not necessarily structure.

---

3 Ibid, page no.15.
Thomas Scanlon had analyzed the power of requirement and relevance. According to him “One should be able to justify one’s action to others on grounds that they could not reasonably reject”. This gives us the basis of fairness of justice. This is a matter of equality in between two individuals. This implies condition of acceptance. The impartiality and universalizability are the general requirement in foundations of ethics on reasoning. Dr. Amartya Sen says John Rawls (1971) has build up the theory of justice on the preposition of fairness.4

“Impartiality” is the demand of universal. Here the impartiality is in a sense of equality. The point is the plausibility of equal consideration at some level is important in political or social circumstances. Equality has to be considered at some level to defend theory, judgment and claims. Now it is to be decided that it is a logical requirement or a substantive demand. This type of reasoning is the foundation of ethics. The point is equality proves for inequality. This is more important in the case of space. This may be former in equality and later in inequality but with in same circle.

7.1.3. Human diversity and basic equality

One human being is different from another human being. We have different external appearances and endowments. Let us start the discussion with his wealth and liabilities. We live in a hostile environment than other; different opportunity in society and community as well as health is prime concern. We differ from natural, social and environmental characteristics and in personal characteristics say age, sex, physical and mental ability. These are the factors help us to examine inequality. Say two people are having the same income. One is disable person and another is able. In such case, the disable person will not be in a position to compete the able person. This is a matter of inequality. The variable of income takes us to another variable of functioning ability. Like this there are many variables which give us the idea of advantage and disadvantage. The plurality of variables takes us to the interpersonal inequality. The choice of evaluative space will be a problem.

4 Ibid, page no.18
Human diversity takes us from equality to another inequality. This means from income to health, well-being and happiness.

Dr. Amartya Sen says Author Nozick is in favour of liberation right than inequality. We accept this than we can not talk about welfare equality. We accept equal right than we can not think of income, utilities, wellbeing and positive freedom. We try to prove the inequality through equality. We should select such a “base” that can give us the equality and impartiality between individuals. Equality of what will endorse the equality in space which will have far reaching consequences on distribution pattern of other space.

7.1.4. Equality verses liberty?

We can put liberty against equality. The conflict is in between equality and liberty is nature of political philosophy and political economy. Robert Nozick is considered as anti-egalitarian because he emphasis liberty than equality. Dalton, Meade and Tawney are egalitarian because they thought for demands of equality.5 You can not distinguish the equality and liberty in above manner. The next thought is who, how much, how distributed and how equal. Here the distribution of right is important. The equality of liberty comes in picture. Equality and liberty are not two opposite things but one can see as supplementary to each other. The possibility is you think one variable as income and another person think a variable as liberty. Income and liberty requires equality. Liberty may be possible field of application in equality and equality can be a possible pattern of distribution of liberty.

We have to select “SPACE” and to fix item say income. We include other things with income than ‘space’ becomes broader. The diversity of spaces will give different views. These different views will help to assess amongst each other’s space. This assessment will give different views of equality.

Now we can say about inequality of income; on one side liberty and on other side equality in terms of achievement and freedom to achieve. The study will have many fold consequences.

5 Ibid, page no.21.
7.1.5. Plurality and alleged emptiness

Plurality of spaces generates doubt about the idea of equality. This should not reduce equality as the political force of idea at the same time. Can demand be considered as serious as many voices speak for equality? Douglas Rae said 'one idea that is more powerful than order or efficiency or freedom in resisting equality'. The equality is itself so powerful that it resists itself.

Weston said equality is empty. The very idea of equality is empty. Equality has many interpretations. Equality can not be taken as truly substantive demand. Equality of what will remove emptiness. The general requirement of the need of the value in some space is not empty. This relates impartiality and equality. This will help in evaluative system and in basal equality.

Dalton was in favour of transfer of income. This is known as "Dalton principle of transfer". He thought for distribution of income in poor people collected from rich. Small portion of income transferred from a richer person to a poorer one will help. Equality is imposed in the form of ranking pattern. Here the total amount remains unchanged. The transfer of portion of income is a distributive improvement in society. This is a general requirement of equality without disturbing other space index or measure.

After deciding the space, if space may have broader choice than it will demand equality. The choice of space has motivation to demand equality say for example-evaluating justice or social welfare or living standard or quality of life will not be formal but substantive discrimination.

In equality, diversity of space will give different solution of different variable in the advantage of individual. This will show how it is advantageous to different people in each other context of spaces. The plurality shows different views with equality and information base. The plurality of choice of space is equally applicable to 'efficiency' also. Efficiency as individual utility

---

6 Ibid, page no.23.
7 Ibid, page no.24.
in welfare economics gets converted into “Pareto optimality”.\(^8\) Efficiency can be considered for liberty and any other item of space. Efficiency is comparable with other variable. This is polarity of notion of efficiency. The plurality of space really reflects diversity to individual advantage and on informational base for interpersonal comparison.

### 7.1.6. Means and freedoms

In case of demand, based on norms and social arrangement equality requires in one or other space. This is a ‘Basel equality’ which has effects on other spaces in distributive system. Basel equality in one space will be directly responsible for inequality in other space. In modern political philosophy and economics, the most prominent name is “John Rawls”, who talks about choice of space and its’ consequences in theory of justice. Individual is holding the primary goods as here the efficiency and equality are analyzed. This is known as the “difference of principle”.\(^9\)

Inherited wealth and talent would not generate income as the Nozick, in egalitarian approach and Rawls, in difference principle considers the Basel equality. The primary goods and wellbeing vary due to the personal diversity. This will be a hurdle to convert into achievement. Example- Pregnant woman will be uncomfortable compared to man of same age and same income and other primary goods. The efficiency of pregnant woman will differ to a person having other things as equal. Similarly the primary goods and freedom will differ in achieving objectives. The relation between primary goods and freedom may vary in interpersonal and intergroup variations.

Apart from individual diversity, the group as men and women is having contrasts. The pregnant woman has less freedom and wellbeing even though same primary goods. These differences are visible in case of interpersonal and inter-group variation of specific characteristics. Inequality

---

\(^8\) Ibid, page no.25.

differs in interpersonal relations with different spices even though it is interconnected.

Human diversity gives scope to examine the inequality. Egalitarianism is due to inequality in different spaces. The same different spaces are the ethical point of inequality in human diversity.

7.1.7. Income distribution, wellbeing and freedom

Human is diverse due to physical features and social things in many ways. It is difficult to accommodate this diversity in evaluative frame work of inequality. The analysis of inequality is mainly in relation to Income. Now what we can and cannot do and to get or not to get our achievement depends, apart from income, in physical and social characteristics. The deprivation of physically handicap person is more than able person in spite of equal income. The real inequality is in opportunity and not income. The handicap person is not in a position to convert his income in to achievement. This will happen due to 1) there are other means available 2) interpersonal variation in means and ends.

Atkinson proposed social loss of equivalent income in his "inequality indices". This is very broad assumption. This is not possible for practical purposes as we agree about heterogeneity of human in society. This approach is useful in integrating income inequality considerations for overall evaluation of social welfare. The negative point is it does not take into account the difficulties of some people to convert the income in well-being and freedom. The positive point is to consider the inequality in distribution of income and not level of well-being.

7.2. FREEDOM, ACHIVEMENT AND RESOURCES

7.2.1. Freedom and choice

A position of a person in society can be seen in two ways

\[\text{ibid, page no.29}\]
(1) The actual achievement (2) freedom to achieve. Actual Achievement is past. Freedom to achieve is future. You have to achieve some thing in coming time. Inequality has to be examined from achievement and freedom to achieve point of view. This is applicable to efficiency also.

Freedom achieved and freedom to achieve is for social evaluation. You can judge the achievement in terms of utility, or opulence or quality of life. Further it is important to know difference between 1) extent of achievement and 2) the freedom to achieve. Individual advantage and good social order are concern for achievement only and freedom to achieve is mean. Utilitarian believes only in interpersonal comparison and utility achievement.

Bergson-Samuelson social welfare function draws the attention toward the achievement and that too in individual freedom as an achievement. 11 Arrovian social-choice frame work thinks in term of individual preference over state of affairs and not the freedom to choose the affairs.12

Achievement and to achieve are two different things. To achieve indicates the lot of happening in future for freedom. Achievement shows the past and no future prospective to improve upon it. This both approaches are partial. It has definite connection to combine for welfare of individual and society. The past will show us the way and future will show to achieve it. Recent development in social choice theory emphasizes on freedom in specific value of liberty.

Primary goods give us the ownership idea and resources give the idea about future achievement. This will make a difference for equality. It will be an assessment of freedom. Dr.Amartya Sen is of the opinion that the primary goods or resources are the cause towards freedom but if you look in term of utility it is freedom away from achievement.

The point is to equalize the freedom to all is not correct as conversion of these things have variations. Variation can be simply due to physical condition and in complex nature-say under nourishment may not solve even

---

11 ibid, page no.32.
12 Ibid, page no.32.
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though the same primary goods and resources with two persons, one may
be free to avoid under nourishment and another may not. These people
think in different ways. One thinks for present where as another person
thinks for his future wellbeing.

7.2.2. Real income, opportunities and selection

The real income interpreted in two ways 1) Achievement 2) freedom. Real
income can be defined as a person receives benefit from particular bundle
of commodity. "Is X a better bundle for this person than Y bundle?"13 You
have comparison amongst bundles can be called as 'selection'. Now person
can buy budget set A or budget set B than it is 'options view'. Person has
liberty to buy more than one bundle from his income. In comparison to
'selection view', 'optimal view' is superior in a sense that it gives possibility
to choose from budget set A as well as budget set B inter alias. This is
known as 'revealed preference' in real income. The reason thought gives you
freedom to choose whether from A one could choose what was chosen from
B. The standard assumption in real income gives the above result. We drop
the standard assumption than the result will be different as strategy
changed. The optional and revealed preference logically extended up to the
choice of freedom.

7.2.3. Freedom distinguished from resources

Freedom and means of freedom are different things. The budget set gives
freedom of space and it derives on person's resources. The attention shifted
from achievements to resources, commodity bundle to income and to
freedom. You can differentiate the means and extent of freedom in the
resources on which budget set depend and budget set itself. The shift from
achievement to resources is in direction to greater freedom.

Political and moral philosophy partly motivated to freedom interpreted as
interpersonal comparison of individual advantage. The freedom to achieve

13 Ibid, page no.34.
and extent of freedom itself is important in principle but difficult in practice. When you convert resources into budget than standard assumption will change and it becomes powerful interpersonal variation. The resources or primary good with a person is imperfect freedom. Resources get converted into budget set. There can be great difference in case of conversion of resources or primary goods into freedom. Freedom does not get bind with any thing. Person can have 'selection' or 'option' or not to use the resources.

7.3. Functionings and Capability

7.3.1. Capability sets

Capability defines in terms of 1) well-being and 2) the freedom to pursue well-being. Well-being is a quality of a person's being. Living is functioning. The functioning can be of (1) being (2) doing - Functioning means achieving. Functioning can be elementary as well as complex. Functioning is a constitutive of a person being and evaluation of well-being is the assessment of function. The functioning is closely related to capability. The functioning is various combinations which man can achieve. Capability gives freedom to live life any way. Capability set reflects the person's freedom. Well-being of a person is depending on nature of person. Person is well nourished or in good health is important for well-being of a person. How does capability related to well-being is a point. Here nature and functioning are tied together.

Person's capability of well-being is interrelated on two considerations. The achieved functioning is person's well-being and the freedom is to have well-being. The ethical and political analysis has relevance to well-being freedom. For example, people consider freedom enjoyed to achieve well-being is the goodness of social state. Some may take individual goodness of social state as 'right'.

Freedom is opportunity of well-being in other words it is instrumental in the process. The indicator of goodness of state is the degree of freedom. The
degree of freedom decides the goodness of social state. A good society reflects in to society of freedom. The indicator of 'rightness' is the degree of freedom.

The achieved well-being depends upon the function of capability. Choosing is living but the genuine choice with option is much richer in a sense. Specific types of capability directly contribute to well-being. When freedom is considered as an instrument than capability function is a social evaluation. Capability set gives us information of functions within reach of person and no matter how well-being defined. Capability approach is new, compare to primary goods, resources and income which are traditional. They are only instrumental to achieve well-being. They have limited function. They are in fixed boundaries. The traditional things are objective and only means to instrumental achievement in well-being. Capability reflects the freedom for constituents which help to get well-being. This is a direct route. Capability is in much broader term. Traditional approach works in the boundary. It does not allow the person to move any where.

7.3.2. Value objects and Evaluative spaces

One can ask two questions for evaluative exercise. 1) what are the objects of value? 2) How valuable are the respective objects. The first object makes the second object working. You apply the weight to object for valuation to distinguish the thing. When you apply weight, it becomes "Dominance ranking " (X is higher than Y, If it yields more of at least one of the valued object and at least as much of each). When you apply dominance ranking, it converts into some standard regulation-transitivity. The standard regularity properties will show difference in evaluative process. This will give us an idea about the comparison. In case of utilitarianism approach—information constraints are there. In utilitarian approach all people are taken together and sum total of all is taken into account.

14 ibid, page no.42-43.
In capability approach primarily the value object identified and functioning of capability in evaluative term. You will not get the particular answer regarding their relative value. Selection of space can discriminate in positive sense as inclusion of potentially valuable and negative sense list of weighted object. The capability approach is more deeply evaluative but cannot give particular answer to the question and their relative values.

A variety of doings and beings is a part of capability approach. This gives fuller recognition and enrichment to lives. Capability approach differs from personal functioning say wealth, opulence, resources, liberties and primary goods. In capability approach evaluation–being and doing are important. Capability has to be judged from both the point of views.

Being is static state and doing is continuous state. Both are important in terms of freedom. The capability is a person’s strength and it has to be used in past as being and will be used in future as doing. This gives a variety of ways to enrich and improve the life. This is the real essence of well-being of a person. The capability is the heart of the thing. Capability approach is the real solution for welfare of person.

7.3.3. Selection and weighting

Real choice element exists in the list of relevant functioning and capability. You can add ‘achievement’ in the list of ‘doing’ and ‘being.’ There are certain function easy to describe but do not carry importance. There will be a problem in selecting a class of functioning and capability. In terms of value, some function may be important and others are not of that importance. The functioning and capability is easy to conceptualize in the sense of selection and discrimination. In the welfare analysis of poverty in developing countries, we have to go long with relatively small and important functioning. In case of more general economic development problems, we have to go longer with diverse subjects.
Dr. Amartya Sen says, according to Charles Beitz, in interpersonal comparison, there may not be the same footing for capability approach. The capability approach may be of little interest. You have to select and weight the things properly in capability approach. Real income framework and capability framework has varying importance in their respective fields—say commodity for income and capability for capability framework. In both the cases equal valuation is necessary. In evaluation of well-being, capability and functioning are value objects. In case of assessment of person's well-being, all types of capabilities are not valuable at the same time single remote capability should not be neglected. On one side the value of functioning and capability requires to be examined, on other side attention is required for means as achievement and freedom in capability approach.

7.3.4. Incompleteness: fundamental and pragmatic

Capability approach gives definite answer in the circumstances of not having total agreement in uniform weight attached to different functioning. Without specification of weight, a particular value object has 'dominance partial order.' Relative weights are in agreements for improvement of different capability and functions. Dominance partial order can work without full agreement for relative values.

Dr. Amartya Sen gives an example "If there are four conflicting views claiming respectively that the relative weight to be attached to X vis-à-vis should be 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, and 1/5, there is, then, an implicit agreement that the relative weight on X should not exceed 1/2, nor fall below 1/5." This general agreement permits us to have many pairs not covered in the dominance ranking.

Let us examine the dominance and intersection in the figure.

---

15 ibid, page no.45.
16 ibid, page no.46.
17 Ibid, page no.47.
The intersection approach only takes us to a distance for all alternative weights on shared implications. The interpretations of the intersection approach are as under. A is superior to B. Dominance ranking is incomplete and can not rank as C, D, or E. When there are more than two value objects, more indifferent curves are possible with out giving idea about which one is correct.

1) Since \( a \) lies below \( c \) according to all of them, the intersection approach declares \( a \) to be inferior to \( c \).

2) Similarly, since \( a \) lies above \( d \) according to all of them, \( a \) can be declared to be better than \( d \). 3) Here the result is still partial because \( A \) is above \( E \) according to some indifference curve and below it according to another, so that \( A \) and \( E \) cannot be ranked in this case.

Capability approach exercise is not for all or nothing. Interpersonal comparison of well-being and inequality evaluation admits this incompleteness. Well-being and inequality can not be taken as total ordering. Incompleteness in relative weights reflects in incompleteness in value of well-being. The partial ordering has two different justifications in interpersonal comparison and inequality 1) well-being and inequality may
look like complete ordering due to ambiguity. This is due to fundamental reason. 2) The pragmatic reason for incompleteness is there. There are certain areas, which are clear, should be presented without waiting for complete ordering.

7.3.5. Capability or functionings?

Capability is freedom to achieve valuable functioning. Capability concentrates on freedom rather than means to achieve freedom. Capability is the person’s freedom to achieve well-being. Capability can be a level of well-being achieved. Achievement of well-being is the process in which various functions, choice of decision associated. This line of thinking over wide domain is the case of capability to achieve well-being which includes the freedom to achieve well-being. Function goes to well-being and capability goes for freedom.

Capability defined as functioning. "N" is a point in this space of functioning. The functioning combination is a point in a space, where as capability is a set of such points. Well-being approach is income, utility etc. and capability approach is constitutive elements of living, does not make any difference as far as space is concern. Capability set contains inter alias information of functioning and we can evaluate the capability set on these chosen combination of functioning.

In elementary evaluation, only freedom of choice is considered. The capability set of evaluation can be used for achievement. Chosen combination gives limited information. We examine the theory of evaluation of well-being in terms of capability than chosen combination is preserved and others are omitted.

Freedom of choice has importance in person’s life and well being quality. Acting freely and able to choose are useful to well-being. In standard consumer theory, the value of the best element is available. You can remove the other parts than chosen part in set will not make any difference as freedom is out in picture.
Now choosing is considered as part of living than 'doing x' is distinguished form 'choosing to do x and doing it. This achievement in well-being is influenced by freedom in capability set. Functioning has various aspects. Let us discuss the functioning of "Fasting". You can interpret the fasting in more than one way (1) Fasting is religious thing (2) Fasting is a case of starvation. Again we can analyze second alternate in two ways (a) Fasting due to insufficient food (b) Fasting voluntarily.

The achieved well-being is a list of items. This requires bigger and better information. Therefore well-being to achieve should be a functioning and need not to bring in capability set.

In statistics, the data are prime important thing. After that right technique is important. The social situation is liquid. This will hamper the data availability which will result into not proper procedure. The information on the part of data and information about procedure are practical difficulties. Here we have to take into account our ultimate interest and circumstance of informational availability. The work of information is to give analysis of quality of life and economic progress rather than individual utility and commodity holding. The capability approach should take note of full freedom in choosing bundle but in practice we have to satisfy with analyzing the achieved functioning.

7.3.6. Utility Vis-a-Vis capability

Capability approach as utility will be seen as personal well-being and social ethics. The value of utility is in welfare economics as individual satisfaction in physical and mental stage. Desire fulfilling is the existence of utility and not mental state. Intensities of desire would have to be compared with desire fulfilment than it is a right approach. One can say that why mental metric in not taken in to consideration for capability approach. This is not possible due to motivational problems. Utility-based valuation is indirect and only pleasure and happiness will affect the other functioning. The desire fulfilment is taken as criteria in evaluation of capability functioning than it is disputable due to no proper mechanical metric of desire available. The inequality can be considered as one thing and deprived person is another
thing. Both can be interpreted as desire fulfilment or in mental metric. The problem of deprivation is intense in inequality. Inequality is socially generated differences in capability than some capability will be wasted due to utility metric.

7.4. Freedom, agency and well-being

7.4.1. Well-being Vis-a-Vis agency

Person is working for self with plan for well-being as well as pursues value and goal for others. This is known as 'the agency aspect' and 'well-being aspect'. In agency aspect person's success is in totality for the considered goals and objectives. This may not be connected with his personal well-being. Person's aim is to have community development, or to start educational institute for downtrodden children, or general goal as agency achievement in social state.

There is a difference between 'agency freedom' and 'well-being freedom'. Agency freedom is one's freedom to achieve value which one attempts to produce. Well-being freedom is the constituents of well-being of one's freedom to achieve those things. Well-being freedom reflects in capability set. The agency and well-being are thoroughly interdependent. The non achievement of well-being goals leads to frustration.

7.4.2. Agency, instrumentality and realization

Agency objectives are further divided into two. 1) Incidence takes place for those things that one values and one aim at achieving 2) Incidence takes place through one's own efforts. Goals realized without one's own role is the first type objective. In second case, the agent has to put in efforts to get realized his goals. The agency objective includes the elimination of famine which fulfils with or without my efforts. Here the comparison is in between the objectives and actual realization of those objectives. In second view, I have to promote elimination of famine objectives. My agency success depends on my own role to promote them. The above two cases are of 'realized agency success' and 'instrumental agency success'. Two things
can happen in person’s agency aspect, the achievement is valued irrespective of instrumental help or value has great importance in our result. Now happening of an incident “A” is direct or through our own effort is like an ‘instrumental agency success’, coincide in ‘realized agency success’. The control of instrument in realization of outcome is important. Person should be free to have control on instrument to bring out the achievement.

7.4.3. Can freedom conflict with well-being?

Let us look at freedom as another aspect. It is seen that in evaluation limit of freedom is proper. More freedom is harmful due to cost of decision. The more freedom may make person less happy and less fulfilled in his well-being. Here freedom is in conflict with well-being. Conflict in freedom and well-being will not move in the same way or same direction. In this we have to distinguish well-being freedom and agency freedom. The agency freedom can reduce the well-being freedom. The example is regarding the prevention of crime. Here your presence on the spot of crime will increase your agency freedom; well-being goes down.

Well-being achievement and well-being freedom goes in opposite direction in case of agency freedom. I am at the place of crime and unable to move out of the situation than my well-being and freedom to achieve well-being will reduce. We see the situation in enhanced way. I leave the place and decide not to fight. In that case my mental peace will be disturbed. The act of my leaving the place and my mental disturbance will decrease my well-being and freedom. My well-being achievement is there in term of well-being and freedom. Here the agency freedom goes in opposite direction in term of well-being freedom and well-being achievement. If we take this as well-being freedom than achievement and well-being will increase. In case of well-being freedom, if you change the objective than achievement will go down and freedom will go up. An interesting example of a doctor’s wished to serve in remote place. Here Doctor sacrifices his

Well-being but the means and opportunity are lacking. The rise in income will result in increase of well-being freedom and agency freedom and less
well-being achievement. This proves that freedom and well-being achievement moves in opposite direction even in the case of interpretation as agency freedom or well-being freedom. We can assess inequality in both the perspective.

7.4.4 Freedom and disadvantageous choices

Freedom might be disadvantageous due to time and energy to be wasted. The more choices can result in hassle and incontinence and far from advantageous. The point is can we consider increase in our choice is expansion of freedom. This concept plays an important role in assessment of social structure and public policy in relation to enhancing freedom.

More alternative does not mean expansion of freedom. The peaceful life is equally important. The small choice is not that important for freedom. You have to decide which option is important and which is not. Choice is both way opportunity and burden. Under the circumstances, choice is made but it is up to you to say NO. This is a case of no value expansion of freedom. Some times the choice is a worth part of living and some times we are force to do, as obligatory, which we may not like. This will bring a negative result on our ability.

7.4.5. Control and effective freedom

Freedom is to get what we value and what we want without control. This is in relation to our decisions. This gives us more power and more freedom to live our life. Example: - The proof reader checks the spelling mistake and errors from my book which is going to get printed. The freedom to print the book rests with me. The control is in other hands but the proof-reader is doing the job which I am supposed to do. The point is proof-reader will take instruction from me or he will work as per my desired instruction. Here the control is in my hand till proof-reader does the job and my freedom is uncompromised though my freedom as control is limited or absent. It is difficult that you have all control of your life in your hand. Some body may
exercise control on you. As a matter of fact how the control exercised is important.

Freedom as control on self is the instrumental and realized control is in boarder perspective. Person, if given choice to live in epidemic-free atmosphere will choose the same. Here the control of epidemic free atmosphere is in others hand. Here you can not say anything for freedom as control. In broader sense public policy to prevent epidemic is more freedom to us. Now instead of elimination, some body is promoting than our freedom as control will not affected but our effective freedom will be compromised badly. The elimination of epidemic is enhancement of our well-being.

The freedom we enjoy and inequality has to be assessed with the help of informational evaluation. This is in light of our counterfactual choices and relation to the freedom. Only control on freedom will not work. Elimination of unwanted or unlinked thing by people can be done by the way of public policy. People will get what they want .This will be a case of freedom enjoyed.

7.4.6. Freedom from hunger, malaria and other melodies

We wish not to have diseases or hunger. This will add to our well-being. This is a mis-understanding of the concept of freedom. It is not the case of more freedom and in reality, it is nothing. The control on actual choice is an idea only in terms of liberty and freedom. Isaiah Berlin (1969) Author said “Man’s or people’s liberty to choose to live as they desire.” The signification of this is it directs to the ability to choose and live as one’s desire. Hunger free life through public policy is an enhancement of liberty to choose live as they desire. Hunger free living through public policy does not increase the range of freedom that one has. Freedom is a social idea. Freedom as social idea is very strong thing in analysis of well-being and freedom. We are not examining the difference in well-being and freedom but we rejoice the freedom.

\[18\] Ibid, page no.67.
7.4.7. The relevance of well-being

A person's agency aspect is wider than well-being aspect. Person will promote his own well-being and weight of this objective will be in balance with agency aspects. The relative advantage of different people can be a comparison in between their respective agency freedom. The information on agency aspect will speak about each person's own well-being. The agency aspect will tell all about a person. An intelligent person will choose one out of two things. Say perfection of life or perfection of work. The first one is chosen, in such case the second one do not loose importance. Both the things are important to all. Well-being and agency aspect have different role in interpersonal comparison for diverse exercises. Example: - society might accept some responsibility for person's well-being that does not mean that society is promoting person's other agency objectives. On one side society takes responsibility about no one starves, at the same time society can not take responsibility to erect a statue in honour of hero.

Interpersonal comparison is in term of agency achievement and agency freedom. We did wish to know that who has how much power to purse his goals. Some people may successful in this type of functioning. Others may fail. In society some people are successful having political and ethical views and some are not. The agency aspect and well-being aspect gets prominence in light of the requirement of any one. In interpersonal comparison both are important. The evaluation of inequality depends on 1) purpose and 2) choice of information. Social security, poverty alleviation, removal of gross economic inequality is important in well-being aspect. Social justice is for general. An idealist sacrifice his well-being for some cause does not mean that he is sacrificing other causes for his well-being. Well-being aspect is important in analyses of social inequality and assessment of public policy. In different class and different group, inequality and social injustice is having strong disparities in well-being. The agency aspect is broad and important.

7.5. Justice and capability
7.5.1. The informational bases of justice

Any Judgment depends on truth of information and independent of other truth or falsity. Specified variables are directly involved in assessing the justice of alternative system or arrangement.

Example: - In utilitarian justice, utility is only the information base and it relates to individual for evaluation in state of affairs. Most of the theories analyzed the information. Information can be used in two different ways.

1) Selection of relevant personal features

2) The choice in combining characteristics.

In utilitarian theory the relevant personal features are utility and combining characteristic is total utility. In welfare theory the personal features remain as utility but combining characteristics are other things. Relevant personal features are utility along with liberty, primary goods, rights, resources, commodity bundles and various mixed spaces. Personal features are considered as opportunity in other theories. Personal features can be supplemented with choice in combining formula. The informational variation is plurality of focal variables. ‘Basel equality’ in turn influences the choice of focal variable for assessing inequality. Justice has close relevance to equality.

7.5.2. Rawlsian justice and the political conception

John Rawls theory of “Justice as fairness” is most distinctive discovery of century. This theory is widely accepted. John Rawls device –“the original position” is the hypothetical state of equality in which people chose alternative principles that would govern the basic structure of society. The alternative principles are (1) each person has an equal right for equal basic liberty, which is compatible with all other’s scheme of liberty for all. (2) Social and economic inequality has to satisfy two things. (A) An open position should be for all under fair equality of opportunity. (B) They should be to the great benefit of the least advantage members of society.
The first one is coming in the way of liberty as it makes the condition weak. Second is "difference principle" in which greatest benefit of the least advantaged. Dr. Amartya Sen sees that the person and society's liberty should be compatible is a matter of thought. Dr. Amartya Sen agrees with the proposal of benefit should passed on to least advantageous people in the society.

We have to examine this in light of politics. We can make out two distinct things from Rawls political conception of justice.

(1) Political conception means, it is political, social and economical institutions as moral conception.

(2) "Constitutional democracy" in which concept of justice is independent of philosophical and religious doctrine. The tolerance, which is metaphysical, has no place in this political conception.

Earlier we had rejected the idea of tolerance on the ground of metaphysics. Tolerance has to be included in political conceptions of justice due to two different opposite sides. The first one is inequality and second one is injustice. There can be justice and injustice in choosing the political, social and economical institutions. The judgment is difficult without these political conceptions. Tolerance is one of the most important aspects in politics in living society. It is difficult to judge the Right and Wrong of politics. The theory of justice should address these things. There fore scope of political conception limits the concept of justice.

In absence of tolerance, it is difficult to resolve the issue like inequality, injustice and deprivation. The court is the right place and no political party is able to solve this of their own by way of tolerance. This will limit the domain of political conception of justice.

In 1973, there was a famine in Ethiopia. The emperor HAILE SELASSIE said, "We have said wealth has to be gained through hard work. We have
said those who do not work - STARVE”.¹⁹ This is no-nonsense principle and might have support from Bible. This is purely in economical term. The concept of welfare is far away. The emperor was not in a mood to apply the ethical thought for his people. Here the question of inequality in capability of famine affected people and rest of the society is important. There was inequality in holding of primary -goods. Emperor and opponent did not put the principle of tolerance in political solution for desire of living together. There was absence of institutional famine relief and principle of social choice was out side the domain of political conception of justice. The theory of justice should not embrace for ‘overlapping consensus’ of philosophical and religious doctrines.

The social circumstances are important factor in political justice. In this world, under the social circumstances, lots of injustice is prevailing. In such society, the 'political liberalism' and 'principle of tolerance' application, is not easy and not helpful. This reduces the scope of political conception of justice.

7.5.3. Primary goods and capabilities

Lots of people have thought about the equality of opportunities in literature of justice. Rawls thought of ‘primary goods’ in ‘differential principle’ is a move in that direction. Primary goods include right, liberty, opportunity, Income and wealth as well as self respect. This is in direction of outcome of freedom enjoyed in equality and justice. Primary goods are not constitutive of freedom but means of freedom. Ronald Dworkin theory of 'equality of resources' broadly accounts for means of freedom.²⁰ Now the means has to convert into value. John Roemer had a formula in mathematical term. In this formula he interpreted “equality of resources implies equality of welfare”.²¹ Here the value of resourced is considered as resourced yield. You can say

¹⁹ Ibid, page no.77.
²⁰ Ibid, page no.80.
²¹ Ibid, page no.80.
that equality of resources yield in equality of welfare. Ultimately it is the valuation of means into valuation of ends. Primary goods into freedom of choice will tell us the inequality in actual freedom enjoyed by different people due to different functioning from person to person.

In capability base assessment of justice actual freedom enjoyed is important. The freedom is the capability of a person to achieve the result of various alternative functioning. Capability as actual freedom is in two ways 1) Primary goods 2) achievements. The point is a disable person has more primary goods but less capability. Another example: in poverty study you come across such an illustration that a person may have more income and more nutritious intake but less freedom to live healthy life due to many reasons. In richer country a person may have less income and primary goods - characteristics of age, disability; susceptible of diseases then it is difficult for him to convert basic primary goods into capability. Now let us look in terms of achievements. One person has same capability as other person but choose the different functions to reach the goal. Two persons having same capability and goals end up in different outcome due to different strategies. It is a fact that disadvantageous people will get less from primary goods than others.

7.5.4. Diversities: Ends and personal characteristics.

There are two variations in primary goods as means and as achievement in the end.

1) Inter-end variation in the form of different conceptions of goods that different people have.

2) Inter-individual, in this, relation between resources and freedom to pursue end.

Rawls believes in first one with the understanding that same primary goods serve all different ends. The first variation is the cause of second one. Person's actual freedom works for his end. Now what end and what power to convert primary good in to ends is to be seen.
The human beings are diverse and have different mean and different end. The ethical and political consideration is more important in respect of justice of fairness. Diversity is our ability to convert resources into actual freedoms. The theory is most significant in relation to divert our attention from inequality only in outcome and achievement to opportunity and freedom. In Dr. Amartya Sen opinion Freedom can distinguished from means that sustain it and achievements that it sustains.

Rawls in fact concerns with importance of liberal institutions and processes need to restrain public policy when personal liberty threatened. Theory of justice cannot ignore the difference in capability of space. Over all freedom to achieve cannot ignore negative freedom. Genuinely, we think in a sense of equality of freedom than it is equality of results and not equality of means. Freedom relates both.

7.6. Welfare economics and inequality

7.6.1. Space choice and evaluative purpose

Evaluation of inequality lies in polarity of spaces and diversity of individuals. Inequality in different space is related to each other, diversity of human divides them apart. In the exercise of evaluation of inequality measurement for purpose, motivation is the factor in different spaces.

Interpersonal comparison and inequality assessment is with some purpose. It is a matter of interest to know how different level of well-being of different people.

Income distribution gives us little idea about inequality of welfare. The study of income distribution is having other motivation than well-being comparison. The study is useful to know about crime in society, social discontent by way of income inequality. We can check the primary goods distribution through public policy by a state or political system.

7.6.2. Short falls, attainments and potentials
An interesting point is in judging individual advantage, should advantage position of a person is positive as level of achievement or negative as shortfall is to be known. The assessment of achievement can be in two approaches. It is possible that result can be different for two distinct reasons.

1) The shortfall in maximum value varied between persons is due to ordering of absolute attainment can differ from respective shortfalls. 2) When we take maximum value for all than comparison is done in ‘proportionate’ attainments and shortfalls term and not in absolute term.

The first issue is important in assessment of inequality after acceptance of human diversity. Equality has two features 1) attainment and 2) shortfall. Attainment equality is actual level of achievement and the definition for shortfall in equality is of an actual achievement level minus from maximum achievement level.

In interpersonal inequality, achievement in proportionate is remote. Interpersonal inequality is clear in human diversity in terms of maximal.

Attainment equality is compared in terms and actual level of achievement. Shortfall in equality is the difference between actual achievement and maximal achievement. Human diversity is the cause of not allowing using potential equality than it is an uncertainty in assessing achievement, judging equality of achievement or freedom to achieve. Only circumstances are the answer to it.

A disable person is not in a position to attain equality than he should be given a chance, “on the base of fairness”, to maximize his below par functioning ability rather than make him to accept shortfall.

John Rawl believed in “maxim” can be further taken up to ‘to make the worst off to well-off as possible’. John Rawl ‘differential principal’ comes in way for maximum in primary goods; deprivation comes in field of “capability”. A policy of attainment will lead to ‘low level equality’. This is not true in sense that equality of many types such as aggregates inclusive of efficiency.
Attainment equality, to achieve fully, will be difficult in a sense that it is unfeasible and inefficient.

7.6.3. Inequality, welfare and justice

The evaluative process for inequality is important. Analytical process motivated with many purposes. Inequality and social welfare has definite connection. An argument for social welfare will decide the connection in between them. Social welfare can be a function of individual utility at the same time it can be argued direct function as vector of income. Social welfare can be a function of individual distributing each commodity. The social welfare function can be termed as interpersonal comparison.

The question of "Equality of what" requires knowing the purpose and motivation behind it. Inequality evaluation is for analyzing social justice, basic structure in general political and social ethics. "Justice based inequality evaluation" is used in welfare economics. Here it is assumed that vector of income determines the level of social welfare in Dalton, Atkinson literature. In Indian philosophy, "Mimansa" is the word. The meaning of Mimansa is general good of people, in interest of public. The judgement should be delivered taking in to account this aspect.

7.6.4. Welfare - based inequality evaluation

HUGH DALTON (1920) found out a way to measure inequality in term of social welfare loss.\textsuperscript{22}The formula is, given total income with the percentage shortfall of the actual sum-total of utilities from the maximal level. This formula is very useful for measurement and in interpersonal comparability of individual utilities. It is not easy to talk in percentage.

ATKINSON’S index of inequality operates on income and measures social loss involved in unequal income distribution in terms of short falls of equivalent incomes. It measures the inequality of a distribution of incomes by the percentage reduction of total income that can be sustained without

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid, page no.95.
reducing social welfare by distributing new reduced total exactly equally. This is known as 'equally distributed equivalent income' concept. Here the difference in actual income gives us the measurement of inequality. Atkinson index is widely used in public economic in general. This is useful for public policy making.

Inequality had descriptive and normative content. In normative approach inequality can go against an intuitional. Example: - individual utility is liner function of individual income than in utilitarian social welfare function actual income is the same. Here the inequality level will be zero in social welfare concept. Atkinson measure shows how bad the income inequality is.

Dr. Amartya Sen has truly explained the ATKINSON measurement of inequality. "When there is slowly diminishing marginal utility, there is less inefficiency from unequal distribution of incomes, and it is this inefficiency in generating social welfare that the ATKINSON index really measures". The social welfare function is additive in Atkinson concept can be dropped as the matter is related for inequality. When you consider social welfare function as individual well-being than variable relationship between income on one side and function and capability on other side has to be taken in to account.

7.7 Poverty and Affluence

7.7.1. Inequality and poverty

Poverty means the number of people below poverty line. Poverty line is a level of income below which people are designated as 'poor.' Poverty index means proportion of the total population that happens to be below poverty line. This called HEAD COUNT THEORY. This theory is widely used in empirical literature on poverty and deprivation.

In measurement of poverty, two things are interrelated (1) Identification of poor (2) aggregation of statistics.

In traditional approach of identification is done by using 'poverty line' income as cut off. Aggregates are total number of poor person in proportion in

\[ \text{Poverty index} = \frac{\text{Number of poor}}{\text{Total population}} \]
population below poverty line. This is known as head count ratio. The possibility of little people below the poverty line or a lot and distribution of income among poor may or may not be unequal. An alternate theory in literature is “income gap”. Here additional income needed to bring poor near to poverty line. The gap can be considered as per capita. Both are different approach for poverty.

In head count theory only the people below poverty line will be counted. Income gap theory does not take into account number of poor but only average income gap of poor from poverty line. The transfer of income from one person, who is below poverty line, is transfer to another person, who is also below poverty line than it will not reflect in the changes either Head count or Income theory. The net effect will be poor person will be poorer. The aggregate poverty increased. Here deprivation will be more in case of poorer.

We have to measure the poverty. Let us say it by “P”. P will be a function of Head count-p- and income distribution-I. This will reflect into GINI coefficient as “G”. Dr. Amartya Sen suggested D as deprivation in poverty should be taken into account for poverty measure. Poverty measure P depends upon H, I and G. Here head count and income theory taken together than the rank of nth person, given rank order weighting, is to be measured in terms of poverty. The richest poor have the least weight; the poorest poor would have the highest weight. In head count theory, government will concentrate on richest poor to bring them above poverty line; in that case, poorer amongst poor will be more sufferers.

Ordinal approach used in Rank order weighting in social choice theory. This is BURDA (1781) theory. This helps in Gini coefficient for inequality measurement. This successfully used in India, Bangladesh, Iran, Malaysia, United States, Brazil and several other countries. This approach used to measure income inequality.

---

24 Ibid, page no. 104.
The deprivation theory is based on income. So income is important in poverty. Dr. Amartya Sen is of the opinion that all the three should be taken into account.

7.7.2. The nature of poverty

There is person 1 and person 2. Person 1 has slightly lower income than person 2. Now person 2 is having kidney problem and needs dialysis machine. We have to judge, who is poor? Person 1 is because of low income and person 2 because of capability restriction.

Poverty exists in society and it is recognized at a particular movement in context of question poses. Poverty evaluation is necessary. Poverty can be described and poverty can be of a policy matter. Poverty is due to deprivation. Deprivation will lead to policy recommendation. Now the question is society has to judge who is deprived in which way. Society has to decide in policy, how to remove poverty deficiencies. In the first case of poverty, description is primary and policy conclusion derivative. In second case, primarily focus of public action and description is derivative.

Poverty from descriptive to public action is the correct way to follow. Public fund should be available to implement the policy for deprivation. The negation of this will make us to redefine the poverty. It is reasoned that the economic hardship has to be eliminated than policy recommendation for fund, which should be available. One should not think that poverty is not there as we took action. Any recommendation should be feasible as we are having fund.

Next step is change in policy. Poverty and society are not independent. Social variances are an objective of study. Social variances are in agreement to deprivation. Basic general functioning and capability are in agreement. Example: - there may be intercultural agreement to avoid acute hunger in the society. Poverty is better seen as capability failure than failure of basic needs in the form of commodities. The motivation is in direction of achieving functioning and acquiring capability.
7.7.3. Lowness vis-à-vis inequality of incomes

We established poverty as failure of capability. The functioning analysis can be of elementary nature and complex nature. These are general functions. The specific functions vary from society to society due to fundamentals.

Poverty is as capability deprivation in two senses.

1) Low utility 2) Low income

One may think that why low income, low utility is not related to well-being. The poverty has link with deprivation and deprivation is in economic sense. Low income is important concept in poverty. Poverty is due to low income and not due to low well-being. Mr. Ramchandran has high income even though he failed in utilizing opportunity does not mean that he is poor. Adequate income is not the answer. The answer is income and resources can be converted into capability to function.

An inadequate capability results into inadequate income. Example: a person with high metabolic conversion rate, parasitic disease requires more nutrient than normal man. He is unable to have same quantity of nutrient against normal person in term of income. Even though same income, first person capability is failure compare to normal person. So capability is important against achievement. We can not consider resources as freedom.

7.7.4. Do concepts matter?

The idea of ‘income inadequacy’ is more important in the analysis of poverty than low income. The first one is more sensitive to convert income into capability. The income conversion into capability is in relation to the relative advantage in the opposite direction. As the income is only the criteria, ordering of poverty and identification of poor will be different in terms of size of income.

Now we define poverty as specific type of deprivation. This deprivation can be in 1) biological reasons and 2) social factors.
Women have disadvantage to convert income into particular functioning. There are number of examples of such types. Income may not give the proper judgment in deprivation but capability failure is the right judgment.

The relation between income and capability affects to age, location, epidemiological atmosphere and many more parameters. Only Income in study of poverty will lose the importance as deprivation. The above factors reduce the ability to earn more and hard to convert into capability. The poor in advanced countries are facing this problem. Advanced countries underestimate such poverty. The disable person's income earning and income using will be different in generating capability. The aged person has number of limitations and it is difficult to make income use in many areas.

7.7.5. Poverty in rich countries

In U.S.A., low income is not only the parameter to measure poverty. Other social environment and many more varieties of parameters are also associated. Capability deprivation is remarkably high in affluent countries. Studies have been conducted and found that U.S.A. person and Bangladeshi person are not at par in age. Bangladeshi can go beyond the age of 40 where as a citizen of New York may not cross this limit. This is due to crime; less medical help and other factors. The intense inequality of non-income in different group is there. The same way a black of U.S.A. in age group of 35 to 55 is having 2.3 times mortality than white of U.S.A. The low income reason may be 50%; other parameters are of rest 50%. The rest 50% may be due to inadequacy of health care, violent mode of inter-city living, absence of social care and other factors.

Food deprivation in U.S.A. exists, compared to poor countries, even after adjusting the price difference. This is also a reason for hunger in spite of higher income compared to middle-income group of developing countries. Capability approach can help us to solve this paradox. The hunger is due to

food intake and to make use of nutrient. The general health care is another important factor in capability. Relative deprivation in the space of income can yield absolute deprivation in the space of capability. The statistics proves the poverty, other than economic factor, at the same time the view of life is important.

The affluent people are having more diverse space basket and therefore they need more income compared to rural Indian native. Here the standard of living comes in picture. The moderate life style will help to spend more for other commodity and man can live in society with due status. The bigger basket of commodity variations takes the much of income. He is left for less for health care and nutrition.

7.8. Class, gender and other groups

7.8.1. Class and classification

Inequality in space is due to the nature of human diversity. Equality in one space leads inequality in different spaces. Basically human is diverse in age, in gender, physical and mental ability and disability, epidemiological effects and social and economic bases. Equality of what can be proved by way of study of empirical data. The data is huge. We have to select one and decide priority about diversities. After that we have to ask in which context inequality is.

In general analysis, it is between groups rather than individuals. In this classification of groups, mostly the recent trend is to consider the economic class only. They are either the Marxist type or Wealth categories or income groups. This type of class base classification is useful in context of general political, social and economic analysis. This class will guide us for analysis in libertarian right for well-being or freedom to live life for some value. The inequality in wealth and income is considered as 'inequality of opportunity'.

In the theory of Marx – exploitation is the main theme. Here the hard working person gets little income and little toil person enjoy higher income.26

---

26 Ibid, page no.118.
Dr. Amartya Sen says PROUDHON-economists contention was that Property is THEFT. Marx had not accepted his views. Max gave proper account of time of labour and explains the contrast of poor and rich. The theory of exploitation is identifying who is producing what. An enjoyment of one person is a fruits of another person's labour, known as exploitation.

It is difficult to decide which factor of production has what share in product. PETER BAUER is of the opinion that one who produce has right to enjoy it. He did not believe in theory of equality. Production is interdependent process. Many resources work at one time and it is not correct to decide arbitrarily. The marginal product concept is not thinking who has produced. The guiding factor is if one more unit of resources is used than what will happen. Here the rest of resources has very limited role than labour. Marx was also not clear about this.

The theory of exploitation is not sufficient in regard to economic opportunity and freedom. Class base analysis does not help to explain equality and freedom. Even if you remove the inequality in property than also lots of questions are unanswered about productive ability, needs and personal variations. Marx had understood the diversity of human and only said equal reward for equal work in connection of 'bourgeois Right'. Marx had agreed that equality in reward for work would not conflict with equality in satisfying needs. He distinctly understood the needs of workers. Marx noted the fact that different workers have different family size.

The income base approach will help after normalization and 'equivalence scale'. The argument of control of number of children is in parents hand has little importance. Primary goods or resources satisfy need. In equality the need will be different. This is a case of interpersonal comparison. The resource distribution to satisfy need will be different. Now the wellbeing or equality thus goes beyond income theory and for that matter beyond Marx.

27 Ibid, page no.118.
28 Ibid, page no.119.
We agreed with the variety of things. For freedom we have to go beyond the income theory. We have to take into account other diversities for life we live and freedom to enjoy. In case of class base analysis, disparity will be a part of it, race and colour of human as example. This definitely effects to human for employment, day-to-day living, medical assistance and assistance from police. These types of far reaching influences are there.

**7.8.2. Gender and inequality**

There is a systematic disparity for freedom of man and woman in the society. The freedom will not make man and woman equal in terms of higher income OR resources. Apart from income, in house, the division of labour, care, education and liberty will differ amongst the family members. In house inequality may be due to different need of members. Now the resource used and transformation into capability aspect has not studied in income distribution with in the family. There is a differential treatment in men and women in the world and particularly in family in between boys and girls. In rural area of Asia and North Africa, the morbidity and mortality rate shows the difference in deprivation of female. This is in extra ordinary proportionate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male-Female ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asia, West Asia, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America and Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher death ratio of men in rich countries like North America and Europe is due to social reasons.\(^{29}\) In South Asia, West Asia, China and North Africa women mortality is high, not due to biological disadvantage but it is due to

\(^{29}\) Ibid, page no.123.
'attainment inequality' and 'shortfall of inequality'. In developing country, it is a case of general inequality and not the income inequality in family. Here the functional difference and disparity reflected into elementary capability to avoid the mortality and morbidity. The sub-Saharan Africa, anti-female nutrition results in morbidity and mortality is less, but there is big gender difference in terms of education, body mutilation, free to pursue independent career and leadership in capability. This affects to their freedom. Social capability difference is seen in female of rich countries. They have less mortality. Ultimately, this is a case of gender deprivation in terms of capability and freedom than income or primary resources.

7.8.3. Interregional contrasts

The empirical examples study show in term of interregional comparison between the inequality by way of income and inequality in achieving capability in basic functions. A factor of long live in standard of living is having impressive difference in case of income per head. This will be compared in terms of GNP and income per head and life expectancy in birth.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interregional contrasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ibid, page no.125-126.
Some time life expectancy of rich country and poorer country may be nearly same.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GNP per head</th>
<th>life expectancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>GNP-per head is $20910</td>
<td>75 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>GNP-per head is $1780</td>
<td>75 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We divert our attention from income to functioning and capability than picture will change drastically. The comparison is regarding social, educational and epidemiological. Here the public policy comes in a picture. In China, Sri Lanka and Costa Rica, the communal health services and medical care, basic education has played a great role. Here is a distinction in income deprivation and capability functioning in public policy.

In large country like India, one state may be way ahead then other state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>literacy ratio</th>
<th>Female literacy ratio</th>
<th>Female literacy ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>70 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All India</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In China and India, male female ratio is 0.93 where as Europe, North America and sub-Sahara Africa is excess in female than male. The male female ratio in Kerala is 1.04 is equal to 1.05 of Europe and North American

31 Ibid, page no.126.
32 Ibid, page no.127.
rich countries. "Kerala GNP is lower in India compared to other countries but it is failed to explain high capability level to premature mortality. Kerala capability achievement is due to public policy in education and health care, food distribution in comparison to rest of India. The women property right in particular and politics in general had played a great role.

7.9. The demands of equality

7.9.1. Questions of Equality

We should ask to egalitarianism that why equality and of what equality? Equality can judge by (1) Diversity of human being in personal characteristics and external circumstances (2) Plurality of spaces—income, wealth, utilities, liberty, primary goods, capability. These can be compared.

We have seen that due to diversity of human, equality of one space do not coincide with each other. Equality at one space may be inequality at another space. Second approach is dealing with real approach to equality in connection of freedom to achieve and actual achievement. This was discussed in terms of capability to functions. Capability approach is freedom to achieve in general and capability to function in particular.

7.9.2. Equality, space and diversity

Any ethical theory of social arrangements will demand equality in space, equal treatment in human respect. The space will differ from one theory to other theory say-libertarians for liberty, egalitarians for equal income and wealth and utilitarian for equal weight in everyone utility. The difference in approach will give different answer. Equality of what is the distinction between diverse ETHICAL approaches to social arrangements.

Therefore it is important that all theories should have some common thing. Each theory should defend and found out why equality. The why takes us to what equality? We have to take basic equality as in individual feature in conception of social justice and political ethics. If you take one space and

---

33 Ibid, page no.127.
examine the concept of equality then other spaces will dispute the equality. This is a conflict of principle. Equality demand in different spaces will create conflict. Therefore "BASAL EQUALITY" concept is necessary. BASAL EQUALITY will explain the claim and denial of claim. The need of basal demand including equality requires tolerance of inequality. The thought of basic equality is very broad. Dr. Amartya Sen has tried to give all to gather new thing in welfare economics.

7.9.3. Plurality, incompleteness and evaluation

Basal equality has certain amount of plurality with demand of equality in various forms. The inequality will be ambiguous here in terms of ranking compared to full equality. We have to find out inequality to what extent is in the ranking. This "Internal plurality" related to (1) Heterogeneity of space and (2) the measurement of distance and distributional inequality in homogeneous variable.

The examples of heterogeneities are (1) Liberty for different rights (2) Primary goods of different types (3) different capability and (4) diverse utility.

In Basel categories, ethical theory is including more than one variable—Liberty and well-being, well-being and agency, freedom and achievement. This is ethical in practice where as Heterogeneity looks like moral philosophy.

There are different ways to evaluate the equality in homogeneous space by using distinct method to measure inequality. The variation of inequality can measure in terms of coefficient of variance, Gini effect, standard deviation etc. in given space. We use the different measurements to measure inequality having good reasons behind it. The different measurement may conflict with each other.

In measurement, we may use different ranking and combining and uniting the space in terms of weight. By applying all ways and means as discussed above, some ambiguities will remain in the ordering of equality and inequality. The ambiguities are creating problems in decision theory and
social choice theory. Analysis of theories has asked for reasoned decision in spite of ambiguity. In inequality, when you use shared partial ranking in which all desirable features move together. The intersection partial ordering places X above Y if and only if X is better than Y accordingly to all the desirable features. 34

Intersection requires scrutiny of desirable features. The different criteria are conflicting in ranking two alternatives than that pair should be left unranked. When more information required then plurality should exclude and extension of partial ordering should allow. Some time incompleteness in inequality may be in concept itself or because of lack of information or in respect of the disagreement amongst parties. Arbitrarily to complete the partial ordering will be misleading step. It is difficult to judge in partial ranking view of interpersonal comparison and assessment of inequality that whether we have more equality in situation “A” than situation “B”. In social and political dispute, clear equality is unattractive.

7.9.4. Data, observations and effective freedoms

Data problem can restrict our calculation. It will be difficult in such a situation to represent capability set. In absence of data, in capability set, one has to take functioning combination as base and judge the actual opportunity enjoyed. In such situation, one has to accept partial capability set. The data limitation makes our motivation lower to accept lower capability set in practical position. Freedom can assess in terms of “Effective freedom” and “Freedom as control”. There may be limited comparison in freedom as an outcome. In particular circumstances, observed functioning can tell us about well-being achieved as well as freedom enjoyed. Available data can give us more precise picture of freedom and inequality.

7.9.5. Aggregation, egalitarianism and efficiency

34 Ibid, page no.133.
Internal plurality has to be supplemented by recognizing claims of spaces in Basel equality. The aggregative and distributive consideration will raise conflict in basal equality no matter which space is chosen. "Efficiency" is the common element in aggregation. Efficiency is a part of our moral sentiments. Efficiency considered in economy in "PARETO OPTIMALITY" in space of utility. This is a weak condition in a sense that it can not raise the utility of all. This used in welfare economic vary widely with out any controversy. Pareto optimality is priority of space of utility then the claim of liberties, freedoms.

Aggregation takes us in different direction in case of equality in general. When we consider the case of basal equality, we should not forget the plurality of ethics, which takes us beyond equality. The aggregate and distribution will differentiate on the bases of assessment in terms of result. Example:-conflict between increasing total income and reducing distributional inequalities in incomes, or between rising aggregate utility and decreasing interpersonal utility difference. The other space may be in contrast but not in result. Say promoting some rights in general and these rights seeking equal distribution is a conflicting thing. The aggregate and distribution is necessary in social evaluation. Aggregate requires thinking for what to include and what weight to be given. We are giving equal weight to each person in utilitarian than it becomes egalitarian stand. The demand of equality may come in many distinct contexts, in quite different ways. The equality may influence the aggregative objectives, the demand of maximize the aggregative object is not the demand of equity.

7.9.6. Alternative defences of inequality

The equality of social arrangements can be argued in three ways (1) The wrong space argument (2) incentive argument (3) operational asymmetry argument. This will not dispute the equality in social arrangements.
The wrong space argument: - The variable is not right one in terms of equality required. Here the equality in other space is inter alia therefore equality in particular space is in dispute. Equality in terms of capability is itself an argument on equality in other space. The next two arguments are showing the conflict between equality and efficiency in the same space. It is a fact that inequality is a bad thing but removal of inequality will result in worst thing.

Efficiency based critics of equality has two arguments. The first one is 'incentive argument' and second one is 'operational argument.'

Incentive argument is much discussed in literature. Incentive should be given to people to do right things and promote the objectives. Inequality will work for investment, enterprise and more work. It is understood that objectives are aggregate type. The efficiency is in any type of objective say-aggregate and distributive. The incentive argument is in individual term.

Egalitarian policy was criticized on the ground of social goals including equality. This went wrong in recent period-say Maoist china or redistribution in welfare state policy.

The operational asymmetry is about aggregates only. This is encouraged by inequality due to operational asymmetry. People's skill and ability difference requires asymmetry. Inequality will be there, if more power given to capable man. The asymmetry requires because of social role. the person requires more power or authority to help every one. The indivisibility in economic operation and technology nature will help for asymmetry on the ground of aggregate objectives. Here a personal incentive problem is not the reason but social role of asymmetry is important.

7. 9.7. Incentives, diversity and egalitarianism

Incentive argument is most famous in economic literature. Incentive explains deep rooted human diversity. The inequality evaluation is the reason for incentive argument. In this sense, incentive argument is different than popular understanding. In welfare economic model, mainly the
difference between different persons achievement comes from disparity in efforts and decision variable and not from diversity in productive ability. This difference is in relation to motivation and opportunity in incentive argument.

If you say that incentive argument is only the result of human diversity and not the difference in decision than it is wrong. Incentive argument is in relation to inequality and freedom. It is solely not the diversity. Example: - You say that only gender or age is responsible for inequality in capability than a policy decision can be taken that the special help will be provided to such gender or aged member of society. Now the point is age is not in your control and it is very hard to change gender, the incentive to this type of problem may not help. People may speak lie about age or gender but not of much help to convince.

Here the incentive argument will help little to egalitarian than standard economic model as individual future is changing due to own chosen level of application. Incentive argument has less stand in light of special medical help because no one wish to have disease and not for longer period. Look at other way as the medical relief is free or heavily subsidies than they will take less precaution and negligent about illness. This is also not true that treatment is free to you to invite diseases. In policy you can decide the medical help could be free in special genetic and or environmental risk of illness.

In egalitarian theory the inequality is related with human diversity which is not a problem due to incentive policy or inequality due to difference in effort and application. An incentive argument is focusing much on effort and application. The factor behind unequal freedom is gender, age and class which are of much concern.

7.9.8. On equality as a social concern

Capability approach is the base to judge the individual advantage. This capability approach is for evaluating the equality and can be use for
assessing efficiency also. You think that capability is economic efficiency. It will reflect as no one's capability can be further enhanced while maintaining the capability of every one else at least at the same level. You can accept aggregate in social evaluation, which will make difference in equality assessment. Efficiency will help in understanding the demand of equality. The equality interpretation depends on other considerations. These considerations are internalising. These will help to understand equality in much lighter way.

The attainment equality and short fall equality are there. The attainment equality is useful due to weight given to aggregate consideration. Example: - Person A is in a position to achieve X as his potential; where as general achievement is 2X of all others. The A's achievement is hampered due to some reason. The argument is we should lower others' achievement to achieve X for person A. This does not mean that in equality we should bring down the 2X level to X level. Here shortfall equality has some merit. In such cases, the achievement of all others should be proportional to their maximal value. This will be a liberal view. Person A will be given preferential treatment to achieve higher efficiency. Here the efficiency is included in equality in aggregate terms. These two terms, aggregate and efficiency come to the help of equality. In such circumstances it is the case of attainment equality.

Rawls used the difference principle as primary goods in 'justice of fairness'. He is supporting the claim of capability in judging individual advantage. Rawls was equating the capability in the interest of public policy. Rawls asserted that the public post should be filled by open competition for fairness. This is put into practice than it will end up in unequal capability. Rawls was of the opinion that greater skilled person should be employed rather than people differ in moral, intellectual capacity and skill. This is an example of operational asymmetry argument.

Dr. Amartya Sen agreed with Rawls argument for higher skilled person appointment. Here the question is "why" one should agree with Rawls. The
efficiency is the right point for the answer. The merit base selection of person and influential position relates to efficiency. Dr. Amartya Sen says the person with lower mental skilled is not his/her fault and such people should not penalized. In influential position and officers are not working with efficiency than the argument of Rawls acceptable. The inequality is there for indifference in capability in influential position and officer's appointment. The inequality should consider as an efficiency and not inequality as every one had opportunity to compete. This is justified in terms of aggregative consideration. This proves that the primary goods in individual advantage are not proper against capability approach. The demand of equality should be supplemented with efficiency.

Rawls had given importance to efficiency consideration in the interest of worst off people. Rawls maxim formula is accommodated in individual advantage which does not record inequality but readily record the space of capability. Here political scrutiny is poorer in information sense. Here capability should be replaced by efficiency for examination.

In case of open competition, it creates a "Meritocracy" which treats less favoured group, unequally treated. The argument should be granted for freedom to appear for competition. The system should absorb the impact of aggregative and distributive aspect in freedom and capability in the name of justice.

7.9.9. Responsibility and fairness

Rawls and Ronald Dworkin were thinking that a person is responsible for matters, which are in his control. Responsibility is not attributes of a person. Person can change his responsibility. Rawls theory of justice as fairness criticized in capability perspective due to person's difficulty to convert primary goods into actual freedom achieved. A person is less able to use the primary goods to secure freedom is disadvantage, compared to the person—placed in favourable position; even though both are having the same bundle of primary goods. This difference has to take note in the theory of justice as fairness.
Person's position can be judged in given choice between achievement and freedom. The individual can claim on society that he should be given freedom to achieve. If individual is wasting the opportunity given to him than he is responsible. This has direct relevance to capability. The person has no control over adversity of event, than he is not responsible. A person gambles incurred loss than he cannot go out of responsibility.

Person must have adequate information so he can take correct decision in risky position. An insurance company OR bank becomes bankrupt and person is not compensated. Here an account holder has freedom to chose, which a case of freedom to choose is a case of freedom achieved. The Person's knowledge, ability to understand, and ability to choose in alternative is a case of actual achievement.

The capability should be accounted in real freedom enjoyed by person. Now a person is not showing courage in social condition to choose than it does not come under ethical assessment. One should not say that person had not effective choice. This is a case of real freedom enjoyed after taking in to account all barriers and social discipline.

There is a difference in a person who manages his desire and a person who do not courage to achieve desire. "Manage to desire' is one of limiting aspects of utilitarian ethics. In capability account, this is a negative point. People do have the capability. In entrenched inequality, person chooses the comparative deprivation and accepts victimized condition.

7.9.10 Capability, freedom and motivations

The 'capability approach' has to offer for evaluation of well being and assessment of freedom. Capability to well-being differs in two ways. Well-being is a shift of commodity and resources to functioning. This is a constitute elements of well-being. Second, the set of alternative functioning vector is available for person's choice. Here the capability set is a freedom which person enjoyed for well-being. If ability to choose in alternate is worth while to live life than capability set has further role in determining the
person's well-being. The set "S" is having number of function. A person chooses "X" functioning from "S" set in which "X" belongs, than the well-being of person is dependent on his doing. The well-being of a person is not dependent on "X" but on the choice of "X" from that set of "S".  

Capability approach is much broader than well-being. In well-being freedom is important either instrumental or actual. Apart from instrumental freedom, for good society, freedom enjoyed is important. Therefore, society should prefer individual freedom. Equality of freedom can be a one of the evaluative foundations. Capability approach should be used to assess and analyzed the equality of freedom in each motivation.

The poverty is seen as capability failure. This may be due to various factors. The poverty analysis from low income to insufficient basic capability is important. This related to the foundation of equality of freedom. This provides guideline for proprieties for elimination of poverty in rich countries like Europe and America.

7.10. Philosophy of welfare in inequality:-

The first chapter was regarding basic thing that how the collective choice rules works in human life and economics. The second chapter was about development. Earlier development means every thing. Now welfare is the meaning of development. In this freedom of individual is most important. We show freedom can be achieved and what different aspects of freedom are. Ultimately freedom is in Rawls thinking as political fairness and justice. Now we talk regarding inequality.

One can see inequality in society. Equality is necessary for economical and political philosophy. Equality can be defined in Utilitarian, Libertarian and egalitarian concepts. Equality of why and how is important. Equality is as impartiality, liberty of space in term income and many variables. Income reflects in standard of living and freedom to achieve. Utilitarian and libertarian both believed in achievement.

\[35\] Ibid, page no. 150.
Political and moral philosophy is in favour of freedom. The heterogeneity of society is the reason for inequality of converting resources and primary goods into achievement. Capability works two ways. It works for well-being and freedom to pursue well-being. Achieved functioning is well-being and freedom to achieve well-being is capability. Well-being and inequality are recent subjects.

Evaluative approach has information constrain. Welfare analysis of poverty in developing country, you have short list of item and in case of economic development a long list of item. The agency aspect and well-being aspect is interdependent. Inequality can be assessed in well-being and agency aspect. A well-being aspect has importance in analysis of social inequality and assessment of public policy.

Theory of justice demands basal equality. Rawls' theory of Justice as fairness is important in economics. Disable person will be looser in case of primary goods conversion into capability and in terms of achievement due to different strategies and different functioning. Human beings are diverse and their goals, function and strategies are different therefore inequality in capability will affects for freedom to achieve and freedom to enjoy.

Deprivation is intense in inequality. Inequality and social welfare has definitive relation. Inequality analysed social justice, structure of general politics and social ethics. Justice based evaluation is used in welfare economics.

Measurement of poverty in society is important for policy matter. Functioning can be of general as well as complex nature. Poverty as deprivation has low utility and low income. Poverty in terms of deprivation can be biological as well as social factor. Pregnant woman need more income. Old age person need more income due to deprivation of opportunity to earn more. Income earning and income using will be different in case of handicap person. Poor can not convert their capability in earning of income in rich countries. People are facing the problem of deprivation of food and other social requirements in rich countries.
Human is diverse in gender, age, physique, mental ability and social and economic bases. This creates inequality and it is analysed in intergroup variations. Female members in the family does not get that importance compares to man. They are deprived in case of food, education, health and liberty. In South Asia, West Asia, China and North Africa male female ratio is different than Europe or North America. Female of rich country has social capability difference.

The equality in space gives requirement for inequality. All three concepts will create inequality 1) incentive 2) competition 3) Efficiency. In operational asymmetry argument, capable person is given power with a view to help to all but this will not fulfil. Incentive policy is in reducing inequality due to diversity. The open competition for filling the job is the test of efficiency, capability and moral.

Rawls and Ronald Dworkin thought that person is responsible for the responsibility which in his control. A person not showing courage and not choosing space than ethically person is not responsible. Commitment is related to responsibility. The tolerance is necessary in society.

Individual well-being and freedom is the good sign of the society. Poverty is seen as capability failure. Various underlying concerns can help to improve capability in policy. The rich countries are using this concept for poverty elimination.

Inequality is thought in various ways in every quarter of life and society. In any regards, Inequality is not accepted by all. This will spoil the social and economical health of any country.

Now we go to the last chapter. In this chapter we are examining and analysing the crucial question of hunger, starvation and famine.
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