

LUISS



Department of Political Science

Bachelor in Politics, Philosophy and Economics

Chair of Political Sociology

THE SOCIOLOGY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

HOW EUROPE AND ITALY ARE WORKING FOR THE RESPECT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

SUPERVISOR

Prof. Michele Sorice

CANDIDATE

Ludovica Costa

093032

Academic Year 2021-2022

« Science sans conscience n'est que ruine de l'âme »

François Rabelais

A nonno e Franci

Index

Introduction	4
Chapter one: The Sociology of human rights	7
1.1 What are human rights	7
1.2 What is the sociology of human rights	9
1.3 Historical pillars	11
1.4 Classification of human rights	13
1.5 Civil and political rights.....	17
1.6 Economic and social rights.....	20
1.7 Cultural and environmental rights, we are culture.....	22
1.8 Angles of human rights.....	26
1.9 Conclusions.....	26
Chapter two: A sociological analysis of the implementation of the 2030 agenda’s principles of “leaving-no-one-behind” and “addressing the needs of those furthest behind first” in the EU’s development policy.....	29
Chapter three: How Italy is working for the respect of human rights, the CIDU	41
Conclusions	45
Bibliography.....	47
Riassunto	48
Ringraziamenti.....	52

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to analyze the main features of the sociological perspective of human rights. The principal way to do so is to think sociologically about human rights and to define the most salient concepts of this science, such as rights bundles, rights claims and rights problems. This process leads us to classify different rights into different categories, not only as positive and negative rights, but also as first, second and third generations, which means civil and political rights, economic and social rights and cultural and environmental rights respectively. However, it is important to keep in mind that language, history, culture and values of the various societies shape and influence the conception and perception of human rights. Despite the differences, there are unique and solid canons that are at the base of the ethical and moral development of the respect of human rights, but this does not mean that nations and governments do not violate them. For this reason, the final aim is to reduce at the minimum the risk of these violations to guarantee at the maximum the respect of the individual. Therefore, I have taken into consideration the policies brought on by the European Union and the implementation of the Agenda 2030 and the work of the Italian Interministerial Committee for Human Rights (CIDU). Even though much work has been done, there is a long way to go to reach substantial equality among different individuals.

One of the questions to which it is increasingly difficult to answer concerns the position of the human being in the natural world. Was the human being or social born first? This is an old question, but it is true that philosophers, sociologists, and anthropologists have always tried to give themselves an answer: on the one hand what is an individual and, on the other, what society is.

The truth is that the two questions, what is a human being and what is society, show their complexity at the very moment in which they intertwine; however, the really important matter is that these two points not only intertwine but must intertwine.

One, and maybe the most important, aspect that most connects humans and societies is human rights. While some subjects such as law, political science, and history have looked at human rights from an empirical point of view, sociology has developed a more multi-factorial attitude towards such an important aspect of society. The development of the sociology of human rights can be explained in part by looking at the history of sociology itself.

For example, the great impact of classical sociologists such as Weber, who stressed the loss of natural law and the emergence of juridical rationality as a result, and Marx, who dismissed individual

rights as mere ideology, has stifled the development of a sociology of human rights in significant ways. Furthermore, the idea that people have rights simply because they are human is widely regarded as a philosophical – or, even worse, ideological – abstraction. Durkheim, Marx, and Weber were all suspicious of the possibility of, and indeed the necessity of, a universalistic and normative basis for human rights, emphasizing instead the much more essential functions of law and morality in the creation of specific societal systems. While for some, rights are thought to be pre-social, individualistic, and liberal (serving primarily as safeguards against coercive governmental power), Marx and Durkheim believed that rights belong to society and/or the state, not to the person. As a result, they argued that any discussion of human rights should be closely tied to the state's and society's ability to ensure that those rights are respected.

With the rise of the concept of the modern state, especially in the Anglo-American societies, there has been a distinction between political rights, seen as more concrete, and human rights, which were conceived more abstract. But this has of course changed over time, for example with the incorporation of women's rights, cultural minorities rights, collective rights. Human rights, however, are no longer solely the realm of lawyers and political scientists, but are also featured in the study and action agendas of other disciplines, including sociology.

The accumulation of rights is a linear process led by Nature and some other trans-historical forces, and non-Western civilizations have made a substantial contribution. Sociologists prefer to highlight the social nature of human rights, but it is important to remember that rights are rooted in human physiology and/or the inherent human potential for sociability. Human rights are acquired not only thanks to the efforts politicians and judges, but also via coordinated fights of ordinary people. In other words, dissatisfied parties, social movement organizations (SMOs), and non-governmental organization (NGO) partners are members of the epistemic community centered on human rights.

This study aims to find a connection between human rights “over there” and human rights “over here”, shedding light on the discovery and development of new solutions to long-standing issues in societies at the global, national, and local levels from a sociological point of view. As it will be shown, many social issues have serious implications for human rights. Human rights, when viewed through a sociological perspective, emerge not simply as declarations written on paper or proclaimed at formal ceremonies, but also as norms, practices, and institutions that operate to empower and limit a variety of social actors.

CHAPTER ONE: THE SOCIOLOGY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

1.1 WHAT ARE HUMAN RIGHTS

Human rights are not privileges that may be given or taken away. They are inalienable and universal in nature; however, it is impossible to imagine studying human rights in abstraction from real-world concerns. How we think about human rights is influenced by external factors, such as media, newspapers, the internet, our perception of it and our empathy.

The idea of human rights has a long and illustrious history. It is hard to define some principles such as the ones of justice and rights, since different histories, values of the different societies, and cultures continuously shape different perceptions of them. However, the United Nations emerged from the devastation of World War II as one of the most comprehensive affirmations of universal human rights. One of the UN's founding treaties includes a commitment to human rights as one of its main aims. In the same spirit, the United Nations General Assembly passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. The cornerstone for modern international human rights law is set out in this declaration, which was drafted by an international body headed by Eleanor Roosevelt. The proclamation is predicated on the premise that all humans are born free and equal in dignity and rights. It contains 30 articles that recognize the principle of nondiscrimination and also the right to life and other fundamental freedoms.

The issue is that consistently implementing these rights and punishing violators is extremely difficult. Despite its authority and respect, the UDHR is merely a proclamation, not a binding legislation. Therefore, when countries break it, the mechanisms in place to deal with it are inadequate. For example, the UN's primary human rights committees primarily monitor and investigate violations, but they have little power to compel states to change policies or compensate individuals. Some pupils argue that taking human rights for granted in a world where governmental interests wield so much influence is naïve.

Some doubt the universality of human rights, pointing out that their progress has been strongly influenced by élites of mostly Western nations. Some others argue in favor of universal human rights legislation, highlighting their good function in defining worldwide norms and assisting activists in their efforts. They further emphasize that not all international human rights mechanisms are ineffective. The European Convention on Human Rights, for example, established a court to which the 47 member nations and their residents can submit claims. The court renders final all the decisions that are passed to all member states.

However, the conception of human rights law is in continuous evolution since also our values and cultures change our perception of them.

Mark Frezzo, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Mississippi, defines human rights as the “set of protections and entitlements possessed by all members of the human community regardless of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, cultural background, national origin, or other forms of identity or social standing” (Frezzo 2011). What we are going to see is whether human rights are seen as a social construct or intrinsic aspects of human nature, but in any case, we can say that they developed and changed across historical periods and geographical areas and are also shaped by culture.

There are many viewpoints on human rights, for example, Turner based his studies of them on a sociological theory of the body, instead, Waters believed that human rights are a social construction, or Sjoberg underlined the importance of the language in the modern societies, Pearce studied human rights in opposition to the perception of them in some underdeveloped realities, such as the ones in the African continent.

For political and analytical purposes, human rights can be divided into two large groups: negative and positive rights. The former are civil and political rights, the most widely understood and accepted, conceived as protections from abuse, exploitation, or exclusion by social habitats. This kind of rights is under the responsibility of governments both at national and local levels, which must limit their powers to guarantee them to all people. Examples of negative rights are the right to life, fair trial, representation, free speech, and assembly.

Instead, positive rights are seen as entitlements and touch the economic and social sphere. Since they provide subsistence to individuals because they enable people to develop into society and facilitate their participation, they need the active intervention of governments and policies to fill those gaps due to existing inequalities. This can be controversial for many reasons: governments change and, therefore, policies focus on and certain aspects that change with them; moreover, policies are always made by little élites that do not live that unease widely spread in many societies of the modern world. For this reason, there are some specific “social rights state” that need to be respected and recognized in any place and at any time, which find their roots in the European Union.

There is a third category of rights that developed in the late years, this is one of the cultural and environmental rights. Until now, we can say that negative and positive rights are conceived for all the individuals, on the contrary, cultural and environmental rights are made for the community as a whole. They are needed to protect minorities and all their uses and customs and, in a sense, they can

be attributed to positive rights in nature because they can be seen as entitlements that the state must provide to its citizens.

However, in real life, those three general categories overlap with one another and this study aims to find a way to better deal with some problems that have arisen during the globalization era. The main aim of this thesis is to find the probable causes and the possible remedies for conflicting rights claims due to power relations, interests and political works. However, it is important to keep in mind that the best way to manage different claims is to have dialogues and negotiations with the different institutions and individuals.

1.2 WHAT IS THE SOCIOLOGY OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The discipline of “sociology of human rights” was firstly used in the French and German culture of the 19th century, but its roots are in the Latin word “socius”, which means companion, and the Greek word “logos”, meaning knowledge. Therefore, this science is perceived as the companion to the scientific knowledge. Auguste Comte, the father of sociology and the son of the Enlightenment values of rationality, of the scientific method based on the theories of observation, used sociology as a “systematic line of inquiry” (Frezzo 2011) to better explain the social issues of his time. Illuminists, in fact, were the first to redefine a cosmopolitan, rational, humanitarian ethic of rights, made by humans for humans, capable of giving rise to a powerful political language of the modern against the secular ancient regime of privileges, of hierarchies, inequality and blood rights. They made known to the whole world that human rights, in order to be defined as such, must be equal for all, without any kind of distinction of birth, class, nationality, religion, gender, color of the skin; universal, that is, valid everywhere; inalienable and imprescriptible in the face of any form of political or religious institution. And it is precisely by emphasizing the principle of inalienability that “the Enlightenment culture radically transformed the scattered and harmless references to subjective rights in the state of nature into a political language capable of initiating the emancipation of the human being” (Ferrone 2014). It is for this reason that Comte looked at sociology as the “religion of the community”.

Due to the interdisciplinarity of Sociology, it is important also to mention the role played by Marx in his anthropological and geographical analysis of human rights, Durkheim for his studies in criminology and criminal justice and Weber for his examination of the relationship between political science and human rights. They have planted the seeds for the modern sociologist to focus on normative proposals for a better world, connecting the analysis of human rights with the advocacy

for their actual implementation in the real world. This is really challenging since it is strictly linked with the different policies of governments. Furthermore, “it is the job of the activists to push for new policies and laws in the interest of human rights” and “it is the job of government officials to ratify and implement measures to improve human rights” (Frezzo 2011). The role of sociologists is more concentrated on the observation of social and political events to give an answer to the behavior and give the right tools in terms of political power, respect for the natural environment, protection of minorities, and insurance to access social programs. In other words, rights sociologists can be seen as the linkage between politicians and activists and as educators in the multiple pathways to the expansion of human rights on a global scale. To do so, sociologists need to look at rights claims from many perspectives in order to have a more complete view of the issues, for example taking into consideration also other branches of sociology, including the sociology of peace, economic sociology, social psychology, environmental sociology and so on. The best aspect of this discipline is that knowledge about rights can come from ordinary people, but also from specialized institutions and professors, policymakers, NGOs, and Social Movement Organizations (SMO) members; as a result, it is critical to create a dialogue between the various parts, with the understanding that only through the contestation of different perceptions of rights can a solution to social issues be found.

By definition, “sociology is an academic discipline devoted to the systematic analysis of human behavior, power relations and social structures on the global, national and local levels. Meanwhile, human rights are defined as norms, laws, customs, policies, programs and institutions that afford protections and entitlements to persons in their home context. Notwithstanding changes associated with globalization, the nation-state remains the most important institutional actor in the area of human rights” (Frezzo 2011).

Therefore, it is possible to say that there are many ways of practicing the sociology of human rights: a first way can be to look at the background of the situation to analyze (whether economic, social, political or cultural); a second way is to wonder how some rights claims have accumulated over time in specific conditions and how they can be classified; a third way is strictly connected to the ever-changing governmental and political powers because it is more focused on the relations with policies to implement certain rights; a fourth way follows a more systematic approach to how different rights claims are connected to one another both in theoretical and practical terms, giving birth to the concept of rights bundles (needed to balance political and legal forces). Nevertheless, for sociologists it is really important to consider also the distinction between advocacy and analysis of human rights and their relationships, also taking a more normative approach to the issue. However, the concept of interconnection and relation between different spheres of influence is central in the whole study of

sociology (both in general and in the specific discipline of human rights) and the relation between scientific research and the affirmation of explicit values is fundamental in this analysis.

As stated above, the concept of rights bundles is fundamental because it has the greatest direct impact on the link between social scientific research and value advocacy. In the real world, the inextricability of different forms of rights is seen in their representation through policies, social movements, activists, common individuals, scholars, students that, both individually and collectively, determine what actually counts in a given space and time. The participation of these players strengthens the argument that what survives as human rights in a particular time and location is the result of a complex interaction of social and political factors. Any conceivable universalism would need to be anchored not merely in a critical evaluation of human history, but also in a community discourse about the nature, extent, and usefulness of human rights. For this reason, also the character of indivisibility becomes central in this study through the promotion of longevity, the full development of the individual and the possibility to reach stability. Finally, all the bundles must take into consideration the specific cultural frameworks.

1.3 HISTORICAL PILLARS

Human rights have built their structure both on a national and international level, not in a simultaneous way and for many different reasons, such as the history of a country, its geography and its culture.

Since the publication of the US Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the French Declaration of the Rights of Men and of the Citizens in 1789, the conception of human rights has completely changed. Firstly, because they have put the basis for the Human Rights Canon, starting the history of the accumulated knowledge in the domain of human rights that will develop later with the drafting of the future UN treaties and declarations, Constitutions and other legal acts. Sociology is a relatively new discipline to have its canonical text, but this field is plenty of theories studies and projects that are useful to build what we call “epistemic community”. Therefore, it is important to understand that “what bonds the members of an epistemic community is their shared belief or faith in the verity and applicability of specific forms of knowledge or specific truth”(Haas 2013). Since a canonical text is always subject to too many differences in geographical, historical and cultural terms, a human rights canon remains highly contested by forces all around the world.

Examples of canons that are used by students, scholars and experts in this field are the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). From their titles and from what is stated above, it is possible to deduce that they comprehend what is defined as negative and positive rights and, over more, they are at the base of the 1978 International Bill of Human Rights (IBHR). The latter, in particular, has been drafted by UN officials to give a legal framework to what, until that time, was seen as a “moral compass for forces seeking to advance the cause of human rights across the world, especially in regions that had suffered under the yoke of the European colonialism” (Frezzo 2011). The main historical event that helped to better develop a new conception of human rights has been the period of the Cold War since the values of self-determination and progress were central for both the Western and Eastern powers. The canons mentioned above are part of the historical luggage that the whole world community should (unfortunately it must be used in a conditional form) remember every day because they set the ground for the process of decolonization, nation pacific building, and development of the society.

The UN became an institutional protector of human rights as part of the post-Second World War rebuilding. In essence, the UN legitimized and helped the decolonization processes. Although the newly independent countries did not arise on an equal basis with wealthier and more powerful countries, their independence did help them to some extent. Furthermore, in giving concrete meaning to the rights to national self-determination and development, newly independent countries affected not only the framework and initiatives of the UN system, but also the substance of the ICCPR, the ICESCR, the Stockholm Declaration, and other human rights canon documents. In the early twenty-first century, the UDHR, ICCPR, and ICESCR are insufficient to encompass the entire range of human rights violations and remedies. Future studies should address the political and practical grounds for the pressure on the human rights canon. So, despite the Western origins of much human rights thinking and the strong impact of the United States and other great powers on human rights institutions, the United Nations served as a breeding ground for "Third Worldism," a viewpoint that critiqued both the United States and the Soviet Union and endorsed greater collaboration among poor countries.

In the meantime, the welfare states of the First World created a range of economic and social entitlements, such as collective bargaining, unemployment insurance, disability insurance, social security, and, in some cases, national healthcare, in response to the opposition of the working-class movement and its allies, and part due to complicated geopolitical dynamics underlying a governance consensus. These rights were created not just to offset the consequences of economic volatility,

disaster, and natural calamities, but also to help people go through the phases of life. Trade unions and political parties in Western Europe were successful in defining these rights not just as public goods or beneficial policy initiatives, but also as economic and social rights. This echoed in the European Charter of Social Rights, adopted in 1961.

1.4 CLASSIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Classification is a fundamental component not just of humans' efforts to make their experiences understandable, but also of scholars, politicians, activists, and other members of the rights-oriented epistemic community's efforts to highlight human rights violations and solutions across the world. We require a reference point to determine which types of rights have been violated and what remedies are accessible to the offended party, as well as to examine the priorities we place on various types of rights. It is necessary to ascertain, however, that they differ greatly from one nation-state and cultural setting to another. What valorizes American society is a clear example; indeed, they prefer to emphasize negative rights; instead, many constitutions in Europe and Latin America expressly provide for positive rights. However, people in these countries are accustomed to considering negative and positive rights equally, with the implicit idea that negative rights are important but inadequate for citizens to have fulfilling lives. The major purpose of this study is to understand how the classification of rights affects claims-making rather than determining how to rank different categories of rights. This is possible through the understating of the different abuses and violations of rights and, to do so, violated parties must enforce structural studies on the rights to which they stake a claim, either through relating to the existing human rights canon or drafting new legal acts; they must also try to obtain allies (NGOs, activists, UN agencies, mass media) in their struggles and negotiations with political authorities because rights claims are always exposed to filtration, as they move through hierarchical structures and across territorial boundaries.

For this reason, it is necessary to understand also how human rights conceptualization, institutionalization, and practice develop and “circulate” all around the world. This has been studied by Arjun Appadurai in his theories on globalization in 2001, but also other scholars have given their explanations for this phenomenon. In particular, many have studied the consequences of Europe's domination on the rest of the world and the paradoxes of this Eurocentric view; for example, Bessis in 2003 has highlighted the fact that the West's double-movement (especially during the Enlightenment) was to present itself as the arbitrator of universal standards while devising intricate

justifications for breaching those very principles. His conception of human rights follows a more universalistic approach, but real universalism would include voices from throughout the world, regardless of income, power, geography, or culture. The stakes are extraordinarily high in a world scarred by conflict, political strife, forced migration, misery, cultural marginalization, and environmental destruction. This is not possible since there are and there will always be, for example, social classes and, in a sense, they are needed within a society. So, after dealing with the issue of Eurocentrism, we may go on to the related issue of elitism, which is the notion that rights-oriented information always comes from the top of the political structure or highly qualified professionals in the area. Without a doubt, state policymakers and legal experts play critical roles in both developing political policies that assist the pursuit of rights and codifying rights at the legal level. Nonetheless, popular movements frequently generate enormous pressures for human rights growth. Indeed, the movement for a reinterpretation of old rights and the creation of new rights frequently begins within affected communities and organizations before extending to other sectors. The approach the society is used to is the a posteriori since when a problem presents, the hurt part tries to find a solution with the help of the organizations of specialists in the field. From a sociologic perspective, it is needed to change this kind of approach and stand from an a priori viewpoint, trying to make everyone start from the same point and avoid struggles based on race, ethnicity, and gender.

According to Zerubavel, an important concept to take in mind is the difference between lumping and splitting. Whereas the process of lumping “enables us to perceive grape juice as similar to orange juice and chimpanzees as similar to baboons,” the process of splitting “enables us to perceive grape juice as different from wine and chimpanzees as different from humans”(Zerubavel 1996). Zerubavel clearly shows that lumping, which is the first step in categorizing human rights in this case, and splitting, that is to say, the second step in increasing the differences between subgroups, are key moments not only for single individuals to better understand the world around us but also for social scientists' efforts to make better work the structures of our society through the economy, the polity, society, culture. Hence, this is crucial to the efforts of society as a whole to build up and solve rights dilemmas. Economic, political, social, and cultural life, as well as the natural environment, are traditionally treated as "different domains" of the human experience. While this serves vital research and educational objectives, it is crucial to remember that these domains intersect in the actual world. Whether human rights are grounded in physiology, the intrinsic social character of human beings, or simply the accumulation of common experiences, we must acknowledge that different viewpoints about and practicing of human rights have varied significantly across history and geography; also different perceptions of human rights, no matter how broadly accepted, are always influenced by

specific and different cultural frameworks; finally, the way human rights are classified depends on the relation between the government and society. Therefore, the process of lumping and splitting helps to better classify human rights, to make a sense of abuses and remedies, and to have a clearer point of view thanks to the intersectionality of the characteristics.

In general, we can say that there are two different ways of classifying human rights: the first is the distinction between negative and positive rights that are mostly related to the individual, as already explained above. The second way, instead, underlines the differences between individual and collective rights. The latter approach focuses more on the distinction between “first-generation civil and political rights ensuring liberty to individuals as expressed in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); second-generation economic, social, and cultural rights ensuring equality to individuals, as expressed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR); and an assortment of third generation rights (e.g., the rights to self-determination, development, participation in cultural heritage, and enjoyment of a sustainable environment) ensuring fraternity (or to use the preferable gender-neutral term, solidarity) among peoples, groups, and communities, as expressed, for example, in the Stockholm Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment”(Frezzo 2011). The postwar development of debate and the concurrent establishment of organizations to assess the human rights records of state and non-state actors demanded general agreement on the fundamental categories. And this process has been accelerated by the age of globalization. Thus, the distinction between these two models is whether it is acceptable to think of human rights in terms of “generations” and whether to acknowledge the collective rights, largely cultural and environmental in nature, that compose the “third-generation”.

Many scholars have begun a critical reassessment of the differences between negative and positive rights in light of the two schemas. Throughout the process, such studies have emphasized the linkages between civil and political rights on one hand and economic and social rights on the other. The link between individual and communal rights is more challenging since it manifests differently among nation-states and cultural formations. Furthermore, the three-generations schema has been vigorously criticized: while civil and political rights, particularly the rights to association, assembly, speech, and petition, frequently create conditions for SMOs and their supporters to seek economic and social rights and/or collective rights to cultural and environmental goods. In theory, a given state or society can get second or even third-generation rights before obtaining first-generation rights. In conclusion, it is possible to state that society has witnessed several paths leading to the achievement

of human rights in the last decades. The accumulation of rights, however, is far more complicated than the three-generations model would imply. Popular forces and their better-positioned partners (in NGOs, UN agencies, and universities) play a critical role in enlarging what is achievable in terms of human rights.

In particular, social movements are an important way to reach human rights aims. As many scholars have studied, and for example, Stout in 2004 has highlighted, not only may contentious politics (including civil disobedience) impact policies and law at the national and international levels, but they can also change power relations. The same set of direct techniques (for example, occupations, obstructions, and strikes) might be used in various ways depending on the country's environment and political culture. In nations where public protest is prohibited, activists frequently emphasize the need of attaining basic political liberties and broadening access to the public realm as prerequisites for placing additional demands on state authorities. In nations where public protest is lawful, activists commonly employ civil and political rights such as free assembly, expression, and petition to advocate for economic and social rights. Thus, according to social movement theory, civil and political rights can be viewed not just as goals in themselves, but also as means to other purposes, such as the achievement of economic and social rights. The main aspect to take into consideration is always the ability to communicate and negotiate between the parties, also in a context in which the relationship between the popular forces and the political authorities is complex and ambiguous. However, the real circulation of human rights, whether from the bottom to above, horizontally, or from above to bottom, highlights the necessity to investigate the theoretical and practical linkages between various forms of rights.

The circulation of human rights among various social actors throughout time both challenges and produces new differences. As stated above, the age of globalization has accelerated the circulation of human rights, also thanks to the work of the mass media, as they facilitated the spread of information, abuses and reach of goals. Finally, the theory of circulation derived from a careful investigation of the workings of the epistemic community encircles human rights. It connects the notions of rights conditions, claims, consequences, and bundles of rights. In effect, the term "circulation" refers not only to how rights are claimed by local forces, argued in various settings, and either given or refused by authorities, but also to the real consequences of newly acquired rights for society and government. Therefore, this process is open-ended.

1.5 CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Human rights are relational. It is similarly crucial to note that different sorts of rights make sense only in relation to one another when they are classified in some way. The World Conference on Human Rights, held by the United Nations in Vienna in 1993, confirmed the link between civil and political rights and other forms of rights. Civil and political rights have historically acted as a trampoline for a collaboration to make the world a better place. Civil and political rights, clearly, continue to play this role in the age of globalization. The reason for the increasing prevalence of civil and political rights demands is simple: without these rights, activists face oppression in the discrimination or harassment, ostracizing, physical abuse, prison, exile, or even death, making it impossible to promote their causes. In the absence of fundamental rights, activists find it simpler to pursue other objectives. In this sense, civil and political rights are important mainly for their effects on society, indeed, by definition, civil and political rights provide aggrieved parties with moral and legal standing and protection, therefore shifting power relations in the sovereign state and in the societies. However, the progress of rights is neither unavoidable nor predetermined. As a result, we have both social scientific and normative arguments for separating the essence of human rights from Enlightenment conceptions about reason and progress, as researchers and activists in the Global South have frequently stated.

In effect, the US Declaration of Independence (1776), the US Constitution (1787), the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (1789), and other documents linked with the Enlightenment in the pan-European globe found their first modern articulation of civil and political rights (Ishay 2008). While the most radical components were kept under control during the eighteenth century, the rising Industrial Revolution and the concurrent development of urbanization produced the circumstances for increasing social movement organizing. However, it is with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 that the concept of the modern state came out: the new state was meant to become a political actor at the international and domestic level and followed the principle of *cuius regio eius religio*, so every king decided his religion, in the sense that religion was substituted by a rational and legitimate organization of power. For the first time, it was possible the cohabitation of different beliefs in the same territory, but it did not mean that all creeds were respected and recognized freely. There has been a shift from the role of Christianity, which until that moment constituted the milestone of the society, to the new fundamental concept of the States' integrity based on the idea of absolute sovereignty. This period modified the juridical aspects of the institutions, marking the separation between the public law and individual law, dividing the public sphere from

the private and sanctioning the decline of the *Ius Commune*. The state became a real juridical person with a political and sovereign nature, and, as a public body, detached from the life of the king. Thanks to this development, a first step was taken toward the idea that the figure of the state did not overlap with the figure of the king, recognizing a division of powers at the domestic level, and absolute respect of the national sovereignty of all members belonging to the international community. In all countries after 1648, there had been a process of transformation at the territorial, social and economic level because of the growth in the power of the state bureaucracy, one of the composing characteristics of the modern state; bureaucracy was functional both at the internal and external level and it was a power held by public officers under the (limited) control of the king. As also Hegel recognized, “bureaucracy itself became the state, elevating itself high above civil society and turning itself into the latter’s master” (Van Creveld 1999). Another important feature of the modern state was the concept of territory, delimited by geographical borders reached through the conquest of lands and made of citizens, not servants and landlords anymore. The spread of maps was of pivotal importance both to avoid international disputes between states after agreements and for the statistical studies led by professional surveyors on wealth, income, taxation and census. The third main characteristic of the modern state is sovereignty based on the monopoly of violence and military control of the territory. According to Max Weber, the governing body in the Modern State is superior to any other power in that territory, it is the superior law-making body for that territory, it is independent vis-à-vis other States and it is a direct subject of the International community. We have to recognize that, as Frezzo has stated “In the shadow of the Enlightenment, the political revolutions in the US and France, and the Industrial Revolution, social movements led by opponents of slavery and colonialism, supporters of legislation on the reduction of the working day and factory safety, and advocates of women’s rights pursued their objectives throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries” (Frezzo 2011). Nonetheless, it is reasonable to argue that the movements and their elite supporters aided in the passage of laws that extended civil and political rights to previously excluded elements of the people, while also paving the way for economic and social rights, as also Tilly and Woods have underlined in 2009. They criticized the Enlightenment not merely for its theoretical emphasis on civil and political rights, but also for its practical flaws. To summarize, these movements took the French Revolution's slogan seriously by refusing to accept the precedence of liberty over equality and solidarity. The language employed in their proclamation, their conscience, and their sense of brotherhood held the seeds of three generations of human rights schema. However, when it comes to evaluating and ameliorating real-world human rights violations, the schema has some limitations, particularly when it comes to undergoing social problems like poverty and the

structural violence associated with racism, classism, sexism, homophobia, xenophobia, and discriminatory behaviors toward people with disabilities.

The main principle of human rights is based on the right to self-determination, widely present in all the canons. This is an aspect to consider, since the supposed predominance of civil and political rights may be related to the possessive individualism that dominates Western societies. Hence, the question that arises is “why is the category of civil and political rights the most widely embraced and the least contested part of the human rights canon?” The history of human rights helps us in understanding the reasons: first of all, they were born during the period of the American and French Revolutions, due to the feelings of rebellion against the British troops in the American territories and the pressure of the aristocracy in the French society. Secondly, civil and political rights are at the base of the UN system and represent a huge pride for the formation of such an enormous collaboration. Indeed, the United Nations evolved into a venue for discussion of a wide variety of rights, especially second-generation economic and social rights and third-generation cultural and environmental rights. Nonetheless, the supremacy of civil and political rights over other sorts of rights is still widely held.

The UN in general, and UNESCO in particular, have had a significant impact not only on multidisciplinary programs in human rights, peace studies, and development studies at universities but also on the studies on the topic of non-governmental organizations (NGOs); they are of pivotal importance for the formation and the spread of norms to avoid abuses and violations of human rights both locally and internationally. This is required not just because our planet is made up of 7 billion people separated into 193 nation-states, all with their own political and legal systems, hundreds of cultures, and countless environments, but also because the world is continually changing with the spread of information, cultural issues, different economic and political interests. As a result, what is possible and practicable in terms of human rights now differs substantially from what was achievable and feasible in regard to human rights during the period of the Enlightenment. The procedure was designed with a high level of flexibility and this is a crucial social science lesson for human rights defenders.

As a result, it is possible to conclude that there are complex links between the civil and political rights that played a central role in Enlightenment ideals and the resulting rights claims, especially with the emergence of parliamentary systems which include numerous political parties and foster the creation and disintegration of coalition governments. Civil and political rights are important not just as ends in and of themselves, but also as means to other purposes. Indeed, the heritage of possessive

individualism, notably prevalent in Western nations and embodied in the legal system's emphasis on property rights, contributes to the prevalence of civil and political rights.

1.6 ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS

Political economy and development studies have substantially enriched the sociological viewpoint on human rights by highlighting the global economic conditions under which nation-states, societies, organizations, and communities identify poverty, cultural exclusion, and environmental damage as complaints, and transform these complaints into rights claims to be made on governments and other authorities, and seek assistance from UN agencies and NGOs.

As already said before, human rights have sense only if they are conceived as relational and they are really complex because of their dynamic character and their intersectionality with one another. In particular, economic and social rights are needed because they protect individuals from crises, provide basic necessities and assistance and ensure access to education, technologies, cultural enrichment and other means of self-improvement. They are the actual means of development of human beings, the entitlements that help individuals to actualize their potential. As the civil and political rights, also the economic and social rights change in every nation-state because of the different capabilities, values and governments of each society. And, as for the previous kind of human rights, there are many struggles that different societies have to face every day. For this reason, organizations like Amnesty International, started campaigns for economic, social, and cultural rights, reflecting a rising recognition of the interconnection of many categories of human rights among NGOs, UN agencies, researchers, and other members of the rights-oriented community. This is due also to the holistic view that emphasizes the interaction between different forms of rights.

Globalization has produced a new set of rights issues by making nation-states more permeable and combining the “domains” of the economy, politics, society, culture, and environment in unforeseen ways. Such difficulties, it may be argued, necessitate the use of rights bundling. To do so, it is necessary to understand the origins of the second generation’s economic and social rights. They originally became prevalent during the nineteenth-century rise of working-class movements, resistance to enslavement, advocacy for women's emancipation, and liberal nationalism. It overlapped also with the time in which sociology became a discipline in Europe and provided a fertile ground for human rights experiments. Indeed, as Ishay has shown, social movement activity has substantially increased the perception of what is thinkable and practicable in terms of human rights, particularly since the Enlightenment. These movements helped also to broaden the human

rights canon and helped to solve the struggles between liberty and equality, the key point of that time.

When popular forces began to press for economic and social rights, the global struggle for civil and political rights became fragmented. However, there are historical and practical reasons to prioritize civil and political rights. The latter was historically highlighted by the Enlightenment revolutions and the governments that were affected by them. In practice, civil and political rights such as the freedom to the association, assembly, free expression, and petition encourage social movement action in the name of economic and social rights. In other words, in the fight for greater pay, better working conditions, retirement funds, access to healthcare, and other second-generation rights, SMOs consistently prioritize civil freedoms.

Human rights exist in the social circumstances in which they are created, disseminated, implemented, maintained, and abused. Furthermore, they exist in connection to one another. To remark that human rights are relational does not imply that they are unfounded. While it is entirely possible that the rights (whether protections or entitlements) that single individuals and collectivities are “grounded in human physiology (and hence vulnerability), human sociability, or even an intrinsic capacity for empathy, cooperation, and solidarity, it is also possible that rights are founded on little more than the accumulation of social conventions across centuries of conflict and dialogue, dissent and consensus” (Turner 2006; Gregg 2012). Whether we take the essentialist or social constructionist position (or even a middle ground), we must admit not only that what is thinkable and feasible in terms of human rights changes over time, but also that evolution of human rights expertise, organizations, and methods are not linear. As a result, while it is possible to understand how rights have been obtained after a specific event, our abilities to anticipate where human rights will be going in the future are severely constrained. For example, as Frezzo has remarked “Neither the right to same-sex marriage nor the right to free, comprehensive healthcare would have been conceivable – let alone implementable – in the nineteenth century. In the first case, the blockage came in the form of the absence of coherent LGBT identity. In the second case, the blockage came in the form of severe technical limitations in the field of medicine. To this day, conditions, whether cultural, social, political, or economic, are more auspicious in some places than in others for the actualization of the rights to same-sex marriage and free, comprehensive healthcare.” As a result, attempts to appeal to globalism must take into account national conditions, including political parties, parliaments and other institutions, constitutions, current laws, and legal precedents.

The sociological approach, by definition, exposes how human rights are interwoven in all types of social formations, from local groups to enormous societies. While this is true for first-generation civil and political rights, it is much truer for second-generation economic and social rights, which are intended to guarantee social entitlements and safeguards throughout the life cycle.

Finally, the worldwide recognition of these rights, both in the political elite and among the general public, has led to the long-term viability of social programs in the European Union. However, it has not precluded the harsh realities of globalization from gaining ground. These rights, as expressed in the European Social Charter, the ICESCR, and other significant instruments, are valuable touchstones for components of the human rights community. As welfare systems in the Global North, former communist governments, and previous development countries in the Global South experienced budget constraints, popular movements mobilized to make a variety of economic and social rights claims.

1.7 CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS, WE ARE CULTURE

Since the right to have a culture belongs to distinct groups, the class of positive rights encompasses cultural rights as well as economic and social rights. However, it is impossible to deny that, although globalization has opened up new avenues for transnational discourse and collaboration in the service of human rights, it has also threatened the world's cultural variety. Hence, the aim of sociology is to define how human rights principles, norms, policies, and achievements "circulate" across borders in a globalization era characterized by heavy flows of not only capital, goods, and information, but also labor, refugees, and tourists having multiple views of human rights across national frontiers. For example, the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai in his work "The future as a cultural fact. Essays on the global condition" states that *"How the last decades of globalization have intervened to complicate my initial considerations on the social life of things. We can now see how the forms of circulation continue to interact with the circulation of forms, to produce new and unexpected cultural configurations in which the locality takes on ever new and surprising characteristics. and since the globalization process continues to generate new and complex circulation crises we must [...] be mediators, catalysts and promoters of the ethics of possibility in the face of the ethics of probability. [A] moral commitment founded on the belief that genuinely democratic politics cannot be based on the avalanche of numbers about population, poverty, profit and plunder that threaten to stifle any*

street-level optimism about life and the world. Rather, it is necessary to increase the ethics of possibility, which can offer a more extensive basis for improving the quality of life on the planet and accommodate a plurality of visions of the good life” (Arjun Appadurai 2013). In particular, he analyzed the different modes of transmission of human rights through the “mediascape” (through mass media), the “ethnoscape” (migrants and travelers) and “ideoscape” (policies of governments and IGOs) and their relationship to the different cultures of the different areas. He underlined the fact that this is not a process of “diffusion”, but rather a “circulation”, highlighting the mutability and the malleability of human rights due to the influences of political powers, cultures, and geography of a society. It is possible to gain a great awareness of the vast scope of human rights as we consider how rights claims are made in various political, legal, and cultural settings, from civil and political rights that promote liberty to economic and social rights that advance equality to collective rights (especially cultural and environmental rights) that encourage solidarity (understood as the feeling of belongingness within and connection among nation-states, peoples, groups and communities). A key complexity is immediately apparent: although liberty and equality-oriented rights belong to individuals, rights related to solidarity belong to collectives. Indeed, scholars like Vasak, who followed a more influential approach, distinguish three categories and functions: first-generation civil and political rights guaranteeing individual basic freedoms and protections from abuse by state and non-state actors, as well as participation in social life; second-generation economic and social rights guaranteeing individuals basic social provisions, such as a minimum standard of living, a semblance of education and vocational training, and a modicum of upward mobility; and finally, third-generation cultural and environmental rights guaranteeing collective life-ways, access to subsistence resources, and protection for vulnerable eco-systems. This brought a new conception of human rights not only in social movements but also in political parties and the language used in the constitutions.

Jointly, first-generation rights guaranteeing individual liberty and second-generation rights assuring individual equality are the two primary components of the Enlightenment vision of human empowerment. Ever since that time, social movements and their supporters have pursued civil and political rights as a method of furthering economic and social rights. While some academics say that solidarity rights are the most understudied part of Enlightenment philosophy, others argue that such communal rights are well beyond the extent of anything that could have been imagined in the late 1700s. From the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, solidarity claims, defined as the links that bind together civilizations, peoples, ethnic groups, and communities, are not just historically

loaded but are also often linked with non-Western cultures. They were developed and spread in reaction to the failure of the Third World developmentalism project and the ensuing necessity, as globalization reshaped the world, to deal with mounting dangers to culture and the environment. The homogeneity of culture and the deterioration of the natural environment have been important consequences of the development and intensity of consumerism. As a result, third-generation cultural and environmental rights for collectivities play an important role in the globalization period. In particular, the sense of solidarity is a fundamental value that helps to protect the cultural tradition of a specific society and its natural environment, but also provides sustainable development. In sum, solidarity rights represent the inherent rootedness of norms, conventions, rituals, and cuisines, and these links will become clear when the history and geography of third-generation rights will be better explained.

As stated above, solidarity rights do not belong only to individuals, but also to communities, groups and peoples. And what ties together different individuals is what we call culture. This word has its root in the Latin word “cultura” which suggests a deep relationship between a collectivity’s lifeways and its cultivation of the land. This means that a society’s, people’s, ethnic groups, or community’s styles of interacting with the natural environment are an important aspect of its cultural history.

The origins of third-generation rights, instead, can be found in the work of globalization and how it has spread the perception of the need for cultural rights. As Frezzo clearly explained “The reason is that such rights protect the interests not only of vulnerable collectivities but also of the earth itself. The third generation of human rights came to the fore only with the decline of Keynesianism, state socialism, and Third World developmentalism in the 1970s. Notwithstanding profound differences in state capacity, bureaucratic efficiency, respect for civil and political rights, culture, and geography, Keynesianism (in the First World), state socialism (in the Second World), and developmentalism (in the Third World) shared an emphasis on industrialization as the pathway to mass consumption or at least to material wellbeing for the majority of the population. In many ways, these state forms, especially that of the Keynesian welfare state, proved successful in improving the standard of living.” This was accomplished not only by facilitating mass consumption but also by enacting a set of economic and social rights to protect individuals from market failures and disasters while aiding them through various stages of the life cycle. These state forms, however, run their course, irreversibly changing global economic circumstances, cultures, and ecosystems. A place for third-generation collective rights to indivisible cultural and environmental commodities was formed in the context of disintegration. As it turned out, UN delegations from the Global South were particularly helpful in getting human rights cases on the agenda. In particular, many scholars like Blau and

Moncada, have studied the relationship between capitalism and human rights, underlying the fact that beyond contemporary studies in the sociology of human rights, it is obvious that capitalism, characterized by the necessity of endless accumulation, is an infinite system, always on the lookout for new sources of raw materials and natural resources, new labor supply, unexplored markets, and new dumping sites, existing on a limited planet. As a result, the intense and widespread extension of the regime of mass consumerism endangers both culture and the environment. What sociology of human rights focuses on is how cultures are embedded in these environments in order to find the right solutions for the cultivation of healthy individuals and societies through the spread of policies of education, culturalization and sustainable development.

The ambiguity of third-generation collective rights is both its greatest strength and its most significant weakness. However, the principle of subsidiarity could be a good answer to these issues. The notion of subsidiarity underpins many indigenous communities in the Global South's quest for relative autonomy from the national authority. The idea is intrinsically tied to local aspirations for direct democracy, cultural safeguards, and environmental amenities. This propensity for decision-making by the "lowest" authority provides important insights for harmonizing universalism with cultural variety. It is up to social and political philosophers to figure out how subsidiarity might help solve the universalism problem. In brief, the concept of subsidiarity indicates the necessity for a new global governance architecture that would likely move certain state tasks from the national to the global level. Subsidiarity advocates for rights packages that balance global and local, Western and non-Western, and majority and minority needs. There is substantial evidence that nationalism has frequently posed a barrier not only to the application of human rights inside nation-states but also to peaceful relations between nation-states. To summarize, proponents of a new human rights agenda should consider the potential of detaching the state from the nation. These rights demands have also transcended, and in many cases, beyond, the three generations of human rights by spanning the core sociological categories of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and national origin. In the process, they have highlighted human beings' dual existence as individuals and members of collectivities.

Right to culture is needed because people need to be educated about liberty, to protect humans against abuses committed not just by one another, but also by nation-states; to allow humans to freely engage in social life and politics; and to let individuals find and develop their abilities, personalities, beliefs, and values without interference from authorities. But also to bring on the principle of equality and solidarity, to look beyond existing borders (in order to include cultural and environmental commodities), but also by thinking through the relationships between collectivities and individuals.

1.8 ANGLES ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Collectively, political economy/development sociology, social movement research, and political sociology may shed significant insight on rights circumstances (or the ones that give birth to complaints), rights claims (or the articulation of grievances in connection to the human rights canon), and rights effects (or the policy results of rights debates and battles that concretely transform power relations). However, it is also true that other fields of sociology (for example, cultural sociology and environmental sociology) might greatly assist us in elucidating the cycle through which any proposed right must traverse. For example, it is obvious that cultural sociology is well qualified to illustrate how the repression of cultural variety, whether purposeful, as in the case of some authoritarian regimes, or inadvertent, as in consumerist cultures, precipitates grievances that test the human rights canon and question the human rights community. Likewise, environmental sociology may explain how environmental degradation, whether intentional, as in the case of cruel extraction of natural resources, or unintentional, as in the case of unknowing consumption, fuels concerns that go beyond current human rights treaties. Cultural sociology and environmental sociology, when combined, provide invaluable insights into both the rights circumstances and the rights demands of most societies in the Global South. This has implications not only for the comprehension of third-generation collective rights but also of rights bundles, not only because third-generation rights, given their implications for collectivities and individuals alike, as well as their predisposition to be aimed directly at poverty in the Global South and the impacts of consumerism around the world, point nearly inexorably in the direction of rights bundling. To summarize, it is critical for rights-oriented sociologists and their colleagues through drawing on existing theoretical, methodological, and substantial resources in catching the human rights cycle, from complaint genesis and expression to alliance mobilization and legislative reform. This is the justification for advocating for the development of new scholarly resources to address the myriad issues related to modern debates and fights over human rights.

1.9 CONCLUSIONS

Some sociologists question the legacy of positivism, which holds that sociology must imitate the scientific sciences while attempting to maintain value-neutral (Frezzo 2011). NGOs and UN agencies frequently use the Human Development Index (HDI) to analyze circumstances in nation-states throughout the world, reflecting the effects of different disciplines. This has enormous policymaking

potential for combating poverty and its related issues, such as poor access to healthcare and education. On the one hand, rights-oriented sociologists might benefit from expanding into areas that they have not yet thoroughly explored. Health, education, and other sectors of social provisioning have been exposed to financial constraints in welfare states, former communist governments, and former development nations all over the world. On the other hand, they must take steps to establish the discipline around basic ideas, concepts, and substantive concerns. To do so, firstly it is needed to reinforce the value of marking on strategies other than those presented here, particularly those of cultural sociology and environmental sociology, in conducting empirical research on the conditions that foster rights-oriented complaints among poor, abused, stigmatized, threatened, or otherwise vulnerable constituencies, organizations, and groups, including problems relating to group identity and collective availability to life-sustaining assets. Secondly, to call for a comprehensive theory of rights circulation to account for the formation, contestation, development, implementation, and enforcement of human rights. Thirdly, to broaden the concept of epistemic communities to include popular forces and their supporters (particularly NGOs) in interpreting and changing the human rights canon. Finally, to call for rights-oriented sociologists to become more directly involved in the debate over the origins, evolution, decline, and future of the welfare state, particularly in the United States, as a provider of economic and social rights in the form of worker protections and provisions, healthcare, and education.

In this section, I have analyzed the sociological perspective of human rights the use of sociological ideas and methodologies to understand the several conditions in which aggrieved parties and their supporters construct rights claims, how national governments execute rights-oriented policies, and the political consequences of human rights legislation In order to do so, I have defined rights conditions as situations that inspire or force under-represented or humiliated groups to express their concerns, and rights claims as requests for safeguards and entitlements made to political authorities by aggrieved parties. This process results in rights effects, which are perceptible changes in political systems and social structures that arise when victims fully express new rights through policy, law, or custom, as well as rights bundles, which are packets of linked rights that surpass the traditional categories.

This aided my understanding of human rights classification: a schema that designates first-generation civil and political rights designed to ensure liberty, second-generation economic and social rights designed to ensure equality, and third-generation collective rights designed to ensure solidarity. Different parties in the human rights field utilize the categories to assess real-world puzzles. Thus, puzzle solving is a fundamental duty of the natural and social sciences. By definition, the sociology

of human rights is concerned with establishing and resolving challenges concerning not only the deprivation of rights, but also the claim of future rights by aggrieved groups all over the world. In other words, the puzzles examined by rights-oriented sociologists may be related to either the failure of governments to respect the rights established in the human rights canon or to the claims for rights made by society and organizations. Sociologists can organize complicated social issues that have an influence on actualized or proposed human rights as a rights puzzle. They include socioeconomic issues such as poverty, injustice, exploitation, and prejudice based on identity, as well as cultural degradation and environmental damage. Sociologists solve rights puzzles by drawing sociological theories and methods to explain why a given social problem should be conceived as a rights puzzle, why the problem could need different approaches rather than conventional solutions, and how state policies should successfully implement them to consistently solve the problem.

As will be shown in the next section, a solution to the poverty puzzle would entail state policies that take a range of non-economic factors into consideration.

SECOND CHAPTER: A SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGENDA 2030 AGENDA'S PRINCIPLES OF LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND AND "ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF THOSE FURTHEREST BEHIND FIRST" IN THE EU'S DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

As we have seen, the essential purpose of human rights sociology is to solve rights puzzles. In practice, this includes critically working through the three generations of human rights scheme to arrive at a more productive method of thinking about and acting on human rights principles. Poverty, inequality, exploitation, discrimination based on identity, cultural annihilation, and environmental degradation are all problems that require answers that cross the three generations of human rights.

Because the difficulties are generally the result of several causes, comprehensive solutions in the form of rights bundles are required.

It appears that, among the various groups that we now deem necessary to safeguard and include, one has been neglected, which has always been excluded: the poor. We are now attempting to break down assumptions about gender, ethnic classification, and the inclusion of the disabled, but perhaps we are not yet ready to examine a big taboo, the father of all inequalities: money.

The core, transformative promise of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals is to "leave no one behind" (LNOB). It symbolizes the UN Member

States' unequivocal determination to eliminate poverty in all of its forms, abolish discrimination and exclusion, and decrease injustices and weaknesses that leave people behind and diminish the potential of the individual and society as a whole. LNOB entails not just assisting the poorest, but also combating discrimination and developing inequality within and across nations, as well as the root causes of these discrepancies. Individuals, families, and whole communities are penalized and disenfranchised as a result of persistent forms of discrimination. This study is based on specified criteria established by the UN, which are important aspects of the UN Charter, international human rights legislation, and national legal systems across the world. LNOB encourages us to focus on discrimination and inequality (which can be many and overlapping), which limit people's power as rights owners. The majority of these barriers to accessing resources, assets, and equal opportunities are the result of discriminatory policies, legislation, and social norms that leave some groups of people further behind. Many studies have found that various multidimensional and intersecting factors exacerbate existing inequality.

Poverty, according to Oxfam, requires a multidimensional strategy that includes civil and political rights in addition to economic and cultural rights. Poverty baffles social scientists and politicians alike since it has proven impervious to even the most socially sophisticated and comprehensive policies of welfare states in the Global North and development governments in the Global South. The challenge is especially difficult in the Global South, which reaped uneven advantages from post-World War II development efforts. What is obvious is that poverty is a multicausal problem that cannot be relegated to solely economic considerations; hence, any viable solution to poverty must be multidimensional.

The "right to be treated equally," and thus to be protected by the law, effectively implies civil and political rights such as the right to have an identity, the right to affirm one's effective participation in a cultural tradition, and the freedom to practice (or refrain from practicing) a religion. All of these safeguards are individual rights. Poverty can thus be sustained and exacerbated not only by an absence of lucrative activities and social services, but also by cultural oppression, environmental destruction, a lack of participatory democracy in major decisions, and, of course, discrimination based on a variety of identity characteristics. Indeed, the final two components are clearly related to first-generation civil and political rights. As a result, poverty reduction spans beyond traditional domains of human rights.

In other words, resolving poverty would involve giving first-generation civil and political rights, as well as second-generation economic and social rights and third-generation cultural and

environmental rights to impoverished nations, groups, and citizens. We seldom consider poverty to be a breach of civil and political rights. Nonetheless, two aspects must be taken into consideration. Firstly, organizations, communities, and people might become impoverished as a result of discrimination based on identification features. Secondly, poverty can make it very hard for groups, communities, and individuals to exercise whatever civil and political rights they may have. Claims for effective accountability, openness, stability, justice, and even democracy can be linked to the right to development.

Many international and national organizations have investigated how women's rights may promote development and alleviate poverty. For example, the Oxfam program "Women, Culture, and Development" (WCD) focuses on the problem of poverty and thereby improves economic well-being while fully preserving gender relations, culture, and the environment. In fact, by using a holistic approach, WCD demonstrates that there is no valid reason to isolate poverty from the goals of gender equality, cultural sensitivity and inclusiveness, and environmental preservation. This program is a rights package in the sense that it assumes poverty is a human rights violation that affects all three generations, and that human rights solutions to the problem of poverty must target all three generations at the same time. Because the human rights canon serves as an ethical code or point of reference for social actors all over the world, it provides an important framework for the expression of poverty-related grievances, including objections not only about the denial of basic needs, but also about a lack of opportunity to access education, vocational courses, and other means of social mobility. If a person is impoverished, he or she is less likely to: live a long life, to be mentally and physically healthy, to obtain the level of education and means of training, amount of data, and range of options required to develop his or her talents, skills, and personality, and to live in a peaceful environment. For example, Leach develops an empirical framework that integrates six aspects of social inequalities: economic, political, cultural, geographical, environmental, and of knowledge. Not only do these inequities intersect and overlap, but their connections are also changeable. Instead, Platt emphasizes the role of social categories in establishing and maintaining inequalities, while also acknowledging their related variety, intersections, and disparity of opportunity or result. It is critical to determine if they are "natural" or socially generated, right or unjust, preventable or unavoidable. Everyone agrees that social groupings and their variations are important in explaining disparities, but we must be careful not to essentialize these categories or neglect diversity within them. Kabeer, on the other hand, describes the structure of inequalities, distinguishing between vertical inequalities, which rank individuals or households; horizontal inequalities, which result from discriminatory

treatment against social classes; and geographic inequalities, which result from access to services and other assets in different areas, such as rural versus urban areas.

Sandra Fredman, on the other hand, outlines four dimensions of equality: remedying disadvantage (the wealth redistribution dimension); addressing prejudice, marginalization, humiliation, and abuse (the recognition dimension); supporting voice and agency (the participative dimension); and changing structures (the structural dimension).

In this section, the activities of the European Union in addressing poverty and other social disparities will be examined. In a world marked by growing disparities, the EU has taken a rights-based approach to inequalities, which means that human rights are recognized as a crucial instrument for ensuring that no one is left behind and that all kinds of discrimination are tackled. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, established by the European Parliament in the 1990s, includes a cross-cutting efforts to support non-discrimination, the rights of persons belonging to minorities (whether linguistic, ethnic, or religious), and the rights of disabled people and other marginalised communities. Furthermore, this instrument addresses cross-cutting criteria such as basic labor standards and social inclusion. The European Commission has also approved a policy for 2021-2027 to reduce disparities experienced by individuals with disabilities and enhance inclusivity, addressing them both from within and outside. Children and young people in impoverished nations and post-conflict environments, in particular, experience overlapping vulnerabilities beyond disability, such as exclusion from basic services, a lack of protection and knowledge, a lack of access to justice, and legal identification challenges. To overcome these barriers, the European Commission encourages engagement within the framework of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, and thus mainstreams its responsibilities in all sectors of external action, such as development and humanitarian aid. The European Parliament remains an essential player in development policy. Its position and impact have grown since the Lisbon Treaty made it a co-legislator with the Council on development policy in 2009. Through its co-legislative powers, regulatory function, and budgetary authority, the European Parliament may affect development policy.

In light of a changing context, the European Parliament underlines the need of maintaining Policy Coherence for Development as a vital springboard not only toward fulfilling the Sustainable Development Agenda, but also managing risks such as assistance fragmentation and ineffectiveness.

This emphasis on inclusion, involvement, and mutual relationships is critical in effecting the revolutionary changes required to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 10 and ensuring

that no one is left behind. Furthermore, in the context of tackling inequality, where, as previously said, a lack of political commitment is one of the missing factors for success, the EP, as the primary European platform for political discussion and consensus building, plays a critical role in mobilizing political support and keeping the other European institutions accountable through its oversight work.

Policy adjustments and operational methods must also reflect this comprehensive approach to recognizing and combating inequality, with its interrelations between different kinds of harassment and their aggregate consequences on poverty and inequality. Governments, international organizations, bilateral donors, and civil society are all working to put such a strategy into action by incorporating it into programs and projects. Encouraging policy coherence is key to solving inequality because EU policies in a wide range of areas, such as trade, agricultural support, fisheries, and international taxation, can have a deleterious impact on international development and partner governments' policy space to address inequality.

The first step in understanding poverty is identifying it through context-specific inequality assessments such as degrees of deprivation, health and nutrition, features of disadvantaged groups, and geography. So, who is left behind and why they are in these conditions relies on prejudice, location, governance, socioeconomic position, crises, and vulnerability. Furthermore, as Fraser has noted, it is critical not to lose sight of structural disparities while also recognizing group identities.

According to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) “Across countries, women and girls, people in rural areas, indigenous peoples, ethnic and linguistic minorities, people with disabilities, migrants, gender and sexual minorities, youth and older persons are disproportionately among the left behind. In all societies, the furthest behind tend to endure multiple and intersecting disadvantages”.

Critics of the European Program, such as Samman, say that it was an error to exclude individuals at the top of the income distribution from the 2030 Agenda, focusing too much only on low-income populations. Concentrating on the lowest level of distribution compared to the average might obscure deeper inequities within countries, their causes, and how they are maintained. Instead, studying these elites and the global income disparity, as well as the official and informal organizations that support them, may help us better understand not just how disparities are created and sustained, but also how they might be effectively addressed. It is acknowledged that certain hurdles hinder some individuals from benefiting even when possibilities abound. Universal education, for example, provides equal opportunities for everybody, but if girls are unable to attend school due to household duties, inequity remains. LNOB promotes social, economic, and political inclusion for all.

The notion of intersectionality is very essential in this study, as it was for Kimberlé Crenshaw, who utilized it to reveal the distinct effects of gender and race on the career prospects of Black women in the United States (USA). According to Collins and Bilge: “Intersectionality is a way of understanding and analysing the complexity in the world, in people and in human experiences. The events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor. They are generally shaped by many factors in diverse and mutually influencing ways. When it comes to social inequality, people’s lives and the organisation of power in a given society are better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other. Intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves”.

This might illustrate the permanence of marginalization mechanisms for specific populations whose economic burden overlaps with cultural, geographical, and political disadvantage. Intersectionality allows us to not only recognize and correct disparities, but also to identify and approach people who are most vulnerable.

Policy coherence is a useful method of conceptualizing relationships across policy areas; certainly, individual issues cannot be handled in isolation, but must be an integrated element of policy design, development, and application in all other policy sectors. Policy coherence for development (PCD) incorporates development goals into internal and external policy sectors. According to Article 208 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), “The Union shall take account of the objectives of development cooperation in the policies that it implements which are likely to affect developing countries”. The Maastricht Treaty established the notion of Policy Coherence for Development, which was reiterated in the 2005 European Consensus on Development, the Lisbon Treaty, and the current European Consensus on Development in 2017.

The Council highlighted five “strategic challenges” for PCD in 2009, including trade and finance, global warming, food and nutrition security, migration, security, and development. These goals were reaffirmed in the new 2017 European Development Consensus. It also began to play a larger role in EU development policy, most notably in the Union's primary development policy statement, the 2005 European Consensus on Development, which intended to include collaboration in all domestic and foreign policies. The Global Strategy, which established the broad structure of EU foreign policy in 2016, refers to broadening and implementing the PCD approach to additional policy domains. However, development goals, principally reducing poverty and, in the long run, elimination, now coexist with other foreign policy concerns, such as migration.

Burni contended that: “the stronger integration of the tools of EU’s development cooperation and foreign policy may on the one hand improve the unity, coherence and visibility of actions, but on the other hand, could also lead to the subordination of development objectives to foreign policy aims”. Obviously, how this works out in practice is very political. It might be achieved more effectively with constant dialogue across departments and at all levels of decision-making processes. Policy coherence necessitates a clear common vision that serves as a strategic aim and keeps the emphasis on the goal rather than the procedural techniques and instruments.

According to the ECD: “Poverty, conflict, fragility and forced displacement are deeply interlinked and must be addressed in a coherent and comprehensive way, also as part of the humanitarian-development nexus. The EU and its Member States will address their root causes at all levels, ranging from exclusion, inequality, food insecurity, human rights violations and abuses, impunity and the absence of the rule of law to environmental degradation and climate change”.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development introduced the notion of Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD); synergies between the SDGs can result in co-benefits, and the most effective approach to go forward is to capitalize on positive synergies with other targets while resolving or enhancing unfavorable trade-offs with others. The problem is to ensure that no one is left behind in this process, and a transformative method that requires participatory action, reciprocal and reverse learning, and institutional change is required.

To begin, a rigorous examination of current literature and data on disparities is required, followed by semi-structured interviews with stakeholders in EU institutions to give extra information. Second, a holistic approach to inequalities looks beyond income and wealth disparities to investigate the origins and consequences of other types of inequalities. It is critical to understand the impediments and roadblocks to transformation, as well as the political restrictions, ideologies, interests, and institutions that sustain intersectional forms of disadvantage. Indeed, as the United Nations World Social Report indicates “In most cases, inaction is due not to the lack of sound technical advice or even adequate capacity. [...] Understanding the political constraints to reducing inequality and devising ways to overcome them is key to breaking the current stalemate”.

The progress of implementation is inextricably related to the accomplishment of SDG 10, which aims to address both horizontal and vertical aspects of inequality. Here it is attached a summary scheme of the fundamental points of the SDGs.

Box 1. SDG 10: its targets and indicators⁸⁸

The wide scope of SDG 10 is made clear in its range of specific targets and indicators:

10.1 aims at achieving and sustaining **income growth for the bottom 40 %** of the population by 2030 at a rate higher than the national average;

10.2 aims at enabling and promoting social, economic and political **empowerment for all**, regardless of status and other intersecting dimensions of inequality (i.e. race, age, sex, disability, race etc.);

10.3 focuses on ensuring **equal opportunities** and thereby curbing discriminatory practices, laws and policies;

10.4 focuses on promoting **fiscal, wage and social protection policies to foster greater equality**;

10.5 focuses on improving the **regulation and monitoring of global financial markets and institutions**;

10.6 focuses on ensuring **enhanced representation for developing countries in decision-making** in international economic and financial fora, thereby increasing the legitimacy of such institutions;

10.7 focuses on facilitating **orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration** and mobility of people;

10.8 reiterates the need to implement **differential treatment for developing countries**, especially the least developed, in compliance with World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements;

10.9 encouraging the flow of **official development assistance** and other financial flows to the States in greatest need;

10.10 focuses on reducing **transaction costs of migrant remittances** to less than 3% per transaction and eliminate remittance corridors that cost more than 5%.

SDG 10 aims at the reduction of disparities within and between nations. It They do not just relate to riches, but also to a holistic vision of human growth, addressing individual capacities and freedoms, so underlying both well-being and agency. They are generated from restricted access to global stock markets and trade deals, and do not simply refer to economic aims, but rather embrace a wide range of legal, social, and economic reforms. SDGs 10 can thus be regarded a basic, cross-cutting goal. Member states have stated “As we embark on this great collective journey, we pledge that no one will be left behind. Recognising that the dignity of the human person is fundamental, we wish to see the Goals and targets met for all nations and peoples and for all segments of society. And we will endeavour to reach the furthest behind first”.

The main goals of the 'Leave No One Behind' Agenda, which is an essential part of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, are to stop absolute poverty, to cease group-based discrimination that results in unequal outcomes for the disadvantaged, and to help those who are further behind first. It is intended to alleviate inequities for impoverished groups within nations with a majority of non-deprived persons, as well as for 'left-behind' countries where the majority of the population faces different overlapping kinds of deprivation.

So far, four major struggles have been discovered in implementing the LNOB Agenda: first, Member States want to effectively manage the possible future higher costs of reaching those who are farthest behind; second, it has proven extremely difficult to define the discriminated groups and their specific, interconnected vulnerabilities. The role of international political economy interactions in

perpetuating such imbalances is still being disputed; other challenges include weak political commitment on the side of national governments in both wealthy and developing nations, as well as a lack of statistics. Although the majority of OECD-DAC nations have stated their intention to execute the LNOB Agenda, they frequently fail to adapt to specified policy goals and implementation methodologies.

Many have criticized the program for depending on the concept of trickle-down growth, omitting the upper end of the income distribution, and focusing mostly on intra-country redistribution. Furthermore, there has been a failure to recognize the need of fostering Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development in order to assist in addressing inequities both within and across nations. The attempt to cover the very top of the wealth distribution is a contentious and politically charged matter. Finally, rather than only inside nations, the redistribution of income between countries might be examined not only in reassessing the role of ODA and trade laws, but also in promoting more fair forms of tax revenue distribution across countries.

However, LNOB fulfilment is now hampered by additional problems coming from the epidemic for those organizations that are more behind. It is critical to examine the path of inequality trends in absolute and relative terms, concentrating on both improvements for those who are the most disadvantaged in comparison to others and the growth in disparities for certain groups within countries. This has jeopardized progress toward attaining the SDGs by 2030, and although many of the world most disadvantaged have seen their condition worsen throughout the epidemic, the richest have gotten even richer.

According to the World Bank, the pandemic, along with war and climate change, “have reversed the gains in poverty eradication for the first time in a decade”. Some economists, on the other hand, claim that the epidemic is not necessarily increasing global income inequality, and that the net impact will not be obvious until more precise household-level statistics become available. For example, richer nations have had more deaths, resulting in less revenue, and therefore their economies have contracted more, reducing inequality across countries. As a result, while it is too early to predict the entire impact of COVID-19 on inequality, “[t]he overall picture that emerges [...] is, for the moment, one of falling income gaps between countries (when not weighted by population) and—speculatively and preliminarily—rising gaps within countries, on average”.

In terms of global inequality trends, the picture is less rosy and more difficult. Historical statistics demonstrate highly divergent patterns in a disparity between and within nations, with gains and deterioration visible since 1980. There is also evidence of new sorts of inequality arising, with

growing disparities in what the UNDP refers to as 'enhanced capacities,' especially high-quality healthcare and university education. In 2020, recessions associated with the pandemic were deeper in richer countries than in poorer countries, arguably resulting in a reduction in between-country disparities, though this will probably be compensated by their higher capacity to counteract these depressions with improved social safeguards. Simultaneously, the epidemic helped some of society's wealthier sections to become even wealthier, substantially expanding intra-country inequality.

Finally, the achievement of the LNOB Agenda will serve as a testing ground for the success of SDG 10, which has been profoundly impacted by the epidemic.

There are several causes of inequality, and they differ from one country environment to the next, as well as from one group of people to the next. The fundamental factors of income distribution are influenced by socioeconomic and demographic dynamics.

Policies to alleviate inequality must be diverse, just as the causes of inequality differ from one environment to the next. Inadequate or poorly constructed policies can further exacerbate inequality within and across states. Making great progress is also a function of the political will and power of government officials to see them through. The primary goals are to build revolutionary redistributive policies and then supplement them with more targeted targeting of certain marginalized groups that must occur inside or in conjunction to these policies.

First, there are broad revolutionary redistributive policies that emphasize universal healthcare, education, and other social amenities. Social security programs may be used to reduce inequality as well as improve resilience to shocks. The importance of actors in assisting people during a crisis was recognized. This is certainly a significant advancement that may be leveraged to build political will. As a result, it should be capitalized on rather than wasted.

According to Oxfam, taxes is critical to “end the under-taxation of rich individuals and corporations”. It is essential to make national taxation systems more progressive and effective in order to eliminate gaps and in-country inequality. However, international taxation rules and country-by-country monitoring methods that assist governments in taxing foreign firms where profits are produced, so supporting their Domestic Resource Mobilisation (DRM) initiatives and reducing between-country disparity, are also required.

Trade and investment are vital drivers of growth and economic development because they may promote innovation and employment opportunities when supported by sufficient inclusive and equitable policies at both the national and international levels. This could be accomplished through

wide economic growth and human-centered recovery plans; investing in human resources to ensure that unskilled or inadequately-skilled groups in society can participate in the new economic drive by enhancing information and expertise that is sufficiently fragmented and detailed to analyze the specific circumstances of individual-specific groups and implementing land distribution policies in agrarian economies.

Second, according to a research conducted by the European Union, specific measures are required to ensure that no one is left behind. This means that policy must carefully identify who the poor are in each area and how to effectively reach them, as well as steps to guarantee they are not just recognized but also giving them an effective voice. As a result, policymakers must seek to provide equitable access to opportunities; they must also acknowledge the intersections of the problems; and they must work to support the transition of disadvantaged and hardest-hit workers (this is the inclusive growth). It is also needed to mainstream, which is ensuring that a specific cross-cutting problem of relevance is included in all regulatory changes and at all phases from design to implementation, monitoring, and reporting, will help guarantee that inequalities are not reinforced.

According to Oxfam, the epidemic actually makes transformational measures more acceptable and visible to the public, and hence more feasible to consider. This means that as we emerge from the epidemic, we have a rare chance to mobilize the political will to implement and sustain the necessary measures. The relatively quick reaction of countries in establishing these social protection and stimulus measures, as well as the level of agreement among key players on what steps to implement, indicate that the global community knows how to address inequality. Because they are being deployed, we are fast receiving fresh insights about how they perform best and may be most successful. "Never let a good crisis go to waste," Winston Churchill is alleged to have stated during the negotiations to form the UN following World War II.

The Gini index and the Palma ratio are two of the most often utilized measures to analyse inequalities into societies. Gini coefficient, which goes from 0 (perfect equality) to 1 (maximum inequality). It assesses the equitability with which income (or another resource) is allocated among a population. One significant advantage is that it allows for the analysis of wealth inequality between two groups of people, independent of group size. The Palma ratio compares the percentage of income from the top 10% of the population to that of the lowest 40%. It was postulated by José Gabriel Palma based on his findings that income distribution discrepancies are mostly the consequence of fluctuations in the income of the richest and lowest, since there is more income stability within the intermediate group. However, the assessment of poverty has gotten increasingly

complex in awareness that it is not only a matter of income, but also of various degradations that a person and family might face. As a result, the UNDP and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) introduced the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), which studies inequality because it is based on the acknowledgment of intersectionality among the roots of the problem and strongly demonstrates that disparities is more than just wage gap. This required a close examination of four factors: access to health, education, technology, and shock resistance.

The following scheme is a summary of the Commission approaches to addressing inequalities taken from the study of the European Parliament on the Agenda 2030 (Source: European Commission, SWD(2019)final, Chapter 4, pp.11-20).

Box 3. Summary of Commission approaches to addressing inequality

The Commission's 2019 Staff Working Document regroups the EU's current measures that address inequality under three headings relating to factors affecting the distribution of household incomes from (i) earnings (ii) taxes and subsidies and (iii) public expenditure on services²⁴⁵.

Addressing primary income inequality

- *Discrimination* – through a rights-based approach, such as EU Human Rights Dialogues that cover a wide variety of forms of discrimination: gender, ethnicity, children, human rights defenders, freedom of expression, role of civil society, access to rule of law, access to information, etc.
- *Employment, decent work & vocational training* – EU support to the ILO Decent Work Agenda ILO; expertise on social protection, labour and employment (SOCIEUX+ programme).
- *Private sector development, trade and financial inclusion* – role of private sector in achieving inclusive and sustainable growth, updated Aid for Trade strategy in 2017, Trade for All strategy, the Africa-Europe Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs²⁴⁶ and the External Investment Plan (EIP).
- Territorial and urban development – Staff working documents on addressing urban and regional disparities as well as working with cities and local authorities, also included in EIP.
- Digital for development – digital technologies to improve inclusion and EIP priority on digitalisation for sustainable development, including the approach outlined in the Commission SWD247.
- Environment, energy and natural-resource governance – for instance land governance actions in about 40 countries, mostly in Sub-Saharan Africa, FLEGT (Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade) and resilience programmes.
- Culture for development – actions that support social inclusion, freedom of expression, identity building, civil empowerment and conflict prevention

Addressing secondary income inequality

- Fiscal policy – strengthening DRM, progressive taxation, redistributive capacity, budget support
- Social protection – The EU allocates at least 20 % of its ODA to social inclusion and human development, support to partner countries in developing social protection policies.
- Regional approaches in social protection – example of the EUROsocial programme in Latin America and the Caribbean to support social-cohesion policies and services across the region.

Addressing tertiary income inequality

- Education – ca. EUR 5 billion allocated to education in the 2014-2020 budget, support to Global Partnership for Education, budget support, bilateral programmes.
- Health – support for equitable provision to address health inequalities, support to the WHO on universal health coverage (UHC), UHC Partnerships with 38 countries.
- Public financial management (PFM) – support for reform and strengthening of PFM, EU strategy on fair taxation, support to World Bank Debt Management Facility (DMF), use of variable tranche indicators in budget support.
- Support for democracy, the rule of law and the fight against corruption – focus on access to justice, legal protection, corruption free public services, support to law enforcement and judicial authorities.

This table attempts to address inequality at three levels: primary, secondary, and tertiary, which look not only at how an individual perceives inequality on a personal level (primary), but also at both government fiscal policies and social policies (secondary), as well as government public expenditure on services (tertiary), all of which can help reduce inequality if designed properly. The Commission has a great set of tools and finances available to address the issue, which also corresponds to the sorts

of programs advocated by other important players and experts. This might be accomplished through reinforcing current policies that target elementary, secondary, and tertiary income disparity, as well as increasing the mainstreaming of inequality reduction in program design, formulation, execution, and assessment; thanks to stronger cooperation with partner countries, Member States, and other players in reducing inequality, as well as greater data and knowledge collection

With the implementation of the new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF 2021-27) this year, the Commission now has at its disposal the most recent fiscal measurement tool to identify inequality in external action, namely the Neighbourhood, Development, and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI) – Global Europe.

Since the outbreak of the epidemic, there has also been a desire for collaboration under the banner of 'Team Europe,' which includes all EU institutions, Member States and their agencies, the European Investment Bank (EIB), and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD). Team Europe is a framework for increasing the EU's abilities and commitment to 'working better together' that was established in response to COVID-19. As such, it has no policy objectives of its own. As a result, Team Europe actions adhere to the current EU development and humanitarian policy framework.

Policy adjustments and operational methods must also reflect this comprehensive approach to recognizing and combating inequality, with its interconnections between various kinds of discrimination and their cumulative consequences on poverty and inequality. Governments, international organizations, donor agencies, and civil society are all working to put such an approach into action by incorporating it into policies and programs. The 2030 Agenda incorporates the notion of Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development, which the European Commission endorsed as part of its commitment to fulfilling the SDGs (SDGs). The Commission emphasizes that Policy Coherence for Sustainable Development (PCSD) is not a substitute for PCD. Instead, it indicates a larger goal to which PCD contributes. The 2019 EU Report on PCD, for example, emphasizes the continuous necessity for PCD in order to guarantee that EU policies do not harm developing nations.

It concludes: “Whether implementing the objectives of PCD or those of the broader PCSD, we can effectively support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda if we take into consideration and minimize as much as possible the negative effects that our policies can have on developing countries, hence living up to our commitment of leaving no one behind”.

Thank to this study, we can conclude that poverty, inequality, cultural marginalization, and environmental degradation are all human rights issues that are interconnected as a result of

globalization. Therefore, solutions to these concerns must include the right to longevity, complete human development, and peace. This is a long and difficult procedure that is susceptible to several and changing legislative systems. However, the suggestions for rights bundles would just serve as a beginning point for a new human rights circulation process including NGOs, government institutions, and, presumably, global citizens as well.

THIRD CHAPTER: HOW ITALY IS WORKING FOR THE RESPECT OF HUMAN RIGHTS, THE CIDU

In this section, I will analyze how Italy is working for the respect of human rights, in particular focusing on the work of the Interministerial Committee for Human Rights (CIDU). I interviewed the Committee's Legal Adviser, Mrs. Maria Luisa Lapresa and the Secretary General, Mrs. Laura Baldassarre, to find out how the committee's activities are carried out in relation to Italian ministries and other international institutions.

Established in 1978 by Ministerial Decree n.519 and subsequently integrated (most recently by the Ministerial Decree of 5 September 2013, n. 2000/517), the CIDU is composed of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers and Departments/Offices responsible, the various Italian ministries and a series of National Human Rights Commissions and Councils, such as the National Commission for Equal Opportunities for Men and Women or the Superior Council of the Judiciary; National Association of Municipalities of Italy - ANCI.

CIDU is an interministerial coordinating, reporting and follow-up body chaired by a diplomatic career official appointed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, since 2016 Mr. Fabrizio Petri covers this figure. For this reason, it depends directly on the government and, despite being positioned within the Foreign Ministry, it does not deal with Italy's foreign policy. The main functions are the implementation of human rights instruments and conventions in Italy, as well as the organization of awareness-raising campaigns and dialogue in the field of relations with civil society; it also promotes the adoption of the necessary measures to ensure full compliance with international obligations; it follows the implementation of international conventions and takes care of the preparation of periodic reports that Italy is required to submit; it collaborates in the organization of international human rights initiatives and maintains and implements relations with NGOs active in the field. It not only

deals with Italian ministries, but also and above all with the United Nations, the European Union, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). In 2020, the United Nations declared that CIDU is an international best practice. Although not all countries have a committee like the CIDU, there are, however, various committees, especially in the constituent bodies of the UN, which deal with the diffusion of all the recommendations in order to make them part of the national plans.

Since 2020, CIDU has also established a CIDU Human Rights Prize, intended to "specific bodies, associations or individuals that have distinguished themselves particularly in Italy, for having helped to spread a greater knowledge of the various aspects of Human Rights in our country". The initiative, conceived together with the then Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Emanuela Claudia Del Re, with the full support of Minister Di Maio, is intended to enhance the widespread and varied commitment of our Country in the field of Human Rights, awarding, each year, an official recognition to different types of candidates.

At national level, since there is no independent human rights commission or institution, CIDU is based on the recommendations it receives from national and international bodies. At the end of each year, it presents a final report to Parliament on its activities and, more generally, on the protection and respect of human rights in Italy. Although the recommendations are not binding, the reporting and follow-up mechanism has a very positive impact on the realization of rights at both national and international level.

Secretary General Baldassarre claimed that since 2021 CIDU has been aiming to "create a permanent training on human rights with the help of the Public Administration. In agreement with the Scuola Superiore della Pubblica Amministrazione (SNA) and with the Unit for Formation of the MAECI, a first training module dedicated to the Councillors of Legation has been launched, which it is hoped will become a permanent activity of the School itself, contributing to a better understanding and knowledge of human rights". The Legal Secretary Lapresa argues that the "Fundamental characteristic of this committee is the direct listening of the non-governmental world and the constant confrontation with it, as well as with the world of international organizations operating in Italy".

On the international scene, in fact, the CIDU has continuous relations mainly with the Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) of the European Union, based in Vienna, and with the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) of the Council of Europe, based in Strasbourg. Furthermore, within the Council of Europe, CIDU also maintains relations with the European

Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT), and within the UN, CIDU has direct and ongoing contact with the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mrs. Michelle Bachelet.

In particular, the Committee carries out monitoring work with the FRA at the international and European levels and draws up reports on the state of implementation of the implementation of fundamental rights in Europe. Together they are focusing on the implementation of the Fundamental Rights Forum for greater participation of the younger generation in the field of human rights. The CIDU has contacts with the Council of Europe and with the UN, mainly with the one based in Geneva because it is responsible for human rights. In general, the issues involved are, to name a few, conventions on children, people with disabilities, respect for women's rights and the environment. In particular, according to Mrs. Baldassarre "there is still much to be done in Italy for the full implementation of these conventions, bringing examples of good territorial practices on these issues, aiming to make them permanent".

The CIDU is directly responsible in terms of coordination in particular of the Business and Human Rights plan and the Women, Peace and Security plan in which it is not only responsible for drafting the approval, but also all the work to give concreteness to the actions that realize the different administrations.

With regard to the Business and Human Rights Plan (BHR), Italy was among the first countries in 2016 to adopt a National Action Plan for five years (2016-2021) in application of the Guiding Principles of the United Nations of 2011 and in 2018 it was the first country in the world to carry out a mid-term review of the Plan itself. The BHR was established at a supranational level by the UN in 2011, providing member states with the main guidelines for a business that respects the fundamental principles of human rights and that effectively leads to economic development. At the national level, the CIDU continued to promote intensive consultation work "multi-stakeholder" in order to facilitate its application and updating. In particular, since 2016 it has been conducted through a special Working Group on Human Rights (GLIDU), which is regularly discussed in special sessions open to representatives of the business world, civil society and the academy.

With regard to the Women, Peace and Security plan, which is very similar to the Oxfam Women, Culture and Development project mentioned in the second chapter, CIDU has set up a permanent working group in contact with the non-governmental world and with international organizations active in Italy. The plan considers the commitments and obligations that Italy has assumed with regard to women, in the conviction that the three Onusian pillars (peace and security, human rights

and development) must be respected. At the same time, the plan of action has been developed and expanded in the light of the Agenda for Sustainable Development, already analyzed in the previous chapters. The text is also characterized by its nature of “living document”, that is, capable of adapting to developments that will be recorded over the next 4 years. It has also taken full account of the previous Plans, which aim, for example, to strengthen the participation of women in all decision-making processes and the gender perspective, while maintaining the Women, Peace and Security Agenda (DPS) also more specific resolutions and documents such as, for example, the UN Secretary-General’s Call to Action on Human Rights, presented to the Human Rights Council in February 2019. Nevertheless, the strengthened focus of the Fourth Objective of the new Plan on Information and Training is underlined with regard to the DPS Agenda and related issues, and therefore also with regard to human rights and non-discrimination. Then it also notes the (renewed) Italian open pledge presented at the 33rd International Conference of the Croce Rossa (Geneva, 2019), with which Italy has renewed its commitment, with specific actions, with regard to children involved in conflict and post-conflict situations.

On the 31st of October 2000, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security. This is the first Resolution of this body that explicitly mentions the impact of war on women and the contribution of women to conflict resolution and lasting peace. The guiding principle adopted by the United Nations is defined as "zero tolerance", to be applied to the military, rebels, and a fortiori to its personnel, military and civilian, who sexually abuse civilians (women and children) in areas of conflict, as such violence violates international norms and, first of all, constitutes an unacceptable moral behaviour, as well as being a criminal offence. In this regard, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1820 of 19 June 2008 and the General Assembly completed the issue, adopting a "general strategy of assistance and support to victims of sexual exploitation and abuse by UN staff and associated personnel". The support to the victims is of psychological matter, but as stated in the first part of this thesis, one cannot act only and especially a posteriori and, unfortunately, war is not a new issue to our society. It seems that Churchill’s words have not been too effective and the crises that our world has already experienced in history (not too far from us) have not drawn the lesson to which he, and perhaps most of our civil society, aspired. As for the issue of war, not dealing with foreign policy, CIDU focuses more on the reception of refugees thanks to the quantitative and qualitative work that has been done over the years to protect the human rights of people arriving in Italy.

In conclusion, what CIDU is working for is the protection of the person and his and her dignity in times of peace and in times of war. With this spirit, the United Nations has developed since the

Second World War a universal system to promote and protect human rights, a field in which Italy has never failed to make its commitment and which sees us as a very respected actor on the international scene. Certainly, the promotion of human rights has always been one of the priorities of Italian foreign and domestic policy, but there is still much to do.

CONCLUSION

The human rights community must focus on the origins, evolution, and future of global governance, that is to say the institutional framework for international collaboration among nation-states, diplomacy, trade, and law enforcement. The already existing institutions of global governance, such as the UN, the World Bank, or the WTO and hypothetical ones, such as a World Parliament, a Global Development Fund or a Global Environmental Organization), would be assigned to introducing a new development program. Historically, the realm of international relations and international law researchers and the literature on global governance have benefitted greatly from a flood of nonacademic views such as academics, journalists, NGO staff, and SMO leaders. While most modern sociologists are neither positivists nor moral relativists, the discipline has traces of both. As a result, rights-oriented sociologists have been forced to articulate their views on science, values, and the university's role. As it is currently, the ISA Thematic Group on Human Rights and Global Justice and the ASA Section on Human Rights have succeeded in formalizing the area by reflecting the emergence of a knowledge movement. Many field participants balance a dedication to science with the acceptance of normative values, such as popular engagement in decision-making processes. A sociologist can advocate for the importance of people's involvement without endorsing a political party's platform, an SMO's program, or even a specific kind of democracy. The intricacies of how to interpret and implement democracy are thought to be left to the people.

Many sociologists subscribe to a scientificity that allows for the assertion of values in order to avoid the poles of positivism and moral relativism. In doing so, they collaborate with anthropologists, geographers, and others who are interested in harvesting the rewards of scientific study and technological growth for the good of mankind while also safeguarding society from the abuses of technology and science. Simultaneously, these thinkers advocate a universalism that allows for a high degree of cultural uniqueness. In the process, they easily admit that universal principles must be addressed and negotiated across cultural boundaries, rather than being provided a priori.

Furthermore, any reasonable and acceptable form of universalism would have to pass via specific civilizations. As a result, a cross-civilizational, international initiative to develop a framework for universalism and cultural plurality is necessary.

Nonetheless, such a project – involving the reform of the UN and the resulting alteration of the interstate system – would need not just widespread consensus among politicians and their constituents, but also decades of hard labour human by supportive groups and activists. However, imagining such a project is fascinating. Such "grounded utopia" efforts – following promising pathways in the present to their finest potential fruition in the future – are an essential aspect of human rights sociology.

I hope that in a few years I will be able to read this report and I will be able to believe that our society has succeeded in respecting some of the few aspects touched on in this report. "World peace can only be safeguarded by creative efforts commensurate with the dangers that threaten it," said French Prime Minister Robert Schuman in the Quai d'Orsay Clock Room on 9 May 1950.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, University of Minnesota Press, 1996
- Bessis, Sophie. *Western Supremacy: the Triumph of an Idea?* Zed Books, 2003
- Boncinelli Edoardo. *Noi siamo cultura*, Rizzoli, 2015
- Ferrone, Vincenzo. *Storia dei diritti dell'uomo, L'Illuminismo e la costruzione del linguaggio politico dei moderni*, Editori Laterza, 2004
- Frezzo, Mark. *The sociology of human rights*, Wiley, 2014
- Gregg, Benjamin. *Human Rights as a Social Construction*, Cambridge University Press, 2012
- Haas, Peter M. *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, International Organization, 1992
- Ishay, Micheline R. *The History of Human Rights: From Ancient Times to the Globalization Era*, University of California Press, 2008
- Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*, Oxford University Press, 2001
- Mackie, James and Allwood, Gill. *Study on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda's principles of "leaving no-one-behind" and "addressing the needs of those furthest behind first" in the EU's development policy*, Policy Department for External Relations, 2022
- Stout, Kathryn, Richard Dello Buono, and William J. Chambliss, eds. *Social Problems, Law, and Society*, Rowman and Littlefield, 2004
- Tilly, Charles and Leslie Wood. *Social Movements, 1768–2008*, Paradigm Publishers, 2009
- Turner, Bryan. *Vulnerability and Human Rights*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006
- Van Creveld, Martin, *The Rise and Decline of the State*, Cambridge University Press, 1999
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. *Lumping and Splitting: Notes on Social Classification*, Sociological Forum, 1996

WEBOGRAPHY

- CIDU : <https://www.senato.it/service/PDF/PDFServer/BGT/1307226.pdf>
https://cidu.esteri.it/comitatodirittiumani/resource/doc/2021/05/piano_di_azione_nazionale_d_ellitalia_donne_pace_e_sicurezza_2010.pdf

- Shuman Declaration: https://multimedia.europarl.europa.eu/it/video/the-schuman-declaration--9-may-1950_EP102295
- Fabrizio Petri: <https://www.fabriziopetri.com/index.php/en/current-news/49-cidu>
- Oxfam International: <http://www.oxfam.org/en/about/why>
- TEU : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012M/TXT&from=EN>
- TFEU : <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=EN>

RIASSUNTO

L'obiettivo di questa tesi è quello di analizzare le principali caratteristiche della prospettiva sociologica dei diritti umani. Il modo principale per farlo è pensare sociologicamente ai diritti umani e definire i concetti principali di questa scienza, come ad esempio le connessioni tra diritti, i processi del loro cambiamento e i problemi che ne susseguono. Questo processo ci porta a classificarli in diverse categorie, non solo in termini di diritti positivi e negativi, ma anche come prima, seconda e terza generazione, cioè diritti civili e politici, diritti economici e sociali e diritti culturali e ambientali. Tuttavia, è importante tenere a mente che la lingua, la storia, la cultura e i valori delle varie società formano e influenzano la concezione e la percezione dei diritti umani. Nonostante le differenze, esistono canoni unici e solidi che sono alla base dello sviluppo etico e morale del rispetto dei diritti umani, ma questo non significa che le nazioni e i governi non li violino. Per questo motivo, l'obiettivo finale è quello di ridurre al minimo il rischio di tali violazioni per garantire al massimo il rispetto dell'individuo. Ho quindi preso in considerazione le politiche portate avanti dall'Unione Europea e l'attuazione dell'Agenda 2030 e il lavoro del Comitato Interministeriale Italiano per i Diritti Umani (CIDU). Anche se molto lavoro è stato fatto, c'è molta strada da fare per raggiungere una sostanziale uguaglianza tra i diversi individui.

Una delle domande alle quali è sempre più difficile rispondere riguarda la posizione dell'essere umano nel mondo. E' nato prima l'essere umano o la comunità sociale? Questa è una domanda molto gettonata tra filosofi, sociologi e antropologi del tempo; tuttavia, molti hanno riscontrato che la risposta è particolarmente vicina agli ideali delle rivoluzioni della modernità. La verità è che le due domande “che cosa è un essere umano e che cosa è la società” mostrano la loro complessità nel momento stesso in cui si intrecciano. Inoltre, la questione veramente importante è che, secondo i sociologi dell'epoca moderna, queste due indagini non solo si intrecciano ma devono intrecciarsi. Sia

se un individuo è un animale politico che ha bisogno di rimanere in contatto con i suoi simili, come sosteneva Aristotele, o è un'entità egoista, timorosa e aggressiva, come invece affermava Hobbes, l'immagine di una persona deve essere analizzata a partire dall'individuo, al di là della dimensione del contratto sociale e a prescindere dalle trasformazioni economiche e sociali della rivoluzione capitalista. Questo significa entrare pienamente nel mondo delle idee e della mentalità della modernità.

Un aspetto, e forse il più importante, che collega gli esseri umani e le società sono i diritti umani. Mentre alcuni argomenti come il diritto, le scienze politiche e la storia hanno guardato ai diritti umani da un punto di vista empirico, la sociologia ha sviluppato un'osservazione multifattoriale. Per questo, nel primo capitolo ho analizzato i vari aspetti della sociologia dei diritti umani con l'obiettivo di trovare un modo per collegare quelli che dovrebbero essere i diritti dell'uomo e quelli che effettivamente gli individui e la società per interno vivono giorno dopo giorno. L'analisi non può non passare per la storia, i valori e la cultura delle diverse società, soprattutto dopo il periodo della globalizzazione. L'obiettivo però è quello di trovare delle caratteristiche comuni che incitino i lettori a capire l'importanza dei diritti di ognuno di noi non solo per immaginare un mondo migliore, ma anche per capire cosa si può fare effettivamente in termini di politiche, con l'aiuto di attivisti, organizzazioni e istituzioni. È fondamentale però inquadrare dal punto di vista legale (e, quindi, più empirico) gli spazi dati ai diritti dell'uomo non solo all'interno dei canoni, ma considerando anche le caratteristiche sociali di tali diritti. In generale, i diritti trovano la loro base nella più profonda psicologia degli esseri umani e nelle loro capacità di socializzazione e spesso, se non addirittura sempre, la nascita di nuovi diritti è dovuta alle difficoltà che alcuni gruppi di persone hanno trovato nel percorso della loro vita. Quindi si può concludere che i diritti umani non hanno solo una valenza legale, ma servono anche e soprattutto nella vita politica della società che deve tendere a proteggere gli individui, la vita culturale e l'ambiente. Nella prima parte della mia tesi quindi mi sono focalizzata su alcuni concetti base della sociologia dei diritti umani, come le condizioni in cui si devono sviluppare i diritti umani, le loro interpretazioni, i loro effetti sulla società civile e le relazioni che si creano.

In generale, i diritti umani devono essere concepiti come attributi o proprietà di oltre 7 milioni di persone, a prescindere della nostra razza, religione, orientamento sessuale, genere, nazionalità, cultura, età, disabilità o abilità e tutte quelle caratteristiche che ci rendono ciò che semplicemente siamo. Persone.

Aristotele definì l'uomo come "animale politico", enfatizzando il suo carattere sociale e interattivo. L'uomo deve essere per forza sociale affinché si riconosca come tale ed è necessario, oltre che giusto, che tutti siano trattati ugualmente. La nostra tendenza è quella di mettere in maggiore evidenza quello che ci differenzia dagli altri individui piuttosto che quanto ci accomuna a loro. Possiamo dire che nonostante l'uomo probabilmente non sia nato per farsi troppe domande, se le pone e si dà anche (spesso) una risposta. Questo è dovuto a tanti motivi, biologici anche, ma soprattutto relazionali. È importante quindi poter creare un ambiente in cui le persone possano coltivare i propri talenti, perché per essere pienamente umani c'è bisogno di esprimersi.

È per questo che ho preso in considerazione due casi studio: il primo a livello europeo, cioè l'implementazione delle politiche dell'Agenda 2030 che hanno come obiettivo primario quello di seguire i principi di non lasciare nessuno indietro nella crescita prevista e, anzi, far sì che si raggiungano quelli che si trovano più lontani da questo raggiungimento; il secondo, è invece sul lavoro svolto dal Comitato interministeriale per i diritti umani italiano, con il quale mi sono interfacciata personalmente facendo un'intervista Skype con la Segretaria legale, la Dottoressa Maria Luisa Lapresa, e la Segretaria generale, la Dottoressa Laura Baldassarre.

Per quanto riguarda lo studio europeo, l'obiettivo dell'Agenda 2030 e del programma sullo sviluppo sostenibile mira a ridurre le ineguaglianze sia a livello nazionale che internazionale. In questo studio si valutano i progressi compiuti dall'UE nell'affrontare la disuguaglianza, sottolineando l'importanza di adottare un approccio multidimensionale che va oltre gli aspetti finanziari e guarda alle molteplici fonti di svantaggio e discriminazione. Bisogna quindi considerare le tendenze globali di povertà e disuguaglianza, rilevando in particolare l'aumento delle discrepanze di reddito e ricchezza negli ultimi decenni. Fondamentali sono anche l'impatto del cambiamento climatico e della pandemia COVID19 non solo a livello economico, ma anche sociale e individuale per tutto il mondo. Ho scelto questo studio perché identifica un crescente consenso internazionale sull'importanza di affrontare la disuguaglianza e le migliori politiche da adottare. Le cause della povertà sono molteplici, tant'è che deve essere concepita non solo come una violazione, ma anche come un abuso dei diritti fondamentali dell'uomo. Per questo bisogna puntare a migliorare non solo il livello economico le condizioni delle persone, ma anche l'educazione, l'eguaglianza di genere, la sanità.

L'Unione Europea ha partecipato attivamente a questo dibattito, si è impegnata e si impegnerà ulteriormente a contribuire ancora grazie anche all'iniziativa "Team Europe", che aiuterà l'attuazione delle politiche identificate, ma mobilitare e mantenere la necessaria volontà politica può rivelarsi la più grande sfida.

Infine, mi sono chiesta come l'Italia stia lavorando per il rispetto dei diritti dell'uomo e il Comitato Interministeriale per i diritti umani, nonostante non abbia una personalità giuridica, ha un notevole impatto sulle politiche sociali. Nonostante si possa pensare che svolga delle attività con i ministeri, la vera funzione del Comitato è quella di reporting e follow up di tutte le raccomandazioni internazionali e sovranazionali nel campo dei diritti umani. Quindi si occupa principalmente di tenere aggiornate le politiche sociali italiane, di mantenere stabili le relazioni con l'ONU (particolarmente con quello che ha sede a Ginevra, essendo specializzato nei diritti umani), con l'Agenzia europea per i diritti umani (FRA) con sede a Vienna e con le commissioni per i diritti umani. Come per l'Unione Europea, l'obiettivo è quello di diminuire le disuguaglianze economiche e sociali a livello nazionale, seguendo un approccio multidimensionale. Uno dei piani più importanti che stanno implementando è quello sulle Donne, Pace e Sicurezza, che collega come l'impiego delle donne potrebbe diminuire il tasso di povertà e ridurrebbe anche in maniera considerevole lo scoppio di conflitti. Purtroppo, però, l'approccio è "a posteriori", quindi si occupa anche (e soprattutto) del sostegno psicologico che necessitano le donne e i bambini che hanno vissuto e che vivono un periodo di guerra.

La mia speranza è quella di poter leggere questo mio elaborato fra qualche anno e potermi ricredere su molti punti che ho analizzato, che la nostra società sia riuscita a rispettare alcuni dei pochi aspetti toccati in questo elaborato. "La pace mondiale non potrà essere salvaguardata se non con sforzi creativi, proporzionali ai pericoli che la minacciano", questo sosteneva il Primo Ministro degli esteri della Repubblica Francese Robert Schuman nella Sala dell'orologio di Quai d'Orsay il 9 maggio 1950. Io continuerò a studiare in questo ambito per salvaguardare la pace con i miei sforzi creativi.

RINGRAZIAMENTI

Al Professor Sorice, colui che mi ha fatto appassionare a quest'affascinante materia che spero diventi il mio futuro. La ringrazio per la sua dedizione e accoglienza, caratteristiche di chi ha veramente il piacere nel vedere qualcuno crescere.

A me piace pensare alle persone, le penso molto spesso, e nell'arco di questi tre anni ho pensato molto a chi è entrato nel mio cuore.

Chi sin da subito, chi con fatica, chi molto dopo l'inizio, chi pensa di esserne uscito per sempre e chi penso non ne uscirà mai. Tutti mi sono entrati sicuramente nel cuore e mi hanno lasciato un segno che ricorderò, anche non volendo.

In questo viaggio avrei voluto che tante cose fossero andate in maniera diversa, a volte penso che avrei potuto fare molto di più richiedendo di meno, avrei potuto essere più calma nel costruire qualcosa, ma avevo troppa voglia di conoscervi e imparare qualcosa da voi.

Ho imparato tanto, che cosa significa essere amica, avere degli amici e non averli anche, ho imparato ad innamorarmi e dare tutto, a lasciar perdere, a perdonare, a divertirmi anche senza niente perché bastava stare insieme a voi, amici miei.

Ogni giorno del mio percorso ho pensato a questa fine, a chi avrei dovuto ringraziare, con quali parole, ricordando un momento preciso. Ma in verità spero di potervi ringraziare ancora nell'arco della mia vita, di condividere qualcosa con voi. Se anche non dovesse essere così, sappiate che vi ricorderò. Spero che anche io vi abbia lasciato qualcosa, non sarò io a dire se è un bene o no. Vorrei dirvi tante cose, ma ve le dirò da vicino. Lo sapete, faccio le cose a modo mio.

Ma voglio ringraziare pubblicamente la mia famiglia, che anche quando non mi ha capita non mi ha lasciata sola, ma anzi, mi ha sostenuto ancora di più perché l'importante è crederci. Non sentitevi mai abbandonati da me, siete voi il motore che mi fa vivere.

Grazie nonno, solo tu sai.