

THE SUSTAINABLE INTERCONNECTION OF HUMAN FREEDOM AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Krivenko D. U. (Kharkiv)

Language supervisor: Goldina A.N.

Summary: The article deals with a sustainable interconnection of human development and human freedom in the 21st century which is rather urgent nowadays. The types of freedom and its role in society's development are considered and presented as the basis of the evaluation of success and failure. Freedom as a principal determinant of individual initiative and social effectiveness is analyzed. The decision making of a sizable society, reflecting the choices "of people, by people, for people", in other words, the subject of "social choice" is analyzed in the article. The valuable information about Amartya Sen's and K. Arrow's investigations as the founders of human freedom theory is given.

Key words: sustainable interconnection, urgent question, a principal determinant, social choice.

Анотація: Стаття присвячена темі стійкого зв'язку між людською свободою і людським розвитком, яка є дуже актуальною сьогодні. Розглядаються типи свобод та їх роль у розвитку суспільства і представлені як основа оцінки успіхів і невдач людства. Свобода аналізується з точки зору основного визначального чинника індивідуальної ініціативи та соціальної ефективності. Вивчається процес прийняття рішень суспільством, який відображає вибір «людей, для людей і людьми», іншими словами предмет теорії «соціального вибору». У статті надана корисна інформація про дослідження Амартія Сена і Кеннета Ерроу, як засновників цієї теорії.

Ключові слова: стійка взаємозв'язок, актуальне питання, основний визначальний фактор, суспільний вибір.

Аннотация: Статья посвящена теме устойчивой связи между человеческой свободой и человеческим развитием, которая является очень актуальной сегодня. Рассматриваются типы свобод и их роль в развитии общества и представлены как основа оценки успехов и неудач. Свобода анализируется с точки зрения основного определяющего фактора индивидуальной инициативы и социальной эффективности. Изучается процесс принятия решений обществом, который отражает выбор «людей, для людей и людьми», другими словами предмет теории «социального выбора». В статье предоставлена полезная информация об исследованиях Амартия Сена и Кеннета Эрроу, как основателей этой теории.

Ключевые слова: устойчивая взаимосвязь, актуальный вопрос, основной определяющий фактор, общественный выбор.

Human development is moving to centre stage in the 1990s. For too long, the question has been: how much is a nation producing? Now the question must be: how are its people faring?

The real objective of development is to increase people's development choices. Income is one aspect of these choices-and an extremely important one but it is not the sum-total of human existence. Health, education, a good physical environment and freedom to name a few other components of well-being – may be just as important.

A realistic view is that growth in income and an expansion of economic opportunities are necessary preconditions of human development. Although growth is not the end of development, the absence of growth often is. But the growth

should not be merely an aggregate number projected into the future, for the quality of growth is important. The aim should be the growth that is:

- *Participatory-allowing* for private initiative and broad-based people's involvement.
- *Distributed* well – benefiting *all* people.
- *Sustainable* – since raising future production may demand current sacrifice [4, p. 13].

In all countries, developing and industrial, the growth issue should be one of quality rather than quantity, one of more equitable distribution rather than mere expansion. The relationship between the economic growth and the social is complex. While growth is necessary for human development, most types of human expenditure will, in turn, accelerate growth. A healthy, well-nourished, well-educated and skilled labour force is the best foundation for growth. Japan, Singapore and the Republic of Korea invested massively in people-an investment that yielded its fruit in rapid growth.

Human Development Reports always emphasize the importance of human freedom: "Human development is incomplete without human freedom. Throughout history, people have been willing to sacrifice their lives to gain national and personal liberty" [4, p. 18]. That being the case, it was recognized that "Any index of human development should therefore give adequate weight to a society's human freedom in pursuit of material and social goals."

The many kinds of freedom generally belong to two broad "clusters". The first one comprises "negative" freedoms, called so because they imply freedom from something – from arbitrary rule, from illegal arrest or from unwarranted attack on person or property. Whether in village or nations, these freedoms have always had to be defended – often fought for. And a number of institutions have been developed by democratic systems to protect these freedoms-including the universal franchise, the secret ballot and the rule of law, which guarantees the rights of persons and property.

The second cluster comprises the "positive" freedoms. These are the freedoms to do something to take part in the community's life, to organize opposition parties or trade union groups or to go about without being "ashamed to appear in public", as Adam Smith expressed it some 200 year ago. The most systematic codification of freedoms is in the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. These include many personal rights: the right to life, liberty and security of a person; equality before the law; freedom of assembly; freedom of thought, religion and opinion; the right to work, the free choice of jobs; the right to an adequate standard of living including adequate food clothing, housing, education; the right to participate in community life; and so on [1, p. 10].

There are no universally accepted concept and term of freedom. Some economists noting economic freedom emphasize free markets and private property while others extend the welfare economics study of individual choice. And here it is necessary to mention the definition of Amartya Sen, the great contributor to the

development of this category, who considered the economic freedom in terms of the set of economic choices available to individuals.

But in spite of the fact that economic freedom has rather wide range of meanings, it is difficult to argue the fact of its existence in our society. Freedoms depend also on many determinants, such as social and economic arrangements (for example, facilities for education and healthcare) as well as political and civil rights (for example, the liberty to participate in public discussion and scrutiny). Similarly, industrialization or technological progress or social modernization can substantially contribute to expanding human freedom. In general, there exist 5 types of "instrumental" freedom. These include *political freedoms*, *economic facilities*, *social opportunities*, *transparency guarantees* and *protective security*. Each of these distinct types of rights and opportunities helps to advance the general capability of a person. They may also serve to complement each other. Public policy to foster human capabilities and substantive freedoms in general can work through the promotion of these distinct but interrelated instrumental freedoms. In the view of "development as freedom," the instrumental freedoms link with each other and with the ends of enhancement of human freedom in general. That is why, freedom today is considered to be not only the primary ends of development, it is also among its principal means [1, p. 3].

They can be called respectively the "constitutive role" and the "instrumental role" of freedom in development. The constitutive role of freedom relates to the importance of substantive freedom in enriching human life. The substantive freedoms include elementary capabilities like being able to avoid such deprivations as starvation, undernourishment, escapable morbidity and premature mortality, as well as the freedoms that are associated with being literate and numerate, enjoying political participation and uncensored speech and so on. In this constitutive perspective, development involves expansion of these and other basic freedoms. According to this view, development is the process of expanding human freedoms.

Development seen as an enhancement of freedom cannot but address such deprivations. The relevance of the deprivation of basic political freedoms or civil rights, for an adequate understanding of development, does not have to be established through their indirect contribution to *other* features of development (such as the growth of GNP or the promotion of industrialization). These freedoms are part and parcel of enriching the process of development. This fundamental point is distinct from the "instrumental" argument that these freedoms and rights may *also* be very effective in contributing to economic progress. That instrumental connection is important as well, but the significance of the instrumental role of political freedom as the *means* to development does not in any way reduce the evaluative importance of freedom as an *end* of development. The *intrinsic* importance of human freedom as the preeminent objective of development has to be distinguished from the *instrumental* effectiveness of freedom of different kinds to promote human freedom.

The instrumental role of freedom concerns the way different kinds of rights, opportunities, and entitlements contribute to the expansion of human

freedom in general, and thus to promoting development. The effectiveness of freedom as an instrument lies in the fact that different kinds of freedom interrelate with one another, and freedom of one type may greatly help in advancing freedom of other types. The two roles are thus linked by empirical connections, relating freedom of one kind to freedom of other kinds [1, p. 18–19].

The analysis of development treats the freedoms of individuals as the basic building blocks. Attention is thus paid particularly to the expansion of the "capabilities" of persons to lead the kind of lives they value and have reason to value. These capabilities can be enhanced by public policy, but also, on the other hand, the direction of public policy can be influenced by the effective use of participatory capabilities by the public. The *two-way relationship* is central to the analysis presented here. There are two distinct reasons for the crucial importance of individual freedom in the concept of development, related respectively to *evaluation* and *effectiveness*. The success of a society is to be evaluated primarily by the substantive freedoms that the members of that society enjoy. Having greater freedom to do the things one has reason to value is significant in itself for the person's overall freedom, and important in fostering the person's opportunity to have valuable outcomes. The second reason for taking substantive freedom to be so crucial is that freedom is not only the basis of the evaluation of success and failure, but it is also a principal determinant of individual initiative and social effectiveness. Greater freedom enhances the ability of people to help themselves and also to influence the world, and these matters are central to the process of development.

The decision making of a sizable society, reflecting the choices "of people, by people, for people", is, broadly speaking, the subject of "social choice". It includes within its capacious frame various problems with the common feature of relating social judgments and group decisions to the views and interests of the individuals who make up the society or the group. Social choice theory is a systematic discipline first came into its own around the time of the French revolution. The subject was pioneered by French mathematicians in the late eighteenth century, such as J.C. Borda and Marquis de Condorcet, who addressed these problems in rather mathematical terms and who initiated the formal discipline of social choice in terms of voting and related procedures. When the subject was revived in the twentieth century by Arrow, he was very concerned with the difficulties of group decisions and the inconsistency to which they may lead. Kenneth Joseph Arrow is an American economist and joint winner of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics with John Hicks in 1972. While Arrow put the discipline of social choice in a structured - and axiomatic - framework (thereby leading to the birth of social choice theory in its modern forms), he deepened the preexisting gloom by establishing an astonishing - and apparently pessimistic - result of ubiquitous reach.

Arrow's "impossibility theorem" is a result of breathtaking elegance and power, which showed that even some very mild conditions of reasonableness could not be simultaneously satisfied by any social choice procedure, within a very wide family. The nature and role of impossibility theorems should be explained. When a

set of axioms regarding social choice can all be simultaneously satisfied, there may be several possible procedures that work, among which we have to choose. In order to choose between the different possibilities through the use of discrimination axioms, we have to introduce further axioms, until only one possible procedure remains. This is something of an exercise in brinkmanship. We have to go on cutting down alternative possibilities, moving – implicitly – towards an impossibility, but then stop just before all possibilities are eliminated, to wit, when one and only one option remains [2, p. 185].

Kenneth Arrow has shown, through his “General possibility theorem” (an oddly optimistic name for what is more commonly – and more revealingly – called Arrow’s “impossibility theorem”), that in trying to obtain an integrated social preference from diverse individual preferences, it is not in general possible to satisfy even some mild-looking conditions that would seem to reflect elementary demands of reasonableness [3, p. 1 – 3].

And, finally, one question is left. Is it possible to measure human freedom in the society? Many people have attempted to classify human rights and to measure each country against that classification. The systems differ in their concepts, definition and coverage. And none has so far gained universal, or yet common, acceptance. There was an offered “human freedom index” for which 40 distinct criteria were distilled for judging freedom. These include freedom of movement, the right of assembly and free speech, the rights to ethnic and gender equality, the rule of law, and other democratic freedoms. It is a *human freedom index* [4, p. 19].

Applying a system of measurement to human freedoms will always be a precarious exercise. The first difficulty is to decide what constitute serious violations of rights or curtailments of freedom. Does the fact that a few citizens of a country have had their passports revoked mean that the country does not, in principle, allow its citizens to leave the country? Does the fact that some critic of a government cannot appear on state-controlled television mean that the country practice press censorship and should be marked down accordingly?

The second contentious area is the relative importance of different right. Is the right to free assembly more important or less important than a free press? Is the right to ethnic language more significant than the right to vote? These questions should be posed. This will encourage more systematic research and studies on human freedom, which are very scarce today.

One aspect of this index, in particular, is likely to be an issue of contention- the gradation of freedom violations ranging from "some violations or infringements" to "substantial oppression" and on to "total denial". Adopting a simpler method of judgement, one that distinguishes between "freedom guaranteed" and "freedom violated" (a "one"- "zero" approach), gives an illuminating ranking of countries. No country among the 88 covered by the Humana index observes *all* freedoms. Sweden and Denmark top the list with 38 of the 40 measured freedoms guaranteed to their people, followed by the Netherland with 37 freedoms. Iraq is at the bottom of the list and Romania and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya just above it. But human freedom is a matter that can change very

quickly. On the whole, the world today is a much freer world than it was several years ago [14, p. 19].

Is there a correlation between human freedom and human development? Yes, there seem to be a high correlation between human development and human freedom. The causality is far from clear, however. In some cases, political freedom seems to have unleashed the creative energies of the people and led to ever higher levels of income and human progress. In other countries, a sustained investment in people has eventually given them sufficient power and confidence to loosen the authoritarian grip of their rulers and to increase their political and personal freedom.

Democracy facilitates transparency; it encourages accountability and the rule of law. It allows reporting of violations and thus improves recording. An objective, reliable human freedom index could be an important tool of human freedom in the 21st century.

References

1. Sen A.K. Development as freedom / A.K. Sen – 1st ed. Published in the United States by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1999. – 192 p.
2. Sen. A.K. Rationality and Social choice // The American economic review, Vol. 85, No. 1 (Mar., 1995), P. 1 – 24.
3. Sen A.K. The possibility of social choice, Nobel Lecture, December 8, 1998 // Trinity College, Cambridge, Great Britain.
4. Measuring human development and freedom, Human development report 1990. – P. 13 – 21.