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I. Introduction
1. In accordance with its programme and budget for 2014-2017, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) considers the facilitation of global multi-stakeholder dialogue on justice as a prioritized undertaking. In order to contribute to a deeper understanding of the issue and to assist Member States to incorporate a global justice perspective for addressing poverty eradication in the post-2015 development agenda, UNESCO organized in collaboration with the International Social Sciences Council (ISSC) an expert group meeting (EGM) on “Global justice, poverty and inequality in the post-2015 development agenda”, from 28 to 29 April 2014 in Paris, France.

2. The EGM was conceived as an opportunity for social scientists and humanists to contribute through a renewed narrative on social justice to achieve an enhanced vision of poverty eradication and promote global equality.

3. Specific objectives of the EGM included:
   - To advance a systemic framing for our understanding of extreme poverty, inequality and global justice;
   - To develop action-oriented messages and recommendations whereby global justice is incorporated into the post-2015 development agenda and its associated monitoring framework;
   - To set an agenda of priority topics and questions that the social sciences now need to address; and
   - To identify innovative contributions as well as critical gaps in what the social sciences have done and could be doing in this area of research.

4. The meeting set out to provide inputs which could contribute to UNESCO’s tasks related to the design of the Sustainable Development Goals for the post-2015 development agenda, and to the ISSC’s preparation of its two flagship programmes: the World Social Science Forum 2015 “Transforming Global Relations for a Just World” to be held in Durban, South Africa, 13-16 September 2015, and the World Social Science Report 2016. This report summarizes the discussions of this meeting.

II. Organization of work

A. Participation
5. The EGM was attended by 10 experts from different regions of the world and by 2 observers. Staff members of UNESCO and the ISSC also attended the meeting (see Annex I).

B. Documentation
6. The documentation for the meeting consisted of:
   - A discussion paper on “Global Justice as a Framework for Eliminating Poverty: A Preliminary Review of Issues and Debates”, prepared by UNESCO
   - 19 background documents submitted by experts

All the documentation for the meeting was placed in a dedicated online workspace entitled “Global justice and poverty eradication post 2015”. The online workspace, with regulated access, is hosted by the UNESTEAMS website.

This summary and the basic documentation relating to the meeting are available online to the general public at: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/most-programme/sv10/news/the Voices_of_the_excluded_must_be_heard_in_the_post_2015_agenda/#.U3H aN7FOKfA
C. Agenda

7. The EGM had the following Agenda (see details in Annex II):

Day 1: 28 April 2014
- Opening session
- Theme 1: Conceptual frontiers of global justice
- Theme 2: Critical assessment of the knowledge base

Day 2: 29 April 2014
- Theme 3: From knowledge to action
- Theme 4: Towards new social norms and policies
- Closing session

8. Mr. Gudmund Hernes, Member of the Executive Committee, International Social Science Council (ISSC), facilitated the EGM on both days.

III. Summary of Meeting

Day 1. Opening session

9. Mr. Philippe Quéau, UNESCO Assistant Director-General a.i. for Social and Human Sciences, welcomed all the participants on behalf of UNESCO. He also thanked the ISSC for their cooperation and collaboration in convening the EGM.

10. Mr. Quéau stated that visions of social justice have always guided social transformation, resulting sometimes in fundamental outcomes such as the universal recognition of human rights, which is today’s accepted principle for building a better world and provides the foundations for UNESCO’s work. He also recalled that technological advances, globalization and economic growth cannot be identified with progress if they fail to reach the most vulnerable, especially women, who in many countries constitutes absolute majorities. This, he expressed, underscored the significance of the commitment of the international community to take appropriate action guided by international human rights principles and standards, in particular through the United Nations-lead process for the preparation of a post-2015 development agenda. Mr. Quéau recalled the recommendation made by the 37th General Conference of UNESCO, in November 2013, concerning “that the important role of the social and human sciences in addressing the complexity of social transformations and the challenges of inclusive social development be fully reflected in the post-2015 development agenda”. He stated that to that end, UNESCO and the ISSC are coordinating a series of joint initiatives aimed at mobilizing the social and human sciences with the purpose of contributing to elucidate the numerous connections between global justice and the theory and implementation of development, as well as to improve the conceptual consistency of discussions about the post-2015 development agenda. Mr. Quéau remarked that UNESCO plans to engage in those activities several distinguished experts who could not attend this event but who have expressed interest in contributing to this process of reflection.

11. In his opening remarks, Mr. Alberto Martinelli, ISSC President, thanked UNESCO and the ISSC for jointly organizing the meeting and explained that this event is part of a the portfolio of initiatives
coordinated by the ISSC with the purpose of advancing the social sciences and facilitating their practical usefulness for promoting sustainable development. Mr. Martinelli explained that in addition to stocktaking on social science research, promoting interdisciplinary collaboration, and facilitating institutional cooperation, the ISSC is committed to defending the freedom of scientific research. Mr. Martinelli, recalled that the ISSC is also involved in important international initiatives aimed at a wide integration of scientific disciplines, and cited as an example the Future Earth Initiative, encompassing thousands of scientists, into which the ISSC facilitates the contribution of the social sciences. Mr. Martinelli underscored the importance of the World Social Science Forum 2015 “Transforming Global Relations for a Just World” to be held in Durban in September 2015 and the forthcoming World Social Science Report 2016. He thanked in advance the experts for attending the meeting and for their valuable contributions that could inform the preparation of both activities.

12. Heide Hackmann, ISSC Executive Director, also thanked the participants, in particular the experts, for attending the EGM and requested all participants to introduce themselves before giving the floor to the first presenter.

Day 1. Theme 1: Conceptual frontiers of global justice

13. A presentation was made during the session by Mr. John Crowley, from UNESCO’s Social and Human Sciences Sector.

14. Mr Crowley, speaking on the broad theoretical issues relevant to the EGM, outlined three main areas of reflection on justice on which, in his opinion, the discussions could focus: a) the normative agenda; b) analytical conditions; and c) consideration of institutional processes within which discussions are held and actions taken. He considered that the examination of those aspects could offer advantages for adopting justice as a framework for development beyond 2015, which he indicated is not the framework currently being utilized. Mr Crowley recalled that the problem is not new. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), while arguably narrow and technocratically biased, did at least embody a fairly clear background consensus, based on agreement with respect to the moral and legal urgency of addressing extreme poverty, shared commitment to a regulated market economy, and a preoccupation with the progressive realization of human rights. In the intervening years, however, the original consensus has fragmented and has not been replaced, due to a combination of circumstances, including ideology, political situations, and global transformations. Mr Crowley suggested that three processes that unfolded in the 2000s should in particular be noted as contributing to current fragmentation:

- the persistent disconnection between poverty agendas (extreme poverty being associated with developing countries, as a development challenge, and poverty with developed countries, as a welfare issue);
- the lack of meaningful dialogue between reformist and radical positions on matters of distribution and redistribution, the former being defined by an assumption of global prosperity built on technology and globalization, taking for granted that global favorable conditions would over time benefit the least favored, whereas the latter reject even the descriptive basis on which the reformist agenda is premised;
- failure to take into consideration the institutional order within which human economic and social rights can be realized.

Erosion of the consensus on which the Millennium Declaration was based, without its replacement by an alternative agenda, is a major factor in explaining the fragmentation and lack of focus currently visible in the process to replace the MDGs by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), around which the post-2015 development agenda is to be built. This configuration suggests that new thinking is required on a number of key issues.
15. Mr Crowley further proposed that discussions on poverty, inequality and injustice might more helpfully be considered not in terms of the redistribution of wealth, income or other but rather in terms of primary distribution, in other words about how the system operates to raise the question to which redistribution is a necessarily partial answer. In this regard, he suggested that the realization of justice is obstructed by the fragmentation of the development agenda. Specifically, in analytical terms, it is crucial not to fall into the trap of perceiving poverty, inequality and injustice as different things. He suggested rather framing the three issues as distinct but complementary entry points at the same level, avoiding the adoption of the kind of concentric approach that sometimes leads, for instance, concern with inequality to be conceived as a distraction from addressing poverty. Mr Crowley also emphasized that the question of justice is not exhausted by normative considerations, since justice is intimately connected with an understanding of how societies actually operate. With this in mind, referring to the conceptual language of John Rawls, he invited participants in the meeting to consider the following question: is the economic structure part of the basic structure of justice? In connection with article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Mr Crowley suggested addressing the question how the relationship between poverty and injustice may involve complex connections between outcomes and conditions. He called the attention to a rising public interest on the problem of inequality that perhaps could be indicating changes in thinking about those issues, and cited Thomas Piketty’s book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* which in essence states that what is normal under capitalism is distributive inequality, with no in-built guarantee that it will be eroded over time by intergenerational mobility.

16. With regard to UNESCO’s objectives in convening the meeting, Mr Crowley observed that, as a specialized agency of the United Nations, UNESCO is committed to the institutional process to design the post-2015 development agenda and must contribute to it. At the same time, however, UNESCO, and in particular its Social and Human Sciences Sector, through partnerships such as the one that exists with the ISSC, has the function of supporting and strengthening the social and human sciences, including in their critical reflections on UN processes. In the spirit of maintaining an appropriate balance between these two institutional objectives, Mr Crowley suggested that, in order to avoid reducing the post-2015 development framework to a “shopping list” of goals, it is crucial to analyze, from the perspective of the social sciences, how negotiation dynamics work, which voices are being heard, and what are the institutional implications.

17. In the ensuing interactive exchange, experts acknowledged that there is no consensually accepted definition of global justice and that given the relevance of the theme in the context of contemporary social transformation this should be the subject of further study and debates. The view was expressed that injustice is a tragedy in many parts of the world and that urgent attention is required; Africa was mentioned in particular as a continent where the persistence of injustice reveals a serious failure of the international community. Examples from Africa and Asia were cited on how countries in the midst of, or emerging from, conflict are faced with choices that involves how to deal with peace, accountability for and prosecution of human rights violations, as well as reconciliation, in a complex context of foreign intervention and the existence of so-called “failed states”. In that sense, it was underscored the relevance of asking always as a central question of social research: Peace on what terms? Experts remarked that what is not brought in terms of justice into a peace process then it will have implications for injustice. Some experts underlined that there are instances in which decisions of the international community that are adopted in the name of justice, actually become obstacles to justice, being one example the case of “sanctions” and military interventions which typically hit hardest the poor, especially women, youth and children.

18. Experts stressed that it is crucial to understand how poverty, inequality and injustice are created and perpetuated for vast sectors of the population and underlined that it requires a clear understanding of political processes, particularly the lack of participation of people in the decisions affecting their life. The need to include in social studies, as a central issue, problems related to “the voice of the poor” was emphasized by experts. In that sense, it was recalled that the analysis of socio-cultural factors in the process of social transformation should not be ignored or minimized. The case of gender violence –
including female genital mutilation - was cited to illustrate the importance of taking into account cultural aspects on matters of justice and human rights, as a way to allow people to express and address their problems within the right contextual meaning thus eliminating the possibility of manipulation or distortion. The social sciences need to consider that the local voices of the poor really matter in the search for solutions to poverty, inequality and injustice. The view was expressed that poor and excluded people have in general ideas about what is needed to solve their problems. Experts expressed that context determines how people perceive justice and that the social sciences need to address not only what justice is about but whom is justice benefiting.

19. Experts discussed the balanced approach that is required in order to adequately integrate “the global” and “the local” in the study of the complex and interrelated problems of poverty, inequality and global justice. It was recalled that although this is a topic on which extensive work has been done by the social sciences, the need to consider context as a crucial component of studies of those problems must be highlighted. The view was expressed that when reference is made to global justice, it is crucial that social scientists identify who establishes the global norms because in many instances what is being labeled as “global” in fact is decided by a handful of powerful countries that impose their views upon the international system. Experts deliberated on the different angles that are involved in the examination of “the global”: “the global” and the adoption of normative principles which are universal in scope; “the global” and the background conditions for social change; and “the global” at the institutional level. The issue of the unfair appropriation of Global Public Goods was raised during the discussions as well as the need to better address the possibilities of taking global action on key problems of development, which is one of the aspects currently being discussed under the tag of “Global Partnerships” in the context of the post-2015 development debates.

20. Human rights were also discussed by experts, especially in their connection with debates concerning “enabling/ capacity-oriented” approaches and “outcome-oriented” approaches to poverty eradication and social justice, noting that the HRBA to UN development programming put emphasis on both outcomes and processes. The view was expressed that the frequently quoted article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) “Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized” should not be considered by itself as being a sufficient foundation to achieve what is currently being envisioned. At the same time, its importance should not be underestimated as it complements the focus on national implementation efforts with a requirement that an enabling environment be established at the international level. It was stressed that the critical role of international cooperation is explicitly recognized in international human rights instruments, such as the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). The latter states in its article 2 that “Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take steps, individually and through international assistance and co-operation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant by all appropriate means, including particularly the adoption of legislative measures”. Experts recalled that the link between poverty and human rights arose in UN documents in the late 1990s, while a more elaborate interpretation emerged in the early 2000s. It was expressed the view that until then, an imbalance between the attention placed on civil and political rights on the one hand and economic, social and cultural rights on the other, was observable, but that the basis for a balanced situation was formally resolved in 1993 by the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action which reaffirmed the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights.

21. Experts stated that greater attention to issues relating to the institutional setting of human rights at the national and international levels, and the way it is organized, is reflected in the widespread recognition of the failure of the MDGs to adequately address inequalities and to align implementation efforts to human rights principles and standards. The view was expressed that in the context of UN-led processes, which promote HRBA, tackling structural and systemic inequalities becomes inevitable. It was also stressed that the important advancements since the Vienna Conference with regard to the
conceptualization of economic, social and cultural rights provide an important advantage in the context of the post-2015 debates in comparison with the MDGs process. The example was given that, at the UN level, the human rights-based approach has reached an important level of maturity, with a better understanding of its operational implications. Experts expressed that global justice is not necessarily the only nor the best entry point to address issues of inequality, poverty and social injustice. The contribution of the social sciences to the study of complex social challenges directly related to poverty, inequality and injustice, was recalled by experts. In that sense, particular reference was made to the importance of incorporating foresight into the analysis of how social transformation occurs. Futures studies and anticipatory systems can assist in understanding how, by considering that the future exists as anticipation capacities could be created which may impact the agency of social actors and processes of wealth creation and distribution.

Action-oriented messages

*No theoretical consensus exists on what is global justice nor on how it can be assessed but injustice is a tragedy in many parts of the world and urgent action is needed*

*Critical thinking supported by the social sciences and inspired by human rights principles and standards should be part of the search for solutions to current injustice*

*High level discourse on measures that attempt to achieve global justice needs to relate to realities at the grassroots level*

*Taking context into account in the selection of concrete processes of implementation is crucial to achieving social justice*

*The social sciences need to address not only what justice is about but for whom it is intended*

*The social sciences need to embed “the voices of the poor” into policy-oriented research aimed at the eradication of poverty, inequality and injustice*

Day 1. Theme 2: Critical assessment of the knowledge base

22. In this session a presentation was made by Mr. Joshua Castellino, Professor of Law and Dean of the School of Law, Middlesex University, UK.

23. Professor Castellino introduced his presentation by recalling the evolution of human rights instruments after the Second World War. An important aspect for Castellino is that law has become increasingly recognized as an instrument for promoting justice, not only for ensuring order, and therefore it is important for social scientists to study how order and justice interacts. Mr. Castellino expressed that the merits of the human rights mechanisms have been partly offset by their intense focus on civil and political rights, rather than on undivided human rights including economic, social and cultural rights. He considered that as a result, these mechanisms have been relatively inefficient in addressing wider issues of social inclusion, empowering communities in socio-economic terms, or making a serious contribution to the ending of poverty. Mr. Castellino stated that human rights mechanisms have not had adequate answers to the difficulties faced by those in the ‘Bottom Billion’, nor have cogent legal arguments been
made and tackled that would enable adequate focus on the environment and the challenges faced by planetary boundaries to growth. He recalled that legal systems in many countries still reflect the inheritance of colonial times. Mr. Castellino remarked that the justice agenda has not been sufficiently incorporated into the political agenda and that relying, in the case of many countries, on the traditional approach of the “lone advocate” poses questions of legitimacy and social exclusion. Mr. Castellino expressed the view that poor people frequently perceive the law as an instrument of coercion and not as a liberating and transformative tool that could be utilized to fight oppression. He stated that although original notions found in UN texts assign relevance to the issue of equality, the narrative has been focused disproportionately on discrimination which is only one manifestation of inequality. Commenting on the MDGs and on the current efforts to design the post-2015 SDGs, Mr. Castellino stated that competing visions exist from a human rights perspective. One approach consist in designing all post-2015 goals, targets and indicators guided by objectives of concrete realization of human rights, while an alternative vision consist in the “commoditization” of human rights during the process of designing goals and targets.

24. Mr. Castellino, remarked that one frustrating aspect of human rights processes is that they have been largely identified with “naming and shaming” and he considered that the international community must go beyond that practice for a human rights-based approach to be successfully implemented in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. Mr. Castellino cited the work of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) as a process that prioritizes attention to “solutions that work”. He highlighted the importance of South-South collaboration to see what works and to mutually learn from successes and mistakes. Mr. Castellino proposed that it would be crucial to think about solutions drawn from state practice around the world, especially in the economic South. He considered that minorities are very interesting “micro-cosmos” that reveal the connections between law and structural discrimination. He expressed that inequality and injustice affecting minorities cannot be solved through the law if the structures that produce and reproduce inequality and injustice are not transformed. Referring to the different dimensions of legal systems, Mr. Castellino stated that special attention must be paid to mainstreaming human rights into administrative justice, which is a crucial area. He observed that mainstreaming human rights in legislation (i.e. constitution and main laws) is relatively common and that at the judiciary level human rights have been also incorporated but he stated that the problem is that many cases of human rights violation do not reach the judges and are addressed through administrative mechanisms which are deficient from a human rights perspective.

25. Mr. Castellino underscored that human rights law need to focus to a greater extent on the needs and challenges faced by the most vulnerable communities, including women, and remarked the need to correct over-reliance on advocacy as the sole tool to gain rights, while failing to realize that truly vulnerable communities often have no access to advocacy and social policy making entities. Mr. Castellino stressed that instead of insisting on an overt focus on the rights of individuals what is required is an appreciation that many of the issues confronting human existence in the twenty-first century are collectively experienced and need collective solutions. However, Mr. Castellino called attention to the risk of perpetrating confusion through the articulation of a ‘human rights-based approach’ which could mean different things in different contexts. Mr. Castellino also called attention to the problems resulting from an over-emphasis on States as the primary liable actors for rights violations. Mr. Castellino highlighted that the question of human rights is not a ‘what’ but a ‘who’ question and remarked that legal mechanisms need to address the human security aspects of all populations, especially the vulnerable.

26. In the discussions that followed, questions were raised on how to define a “solution” as regards the themes under debate. The view was expressed that this is an “open” issue but that in general it is accepted that “solutions” need to be identified by looking at policies that work and which have the possibility to be replicated. In that sense, it was cited the case of the utilization of that type of approach by the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) in the context of its work for the post-2015 development agenda. Experts discussed how debates about human rights should go beyond “naming and shaming”. Although this practice has led to important achievements in protecting individuals from
specific violations of their rights, the implementation of human rights cannot rely exclusively or predominantly thereon. The opinion was conveyed that a more balanced approach would be needed combining "naming and shaming" at both the national and international levels with the more proactive approach of injecting human rights principles and standards in legal frameworks, policies and practice. The point of view was expressed that strategic choices for the post-2015 agenda seem to revolve around either the introduction of human rights issues that could be “palatable” or to exclude and/or minimize them. Part of the discussions in this connection is related to the view that, in strict sense, the monitoring of human rights does not need to be done through Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) because there are already monitoring mechanisms for human rights. However, an agenda which does not reflect human rights concerns in the design of goals and targets will be problematic.

27. The view was expressed that it would be difficult to attribute the “inefficiency” of established human rights mechanisms for addressing wider issues of social inclusion only or mainly to the inadequate attention to economic, social and cultural rights as opposed to civil and political rights. Inasmuch as this divide may have played a key role in the past, its weight has been largely offset by advancements spurred by the consensus of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Rather, the inefficiency of existing mechanisms seems to be the combined effect of several factors, including the inadequate uptake of their recommendations by authorities at the national level but also by institutions working for development, such as the UN. The integration of a human rights-based approach aims at tackling inter alia this type of lacuna. Such an approach calls for a thorough analysis of power relations in a society and for addressing the root causes of systemic discrimination and exclusion. It was recalled by experts that responses inspired by HRBA are not limited to the alignment of the legal framework to international human rights principles and standards but also extends to policies and practices. In that sense, it was noted that HRBA complements the redress mechanisms by placing the focus on promoting proactively the realization of human rights for all.

28. The view was expressed that human rights do remain individual entitlements but that their realization requires a balanced combination of measures to protect against the violations incurred by individuals (through effective redress mechanisms of various kinds) and measures to promote their full enjoyment, the latter being by definition collective in scope. Problems of equality of opportunities and equality of outcomes received also the attention of the experts as well as the issues of “representation” and the “ritualization of law”. The question on why in many cases key institutions are dominated by certain ethnic groups emerged during the discussions. Experts highlighted that what was really important was not advocating for “quotas” of representation but for giving “voice” to different social groups, something which could be done through different mechanisms. The issues of knowledge gaps concerning analysis of root causes of inequality in specific situations as well as how that knowledge could be useful to other experiences were raised during the debates and it was contrasted with the relative abundance of comparative assessments on outcomes, as in the case of the quality of education. The view was expressed that methodologies of systematic review facilitate advances in that area, including the production of “gap maps” which allow identifying what is known and what is not known on specific themes. Experts remarked that systemic reviews are well suited to deal with problems which are highly context-specific, like in the cases of injustice, poverty and inequality. Experts recalled, however, that the required infrastructure and capabilities to conduct studies using systematic reviews did not exist or was underdeveloped in many countries.

29. The need to clearly identify and update what social scientists consider as priorities of research was highlighted during the discussions. In that sense, the view was expressed that inequality has been identified as a top thematic priority in surveys conducted among social scientists and the question on how that is reflected in the knowledge gaps and systematic reviews was also raised. Examples were cited on how the ISSC facilitates available information on surveys that systematically renew information on what is being produced by the social sciences. Questions were also raised on the standards of the quality of studies being produced and on how to deal with the work which is not considered of good quality. Examples were cited, for the particular case of reviews conducted by the International Initiative
for Impact Evaluation (3ie), of one third of “acceptance”, one third of “rejection”, and another one third of “low quality evidence”. The view was expressed that there is a need to improve the so-called “ecological feedback” in a way that would permit to draw lessons from all type of studies, including the rejected ones. Experts also called the attention to the impact that, in certain cases, the utilization of reviews might have in the dilution of original research and in that sense it was mentioned how scholars from India who conducted original research are not even quoted when references are made on the theme of research. The view was expressed that bibliometric studies reveal interesting findings that suggest the need to improve existing criteria for constructing and managing databases in order to eliminate biases and distortions.

30. Issues of South-South collaboration in the social sciences were also discussed and the opinion was expressed that this may contribute to strengthening the appreciation of context and specificity in social science research in the area of inequality, poverty and injustice. The view was expressed that it was important to know how to deal properly with “fashionable topics” by keeping a balanced perspective of the issues that are worth studying. Experts also addressed problems related to the so-called “journal fetish” in a context in which some of the most relevant contributions actually are found in books and not in journals. The issue of how digital technologies have made obsolete traditional formats of production and dissemination of social science research was debated by the experts and the view was expressed that even more radical changes should be expected during the next five years. Issues of “open access”, recent phenomena such as Wikipedia, and the trustworthiness of peer reviews in the context of qualitative research were also discussed by the experts.

31. The view was expressed that systemic knowledge is a powerful framework for resolving knowledge gaps and for developing meta-analysis that could bring together different fields of knowledge which are necessary to address systemic connections in complex issues such as climate change, poverty, inequality and large-scale tax evasion. Experts recalled that the integration of disciplines and also of multiple levels and scales in analysis was not only relevant from a scholarly point of view but also from a policy perspective. Experts highlighted that the production of social science knowledge has to reflect how change is created in a way that it includes the perspectives of people, and that needs to be linked to proposals for transformative action. The meeting recalled the role and evolution of universities and the need to better connect those crucial institutions in a way that could assist in tackling the so-called “North-South divide” in the social sciences. Finally, experts acknowledged that setting agendas for the production of social science knowledge that might be relevant to policymaking involves a set of politics, institutional processes, and funding factors to which attention must be paid.

**Action-oriented messages**

Greater attention must be paid to political, institutional and funding factors that set the research agendas for the production of social science knowledge

The social sciences need to highlight proposals for transformative action based on the perspectives of the people involved

The application of systemic knowledge must be prioritized because it provides a powerful framework for resolving knowledge gaps which are crucial to understanding how inequality, poverty and injustice are generated by complex social systems

South-South collaboration needs to be strengthened because it contributes to a better appreciation of context and specificity in social science research
Methodologies of systematic review facilitates the production of “gap maps” to identify what is known and what is not known on specific themes.

The question of human rights is not only a ‘what’ but also a ‘who’ and a ‘why’ question.

Legal mechanisms need to comprehensively address the human security aspects of all populations, especially the vulnerable.

The design of all post-2015 goals and targets must be guided by human rights principles and standards.

The law and judicial systems need to be designed and implemented as liberating and transformative tools that could be utilized to fight oppression.

Day 2. Theme 3: From knowledge to action

32. A presentation was made during the session by Ms. Aminata Traoré, Coordinator of the Forum pour l’autre Mali.

33. Ms. Traoré opened her presentation by highlighting the importance of letting people to take their destiny in their hands, particularly relevant for women, especially for poor women. Ms. Traoré stated that after the decades that have been “lost” due to the foreign imposition of structural adjustment programmes, people pay increasing attention to matters of inequality. Traoré’s research has documented how women carried the burden of adjustment programmes in Africa. Ms. Traoré expressed the view that when African women begin to talk they are perceived as a threat by powerful interests. She also stated that there is a clear utilization of military power to ensure the foreign control and appropriation of the natural resources that Africa needs for its development. Concerning human rights, Ms. Traoré raised the question: Who define the norms? She considered that this is relevant in order to address other forms of violence imposed on people: economic exploitation supported by existing social norms which represent massive and serious violations of human rights. Ms. Traoré remarked that the way in which the connection between social science knowledge and its practical application occurs, depends very much on the nature of the issues. She expressed that when social scientists critically question issues which are highly sensitive to powerful actors, the powerful fell heavily on social scientists in order to silence them. She mentioned her personal experience related to her position that war cannot be the solution for the problems of Africa. Ms. Traoré remarked that it is common that political factors act as obstacles to the goal of acquiring a deeper understanding of social problems. She mentioned, for instance, how violence and conflict in Africa are in many cases the direct result of the decomposition of the social fabric of countries. She stated that there is a direct linkage between the irregular violent armies that have proliferated in Africa and the “armies of hungry people” that populate the continent. She stated that notwithstanding those hard facts and visible connections, the solutions imposed by foreign actors and local elites usually revolve around buying more arms that will kill more African people.

34. Ms. Traoré considered that social scientists, particularly in Africa, are regularly confronted with practical dilemmas related to the question: What should you do when you know in advance that you will get into serious trouble if you conduct rigorous social science research? Ms. Traoré expressed the view that in the particular case of Mali what existed was a “fabrication” as regards a false vision of progress on
the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and in the end it has become clear that Mali is a typical case of failure of the development model because it was transformed into a model of “economic apartheid”. She expressed that it was a system designed to exploit people and not to promote development, and that is widely common in Africa. Ms. Traoré stated that the social sciences have to address the issue of how to rethink solidarity, among other things because the reality of countries could be perceived as a “problem” or a “menace” by people in other countries. She remarked that it is absolutely crucial that social scientists speak loud and clear about the notion that poverty cannot be eradicated amidst a war spiral. Ms. Traoré concluded by highlighting that the social sciences have the moral duty to rethink the approaches which guide practical transformations.

35. In the discussions that ensued, which were moderated by Mr. Gudmund Hernes, Member of the Executive Committee of the International Social Science Council (ISSC), experts initiated the exchanges around the issue of how systems that are crucial for transforming ideas into action operates, and how knowledge is framed and filtered. Experts raised the problem of similarities that may exist, notwithstanding differences in context, when the results of social science research contradict powerful economic and political interests. Examples were cited as regards the similar rejection and even the threats to scientists doing research on mining activities, no matter if it is related to mining sites in Africa or North America. Experts agreed that this is an important factor when trying to respond to the question: What kind of research is useful for practical action? In that sense the view was also expressed that ethical considerations are thus a practical problem for social scientists, particularly when policy-oriented research focuses on issues such as social justice, drug trafficking, abusive practices of transnational corporations, dictatorships and regional security, or women rights, among other. The connection of social science knowledge to current debates of the post-2015 development agenda, particularly in the identification of goals and targets, has revealed the importance of being more energetic in involving the social sciences in promoting the application of critical thinking in the context of international agendas. Examples were cited concerning two specific themes which are relevant to post-2015 “focus areas”: gender equality, and global partnerships & means of implementation.

36. The view was expressed that what the United Nations is trying to do in Africa is not working because key decisions are made by a few and powerful “extra-regional” countries and not resulting from genuine partnerships, though an articulated analysis of UN failures in the continent must integrate many more factors, including that accountability on failures cannot exclusively rest on “extra-regional” countries. The view was expressed that regional institutions are excessively dependent on foreign funds and that military interventions are putting money in the pockets of arm dealers while women are bearing the burden of military conflict. The view was also expressed that there is no justice on this and that only what is human can be considered as socially sustainable. Experts acknowledged that problems are difficult to tackle but that the perceptible lack of progress and setbacks were not basically the result of a knowledge deficit but of the lack of political willingness to build collective action. The view was expressed that with the available knowledge solutions exist, on the condition that political impasses are solved. Experts recognized a sense of indignation shared by many social scientists as regards the current state of affairs in areas such as poverty, inequality and injustice. The view was expressed that the analysis of the distribution of power is an important factor in order to move from knowledge to action. In that sense, experts remarked that it was important to highlight the concept that moving from knowledge to action is not only about knowledge but also about getting poor people represented in policymaking and actively involved in social transformations. Experts reiterated the point made in previous sessions concerning the need to take into account the voices of the poor.

37. The meeting examined how through foresight, the social sciences may contribute to a type of knowledge production that is crucial for action, in particular for inventing alternative models of society. The issue of building capacities to use the future differently, focused on how to construct a more efficient reality -not imposing a particular moral but consistent with widely shared human values- was addressed by experts. The meeting discussed how the analysis of knowledge production requires taking into account that the so-called “users” -on the action-side of the process- are not passive actors but in fact
are also producers of knowledge. In that sense, the view was stated that the expression “from knowledge to action” does not involve two different things (knowledge production, and utilization of knowledge, each with well delimited boundaries) but to a single process with various dimensions and linkages. Experts remarked that the social sciences have always had a transformative aspiration and that this is the basic premise to deal both, with the advancement of the social sciences and with taking concrete action that is informed by social science knowledge. The view was also expressed that it is a complex process because social sciences are still rooted in a disciplinary past and that requires, among other tasks, the type of theoretical update that is adequate to explain the world in which we live today. The case of the incongruity between globalization and theoretical perspectives entrenched in the nation-state paradigm was cited as one example of current debates.

38. Experts recognized that the production of trans-disciplinary knowledge needs to be critically revised, and that in addition to the integration of disciplines it is also very important the integration of non-academic stakeholders into policy oriented social science research. The view was expressed that the social sciences play a significant function in finding alternatives to the dominant policymaking paradigms, especially in terms of knowledge that could be relevant to empower and enable grassroots solutions. Concerning framing and filtering of knowledge, experts observed that there is a lack of familiarity in the academic community on how policy works and that there is an observable deficit regarding the analysis of “process” in current debates which might explain why social scientists cannot communicate as efficiently as professional lobbyists. Another view expressed that the disadvantage vis a vis lobbyists was not so much a matter of communication but of differences in money and access to power. At the same time, experts highlighted the importance of transforming social science knowledge into outputs specifically designed for effective policy-oriented communication, including policy briefs, traditional media, and opportunities which are increasingly being created by new technologies and social practices such as social media. Experts reflected on how the World Social Science Forum 2015 and the forthcoming World Social Science Report 2016 could provide opportunities for communicating to relatively wider audiences the findings of social science, the promotion of equality, social justice, and global justice.

Action-oriented messages

The path from knowledge to action does not depend on knowledge alone but on ensuring that poor people meaningfully participate in policymaking and are actively involved in social transformations

Analysis of the distribution of power needs to be emphasized as an important factor in moving from knowledge to action in the area of inequality, poverty and injustice

More evidence-based social science is required but social scientist need also to claim in existing platforms for research-policy linkages their right to conduct rigorous research and to seek its practical application and not being penalized for doing their job, especially in cases where the subject of research could be perceived as contrary to “special interests”

Social scientists need to highlight, whenever it can be substantiated, the notion that solutions to crucial and urgent problems exist on the basis of the social science knowledge already available, on the condition that political impasses are solved

Analysis of knowledge production needs to acknowledge that the so-called “users” on the action-side of the process are not passive actors but also often produce knowledge
The World Social Science Forum 2015 and the 2016 World Social Science Report could provide opportunities for communicating to relatively wider audiences the findings of social scientists on the promotion of equality and social justice.

The social sciences need to bring upfront ethical principles when addressing the role of foreign meddling—above all military “collaboration”—in the context of alleged partnerships for development.

Day 2. Theme 4: Towards new social norms and policies

39. In this session a presentation was made by Ms. Anita Amorim, Head, Emerging and Special Partnerships Unit (ESPU), International Labor Organization (ILO). Ms. Amorim recalled that the ILO is a rights-based international organization which work is guided by the Declaration of Philadelphia adopted in 1944 and incorporated in the ILO's Constitution in 1946 that states: "all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity". She highlighted that many vulnerable and less protected groups such as women, disabled workers, workers with family responsibilities, migrant workers, indigenous and tribal peoples have also received wide attention from the ILO. Ms. Amorim recalled several key actions and instruments from ILO such as the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of 1998, the 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization that reinforces the Decent Work Agenda, the ILO Recommendation No. 202 and the Social Protection Floor Initiative (SPF-I) launched in 2009 by the United Nations Chief Executives Board. Ms. Amorim also noted that in the context of the post-2015 development agenda, ILO has been actively contributing to the UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda, the UNDG Outreach Group on the Post-2015 Agenda, and UN Country Teams and UNDAFs. She cited the strategic document: “South–South and triangular cooperation: The way forward”, approved by the ILO Governing Body in March 2012, which highlights social dialogue, particularly in the developing world, as a crucial condition for attaining social justice, eradicate poverty and reduce inequality. She mentioned that the contribution of the constituent groups (governments, employers and workers) for the post-2015 discussion has been deemed fundamental by the ILO in advancing towards social justice.

40. Ms. Amorim also recalled that the report of the High Level Panel on the Post-2015 Development Agenda “A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies through Sustainable Development”, presented in May 2013, pointed out that the “ILO’s concept of decent work recognises and respects the rights of workers, ensures adequate social protection and social dialogue, and sets a high standard toward which every country should strive.” Ms. Amorim evoked the High-Level Section on the Working Party on the Social Dimension of Globalization that was held during the ILO's 317th Session of the Governing Body in March 2013 which produced the document “The post-2015 sustainable development agenda”. She remarked that the document addressed the encompassing nature of job creation and the role of the Decent Work Agenda for the promotion of inclusive development as it stated that “for countries at all levels of development, an adequate availability of jobs is the foundation for sustained and growing prosperity, inclusion and social cohesion.” Ms. Amorim underscored that the ILO takes into account the potential synergies between basic human rights, gender equality, sustainability, social protection, vulnerable groups of people (children, women, the elderly and migrants), urbanization and demographic patterns to ensure that basic standards of living are available to everyone and that Decent Work constitutes an asset for the individual and his family. Ms. Amorim noted that Decent Work by promoting the quality of jobs, the development of skills policies, the promotion of small and medium enterprises, the formalization of workers, and the breakdown of discriminatory barriers is fundamental to support the efforts to reduce poverty and inequality and to achieve social justice. Ms. Amorim concluded
by identifying key messages from the post-2015 global thematic consultation on growth and employment which are fundamental, from ILO’s perspective, to address poverty, inequality and social justice.

**Messages from the post-2015 global thematic consultation on growth and employment**

- **Decent jobs** for the poor and most vulnerable as a pre-requisite for sustained inclusive growth.
- Addressing the structural causes of unemployment and promoting **economic diversification** and recognizing that governments must be responsible for driving structural transformation through coherent policies.
- Development-friendly **macroeconomic policies**.
- Expanding **social protection systems** as a crucial policy tools to reducing poverty and inequality and fostering social cohesion.
- Combining expanded social protection with **employment generation programmes** especially targeting women and low-skilled workers.
- Strengthening **social dialogue and the voice of workers** so as to improve working conditions and ensure fair distribution of benefits.
- Complementing **official development assistance** with reforms in the **international trade, finance and technology transfer systems**

41. In the discussions that followed the presentation, experts discussed aspects of the participation of ILO in the work of the Open Working Group (OWG) which is preparing the main documents of the post-2015 development agenda, in particular considering the specificities of ILO. Experts addressed topics such as decent work, social dialogue, migration, “jobless growth”, the national implementation of ILO conventions, and microfinance, which are relevant topics for ILO that have been part of the post-2015 debates. The question of the voices that are actually being heard and effectively being taken into account in the preparation of the post-2015 agenda was again raised by experts. Experts also commented on the situation of those who are silent and on how to deal with different opinions and conflict of opinions. In that sense, experts discussed the work of organizations operating at grassroots levels, such as the Initiative for Equality (IfE), in particular as regards how those organizations mediate processes which are led and framed by local partners, and how the organizations become engaged as well in experimental change through interventions. The view was expressed that the elucidation of how poverty, inequality and injustice are created is a problem which obviously seem to interest wide audiences all over the world, as illustrated by the recent success of Thomas Piketty’s book “Capital in the Twenty-First Century”. Experts remarked that the question concerning who should provide solutions, the experts or the people, is a pertinent question for the social sciences in the study of policy processes like the post-2015 development agenda. The opinion was expressed that technocratic emphasis does not represent well the poor but on the contrary it is biased against the poor because many experts regularly do not properly take into account local context in their analysis and recommendations.

**Action-oriented messages**

*The social sciences should take advantage of the increasing interest showed by wide audiences on how poverty, inequality and injustice are created and perpetuated*

*Technocratic emphasis on proposed solutions does not contribute to the representation of the interest of the poor but, on the contrary, it is biased against the poor because many experts regularly do not properly take into account local context in their analysis and recommendations*
Social scientists need to support participatory research at grassroots levels and must become engaged in experimental change through interventions in processes which are leaded and framed by local partners

42. The facilitator of the meeting, Mr. Gudmund Hernes, requested to allocate the last half of the session to identify suggestions that the experts would propose to UNESCO and the ISSC. To that end, the facilitator identified a set of issues and questions that may be useful for guiding the enunciation of suggestions. Those points included the following topics for UNESCO: What is missing from the perspective of UNESCO as regards analysis of poverty, inequality and global justice, and what can UNESCO add into its programme in order to address gaps? In the case of the ISSC, the following points could be pertinent: universities, disciplines and connectedness with non-academic actors; should researchers be turned into policy consultants?; main knowledge gaps that require urgent attention; possible themes for the preparation of the World Social Science Forum 2015 and the 2016 World Social Science Report 2016; how to produce better narratives with more effectiveness to communicate social science knowledge?; How to use better existing knowledge?

43. In response to the request made by the facilitator, experts made the following suggestions:

44. Preliminary suggestions made to UNESCO by the experts:
   - Prioritize equality as the leading theme and contribute to put economic inequality back into the agenda
   - Mobilize the social and human sciences to provide systemic and critical thinking that may be relevant to the post-2015 development agenda (taking into account that the phase of political negotiation of the Open Working Group (OWG) severely limits the possibility of introducing new substantive contributions into the formal UN-led process)
   - Utilize “gap maps” in programming, and prioritize the transformation of context specific knowledge that is already available into action-oriented proposals
   - Support the production and dissemination of social science research of high quality that is directly relevant to evidence-based policy proposals
   - Incorporate the judicial perspective into activities aimed at the promotion of transformative agendas
   - Support the production of communication products focused on disseminating social science-based solutions to problems of poverty, inequality and injustice, and make them available to Member States on a regular basis

45. Preliminary suggestions made to the ISSC by the experts:
   - Prioritize equality as the leading theme for the 2016 World Social Science Report
   - Emphasize conceptual leaps produced by the social science which are innovative and that could be transformed into a positive force for promoting equality and social justice
   - Encourage field research and field experimentation on matters of equality and justice
- Focus on evidence-based research; support developing good evidence in the context of qualitative research
- Support/highlight work on theories of change at different levels (micro, meso and macro)
- Incorporate into the World Social Science Report 2016 articles aiming at empowering women through mobilization, capacity building and decent work
- Incorporate into the World Social Science Report 2016 articles supporting the notion that sexual and reproductive health and rights are an integral part of the sustainable development agenda
- Emphasis should be put in supporting critical thinking
- Support social science research which gives voices to the poor, especially women, placing particular attention to Africa
- Encourage South-South collaboration in social science research to promote equality
- Support social scientists in places where powerful actors do not want the dissemination of findings of research on issues of equality and social justice

46. After the preliminary identification of the suggestions, Mr. Gudmund Hernes, offered a final opportunity to make comments which could enrich the suggestions. Referring to the proposed focus on the promotion of equality, experts agreed on the relevance of the suggestion and it was underscored the importance of establishing its intimate connections with the other two topics of the meeting: poverty eradication and global justice. The view was expressed that this is an issue already being addressed by UNESCO, in particular because the term “poverty eradication” is prominently displayed in the main programmatic documents of the Organization and it is assumed through its connections with equality and justice in the concrete work plans adopted for the implementation of UNESCO’s programme. It was remarked that at a substantive level, for example, poverty is a manifestation of inequality and it is also a structural condition which contributes to inequality. The view was restated that poverty, inequality and justice should not be perceived as different things and that the three issues must be framed as distinct but complementary entry points at the same level, avoiding the adoption of a concentric approach. Experts also remarked that the social sciences need to assign priority to process-oriented concerns in the context of the post-2015 development agenda, in particular to the connections between themes (i.e. “focus areas”) and processes which may be relevant for the “architecture” of the post-2015 development framework. The view was expressed that culture has been barely taken into consideration in the post-2015 process and that given the important role that culture plays in understanding the context of development, UNESCO should prioritize the mobilization of the social sciences to produce policy-oriented research findings in that area of study.

47. The revised suggestions of the EGM are identified in the following boxes:

48. Suggestions made to UNESCO by the experts

Suggestions made to UNESCO by the experts

- **Prioritize the visibility of equality in the design of activities, within a framework that considers the three main topics of the EGM—global justice, poverty and inequality— as distinct but complementary entry points at the same level, avoiding the adoption of a concentric approach.**
- **Contribute to put economic inequality back into the agenda**
- **Prioritize the mobilization of the social sciences to produce policy-oriented research findings aimed at elucidating the role that culture plays in understanding the context of development and thus contributing to enhance the standing of culture in the post-2015 development agenda.**
- Mobilize the social and human sciences to provide systemic and critical thinking that may be relevant to the post-2015 development agenda (taking into account that the phase of political negotiation of the Open Working Group (OWG) severely limits the possibility of introducing new substantive contributions into the formal UN-led process)

- Use “gap maps” in programming, and prioritize the transformation of context specific knowledge that is already available into action-oriented proposals

- Support the production and dissemination of social science research of high quality that is directly relevant to evidence-based policy proposals

- Incorporate accountability and the rule of law into activities aimed at the promotion of transformative agendas

- Support the production of communication products focused on disseminating social science-based solutions to problems of poverty, inequality and injustice, and make them available to Member States on a regular basis

49. Suggestions made to ISSC by the experts

Suggestions made to ISSC by the experts

- Prioritize the analysis of equality and social justice in different domains from education to work and employment, mobility, dignity, and capacities. In so doing do not neglect economic inequalities which are related to many others.

- Consider the multidimensional level of inequalities in a dynamic way: how they reinforce each other and how they perpetuate

- Support new ways of thinking and new concepts produced by the social science which are innovative and that could be transformed into a positive force for promoting equality and social justice

- Highlight evidence-based research in quantitative as well as in qualitative research

- Support work on theories of change at different levels (micro, meso and macro)

- Emphasis should be put in supporting critical thinking

- Support social science research which gives voices to the poor, especially women, and disadvantaged groups, Africa a region that deserves particular attention

- Encourage South-South collaboration in the social sciences research in order to promote equality

- Support social scientists in situations in which powerful actors do not want the dissemination of findings of research on issues of justice, equality and poverty
Closing session

50. In closing the meeting, Mr. Philippe Quéau, UNESCO Assistant Director-General a.i. for Social and Human Sciences, commended the constructive spirit of the lively debates of the sessions and thanked the valuable contributions provided by the experts. Mr. Quéau remarked that UNESCO has greatly benefited from this EGM which provided crucial insights and suggestions for the implementation of the programmes of the Organization and for achieving a better collaboration with the ISSC. Mr. Quéau recalled the relevance of the suggestions concerning the need to prioritize systemic and critical thinking as well as the relevance of linking researchers with other stakeholders, especially with poor people. Mr. Quéau underscored the important contribution that is expected from the social and human sciences in order to renew development frameworks and discourses. Suggesting the way forward, Mr. Quéau indicated three possible main directions of work:

- **Production of policy-oriented outputs** that could stimulate actions by Member States and other stakeholders that might be interested in emphasizing global justice, poverty eradication and promoting equality in the context of the post-2015 development agenda. UNESCO and the ISSC will prepare an outcome report, which will synthesize the presentations and debates provide inputs into policy - including policy briefs, op-ed pieces and texts to be disseminated through social media.

- **Identification of possible components** for planning UNESCO-ISSC contribution to the 2015 WSSF in Durban (i.e. possible panels in Durban; identification of experts who could be invited to different panels, etc.)

- **Assessment of issues that might be relevant for informing the design of the 2016 World Social Science Report as well as identification of possible authors**
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**PROGRAMME MONDAY 28 APRIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>ARRIVAL REGISTRATION COFFEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10.00 | WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS        | Philippe Quéau Assistant Director General a.i. UNESCO-Social and Human Sciences  
Alberto Martinelli ISSC President |
| 10.20 | THEME 1 CONCEPTUAL FRONTIERS OF GLOBAL JUSTICE | Open, framing discussion on issues of global justice, poverty and inequality, conceptual clarification, new developments and understanding these issues in the context of the sustainable development discourse and associated processes  
Introductory remarks John Crowley, UNESCO (15 minutes)  
Plenary discussion (135 minutes)  
Sum up (10 minutes)  
Facilitator Gudmund Hernes |
| 13.00 | LUNCH DELEGATES’ BAR             |                                                                         |
| 14.30 | THEME 2 CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE | Taking stock of existing key contributions from the social sciences, identifying knowledge gaps, priority areas and questions, as well as new, innovative lenses on the topic for future social science initiatives such as the World Social Science Report and World Social Science Forum  
Introductory remarks Joshua Castellino, Professor of Law & Dean School of Law, Middlesex University, (10 minutes)  
Discussion (80 minutes)  
Facilitator Gudmund Hernes |
| 16.00 | REFRESHMENT BREAK                |                                                                         |
| 16.30 | THEME 2 CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE BASE continued | Discussion  
Plenary discussion (50 minutes)  
Sum up (10 minutes)  
Facilitator Gudmund Hernes |
| 17:30 | close of meeting                 |                                                                         |
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## Programme Tuesday 29 April

### 09.30 Theme 3 From Knowledge to Action

The connection between normative ideas and public activism on global justice. The role and limits of the academia in shaping public opinion, the question of how to move from reasoned criticism of global injustice to a politically influential discourse on global justice, and the weight of “the local” in shaping public notions of “the global”.

Introductory remarks *Aminata Traoré*, Coordinator of *Forum pour l’autre Mali* (10 minutes)
Discussion in 2 groups (80 minutes)

**Facilitators**
- Gudmund Hernes

### 11.00 Refreshment Break

### 11.30 Theme 3 From Knowledge to Action continued

**Discussion**

- Plenary discussion (50 minutes)
- Sum up (10 minutes)

**Facilitator**
- Gudmund Hernes

### 12.30 Lunch Delegates’ Bar

### 14.00 Theme 4 Towards New Social Norms and Policies

Global justice and inequality in the post-2015 development agenda. What recommendations can be taken forward?

Introduction *Anita Amorim*, Head, Emerging and Special Partnerships, ILO (10 minutes)
Plenary discussion (105 minutes)
Sum up (10 minutes)
Closing comments *Philippe Quéau* and *Heide Hackmann* (10 minutes)

**Facilitator**
- Gudmund Hernes

### 16.15 End