

Ethical Economics Support

Occasional **Newsletter** of the
Association for Integrity and Responsible Leadership
in Economics and Associated Professions
(www.AIRLEAP.org)

AIRLEAP

AIRLEAP

December 27, 2007

LATEST NEWS / UPCOMING EVENTS

Mark Your Calendars! AIRLEAP's next **monthly meetings** will be held on the following Wednesdays:

January 16, 2008
February 13, 2008
March 12, 2008
April 9, 2008

See www.airleap.org/meetings.htm for details.

See Us at the AEA Meetings! As members of the International Confederation of Associations for Pluralism in Economics (ICAPE), we are sharing their booth at the AEA meetings on January 4-6, 2008 in New Orleans.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summer Intern Program – page 2

Call for Volunteer Authors in AIRLEAP's Upcoming Book: *Hope for Economics: The Struggle for Integrity and Responsible Leadership in the World's Most Influential Discipline* – page 2

Membership Fees and Novelty Items (including new AIRLEAP t-shirts and mugs!) – page 3

Summaries of Recent Presentations

Economics as Art, Science, and Science Squared – page 4.



(Courtesy of NASA Image Exchange)

The Study and Promotion of Integrity and Responsible Leadership in Economics – page 6.

Plagiarism in the Economics Profession – page 7.



Essays

Ethics of Globalization and Development – page 9.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Call for Volunteers. AIRLEAP continues to need volunteers for a wide range of activities. (See <http://www.airleap.org/members.htm>.)

Annotated Bibliography. We are continuing to expand and revise our annotated bibliography. (See <http://www.airleap.org/bibliography.cfm>.)

AIRLEAP Survey: IF you haven't already, **PLEASE TAKE THE SURVEY!** It is important to our mission, and your opinion matters. (<http://www.airleap.org/Survey/>)

AIRLEAP's Summer Intern Program

AIRLEAP® is a newly formed, international, nonprofit association that is headquartered in the Washington, DC area, and incorporated in Virginia. The acronym stands for the Association for Integrity and Responsible Leadership in Economics and Associated Professions. (See www.airleap.org.) AIRLEAP will be hiring a summer intern in 2008, for 8 weeks at \$10/hour (assuming a 40-hour work week). The intern may work outside the Washington, DC metropolitan area, but must be located within the United States. Responsibilities will include improving AIRLEAP's annotated bibliography (<http://www.airleap.org/bibliography.cfm>) and authoring a literature review for AIRLEAP's website (which the intern may later revise and publish elsewhere). Both graduate and undergraduate students who have completed at least four economics courses may apply. Economics majors with proven writing skills are preferred. Interested candidates should email steven.payson@airleap.org with "Summer Intern" in the subject line, a cover letter mentioning ranges of possible starting and ending dates, a 200-word essay on why the applicant would like the position, a resume that lists academic and employer references, a copy of college transcript(s) (official or unofficial), and one to three writing samples. The candidate must be legally able to work in the United States. The deadline for applying: March 20, 2008. AIRLEAP is an equal opportunity employer.

Call for Volunteer Authors, Copy Editors, and Researchers for a New Book

AIRLEAP is now organizing the production of a new book, entitled:

Hope for Economics: The Struggle for Integrity and Responsible Leadership in the World's Most Influential Discipline

This will be an edited volume, consisting of chapters from several authors. The chapters will address a wide range of topics that pertain to integrity and responsible leadership in economics and associated professions. The book will be designed under the guidance of AIRLEAP's Board of Directors (<http://www.airleap.org/BoardOfDirectors.htm>) who have extensive experience in this area.

Hope for Economics will cover the same major areas that are listed in AIRLEAP's annotated bibliography (<http://www.airleap.org/bibliography.cfm>): I. How Economics Classes Are Taught; II. Economics as an Objective Science; III. Breadth of Economists' Perspectives; IV. Usefulness of Economic Discourse; V. How Ideas are Recognized and Rewarded; VI. Funding of Economic Research; VII. Contracted Economic Studies; VIII. Economic Statistics; IX. Job Market for Economists; and X. Economics and International Relations. The book will include both newly written papers and reprints of published articles.

AIRLEAP will be the listed author of *Hope for Economics*, and will acknowledge the individual authors of each chapter. AIRLEAP will promote the book heavily in support of its mission.

Contact Airleap_news@airleap.org if you would like to help as a volunteer author, copy editor, or researcher, writing in the subject line, "Volunteer for HFE."

Please join and/or help support the *Association for Integrity and Responsible Leadership in Economics and Association Professions (AIRLEAP®)*.

Membership or Purchase	Cost	Membership Includes	
		Mugs	T-shirts
Student Membership*	\$25 / year (or \$60 for a 3-year membership)	1	
Regular Membership*	\$75 / year (or \$200 for a 3-year membership)	1	1
Family Membership (best value)*	\$100 / year (or \$250 for a 3-year membership)	2	2
Purchase 15-Ounce Ceramic Mugs	\$10 for one; \$18 for two		
Purchase T-shirts (choose small, medium, large, or extra large)	\$12 for one; \$21 for two		

(Only checks, payable to “AIRLEAP,” or cash will be accepted at this time.)

*The cost of membership, minus the value of the gifts included, is exempt from federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. (The EIN for AIRLEAP is 36-4600302.)



Front

Back



“Economics as Art, Science, and Science Squared”

Summary of the Presentation by Steve Payson to the American Friends
of the London School of Economics (Washington, DC; June 27, 2007)

In Dr. Payson’s presentation to the American Friends of the London School of Economics he expressed his own, personal views of the field of economics as a fellow alumnus of the LSE (where he acquired a Masters of Science degree in Economics in 1982). Below are excerpts from his talk and slide presentation, entitled, “Economics as Art, Science, and Science Squared.”

In the overall balance of things, my personal view is that economics itself could benefit from a greater commitment among economists to be scientific in their perspectives as they generate thought and apply economic models. I think this subject is most relevant to graduate students, or would-be graduate students ... for two reasons: One—Economic students are the economists of our future. And so, how economics students today perceive economics will have great bearing on economic thought and literature in the future. And two—There may be biased selection ... where more science-oriented students may write off economics as not being for them ... while students who enjoy rhetoric enough to make a profession out of it, may find a comfortable place in economics.

...

It’s funny though, how often I, and others with similar views, have been accused of being naïve or unrealistic in expressing the idea that economics should be more scientific. Perhaps this is true ... perhaps we ARE naïve. . . . For some strange reason that I cannot quite understand, there is confusion when someone says economics *should* be more scientific. Sometimes people think we are ... talking about how economics is actually practiced, and saying economics IS more scientific. ... The suggestion that economics should be more scientific is not a suggestion that economics today should be seen as scientific. Rather, it is a bold suggestion that economics can be changed ... from being less scientific, to being more scientific! That is a different thing to be naïve about – whether economics *can* change, simply because some people would like to see it change. But one observes from the history of economic thought that economics has, in fact, changed over the years. Largely *because* people wanted to see it change.

...

If someone suggests to most farmers the idea of growing crops in a desert, or on the side of a mountain, it is natural for many of them to think that these suggestions reflect a lack of understanding of farming. They might say such thoughts are not the thoughts of real farmers, or knowledgeable farmers, but naïve, or perhaps even stupid farmers who don’t know anything about farming. The prevailing belief is that *farming should exist where it is easiest to farm*. But, I would argue that there is another perspective – ... what about the challenge of farming where it is *not* easy to farm? I would call this perspective *farming squared* – a commitment to farming that is so great, it is a commitment to expand farming where farming had not been done before. ... because farming can, in fact, be done on the sides of mountains, and it can be done in barren deserts.



(Courtesy of AgriSupportOnline Image Gallery www.agrisupportonline.com)



(Courtesy of AgriSupportOnline Image Gallery www.agrisupportonline.com)

The same might be argued about teaching religion. We have many formal and well established structures and social environments where Western religion is taught and practiced. And teaching Western religion in such surroundings is fairly easy and is expected. Teaching Western religion in a completely different setting, where it is not so easy or expected, is not common, and is not chosen by the vast majority of people who decide to teach Western religion. Yet, does this mean that people who go out into societies and environments where their own religion is not taught are people who are ignorant or naïve about their own religion? Recycling the same metaphor that I just used for farming, I would argue that the work of missionaries might be seen as *religion squared* — a commitment to their religion that is so great, it is a commitment to expand their religion to areas where it had never been before.

And now, by the same analogy, I am prepared to talk about “science.” There are many obvious reasons why it is easier to do scientific research in the natural sciences, like chemistry, physics, and biology, than to try to attempt it in the soft, social sciences, like economics.

As I have already mentioned, in the natural sciences we can usually have controlled experiments, and we usually have well behaved physical constants and mathematical laws whose parameters, like the speed of light, do not change, etc. But does this mean that it is unrealistic, or ignorant, or naïve, to try to do science in something as apparently “unscientific” as economics ... studying such things as the “chaos” of markets or the mysteries that determine income and wealth? I like to think of it as a form of *science squared* – science outside the convenience of a standard laboratory – that takes science where it has not been before. ... I am not a philosopher of science, but I strongly believe that science can exist “outside” the traditional laboratory ... just like farming can be done in a desert with the right equipment and expertise, and religion can be practiced outside a church or temple.

For students interested in economics ... I ask that you do not think of science with images of chemistry sets or microscopes or telescopes. But, when you fly into Heathrow Airport in London, on your way to the London School of Economics, or simply the next time you are on a plane, look out the window ... at the physical reality of what we call the economy.



(Courtesy of AgriSupportOnline Image Gallery
www.agrisupportonline.com)

From the airplane see the roads and buildings and farms and vehicles and the people walking around that make up the incredible system of wealth and distribution ... on this planet, that we call “the economy.” See ... the physical reality of it all, and keep that view ... in a safe place in your mind ... An economy made up of all of the physical, social, psychological, and organizational aspects of this incredibly integrated system of circumstances and events whereby human beings manipulate, manage, and distribute our planet’s resources. ***Dare to think, if you will, of economics...as a science.***



(Courtesy of AgriSupportOnline Image Gallery
www.agrisupportonline.com)



(Courtesy of NASA Image Exchange)

“The Study and Promotion of Integrity and Responsible Leadership in Economics”

Summary of the Presentation by Doug Palo to the USDA Economists Group
(Washington, DC; October 29, 2007)



Doug Palo

As a fellow employee of the United States Department of Agriculture, and also as a co-director of AIRLEAP, Mr. Palo gave a presentation before the USDA Economists Group in their main headquarters (the “South Building”). Excerpts from his presentation are shown below (and his entire slide presentation is available at: <http://www.airleap.org/publications.htm>).

How many of us remember Wassily Leontief? Professor Leontief was known for many things: Winner of the 1973 Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor at Harvard in the 1930s and 1940s, Father of Input-Output Analysis ... But, he was also known for being one of the many prominent economists who raised concerns about integrity and responsible leadership in economics. In his Presidential Speech to the American Economic Association in ... 1970 Wassily Leontief said:

Uneasiness ... is caused not by the irrelevance of the practical problems to which ... economists address their efforts, but rather by the palpable inadequacy of the scientific means with which they try to solve them. ... Continued preoccupation with imaginary, hypothetical, rather than with observable reality has gradually led to a distortion of the informal valuation scale used ... to assess and to rank ... scientific performance.

The Issue of Integrity in Economics is as at least as alive today as it was in Leontief’s time. ... Until now, however, ... concerns and ideas for improvements have come primarily from individual observers, who have not been unified, and have not been successful at inducing positive change. The only real effect has been the generation of literature on the topic, which has largely been ignored by the profession overall. Most of the discussion of integrity and responsible leadership in economics has been expressed by groups that either:

- Support particular ideologies, where they discuss the topic in relation to their ideologies, such as “Econ Journal Watch” (supporting “free markets”) and the “Post-Autistic Economics Network” (for “non-neoclassical” economics).
- Focus on intellectual history and prepare scholarly discourse on the topic designed for an audience that is only a tiny fraction of the economics profession, such as the “International Network for Economic Method.”

By being divided among ideologies and very different audiences, the proliferation of expressed concerns and proposed solutions has never been unified, and thus, for the most part, has gone nowhere. There has GOT to be a better way! ...

Face the Facts: Several problems have been identified in the literature and are commonly known simply from casual observation by experts in the profession — these problems are not secrets! Such problems include, for example, a tendency for some economic studies to be esoteric exercises with little practical value, and a tendency for recognition to be based, in part, on cronyism.

What appears to be lacking most is commitment by individuals to address such issues, without debating about ideological preferences that are actually peripheral to these rather-simple problems. The solution, therefore, is for economists to organize, develop, and publicize their thoughts on how to promote integrity and responsible leadership in economics, and be committed to stand by their words. Apathy and insecurity must be overcome for this to happen. Once economists do “get involved,” the rest will be easy.

“Plagiarism in the Economics Profession”

Summary of the Presentation by Gary Hoover to the Society of Government Economists
(Washington, DC; December 14, 2007)

Dr. Gary Hoover is a Professor of Economics at the University of Alabama, where he is also Assistant Dean for Faculty and Graduate Student Development in the College of Business. Professor Hoover is a Co-Director of AIRLEAP, who recently met with some of our members and other directors at our monthly meeting in Washington, DC on December 13th.

Hoover was recently invited to give a talk about his research on plagiarism in economics to the Society of Government Economists. Excerpts from his PowerPoint presentation will be made available at

<http://www.airleap.org/publications.htm>).



As a summary of his presentation, Hoover wrote:

I report the results of a survey regarding the instances of plagiarism reported by journal editors in the economics profession. In addition, I report the results of a survey regarding academic plagiarism among professional economists. The former finds that nearly 24% of responding editors encounter one case of plagiarism in a typical year. In addition, the survey reveals that less than 19% of responding journals have a formal policy regarding plagiarism. In the latter, I find that respondents are not aware of the distinction between copyright infringement and plagiarism. I also find that risk of damage to ones reputation from plagiarizing is minimal since most cases go unreported. In both cases respondents were split over whether the economics profession would benefit from a professional code of ethics, although rank-and-file economists were more in favor. I also develop a simple model to show that it is rational for individuals in the economics profession who want to plagiarize to engage in this activity, given current incentives. (<http://www.sge-econ.org/0712luncheon.htm>)

In addition to discussing plagiarism in economics, Hoover mentioned similar issues that he described as being “much more common.” These included situations where the same author(s) rewrite their articles in a slightly different form, or recycle and piece-together substantive portions of previously written articles, and pass them off as new papers for publication in other journals. Hoover explained that such behavior is not plagiarism, since the same author(s) are involved, but it is likely to be a violation of the copyright agreements that author(s) sign with the publishers with regard to the first articles they wrote on the topic. A similar situation occurs when author(s) rename a published paper and have it published by a lesser-known journal in an obscure location. Since these additional publications are likely to have a different audience, the author(s) are able to expand their publication counts without repercussions (i.e., without *being caught*). Another example, where individuals may be credited for authorship that they did not deserve, is the situation in which there are multiple authors, but where some of them may not have contributed significantly to the work.

On a positive note, however, Hoover remarked that “such practices eventually become transparent.” He quipped, “George Stigler, one of my professors in graduate school, was once asked why he’d ‘only’ written 70 or so articles while a colleague of his at that time had written hundreds. Stigler’s response was ‘Ah, but mine are all different.’”

Also discussed were situations in which material is stolen before it is published, when authors are sending out drafts to colleagues or when their work is already being received by journal referees. Such cases might include, as well, professors “lifting students work,” or receiving credit as a coauthor without contributing significantly to the work.

During his presentation, several members of the audience were shocked at what they were hearing, and occasionally asked him to repeat or rephrase his study’s findings, just to be assured that they were hearing correctly. Since most of the audience were government economists, who generally do not face the same pressures for publication counts that academics do, some appeared to be initially puzzled as to why people would even go through so much trouble of playing such games (such as renaming and recycling an article in an obscure journal) simply to expand their publication record. Professor Hoover explained that this is done because academic careers depend quite heavily on publication counts, especially when professors are applying for tenure.

Hoover presented the results of a survey he conducted of economists and journal editors, and he quoted several candid statements that were made by various authors, journal editors, and other economists regarding their experiences with plagiarism or similar issues. Some of these statements were quite revealing. For example, Hoover mentions that one author, who felt s/he was plagiarized remarked, “I complained to my colleagues and to members of my committee but nothing was done. I since found out that this reputed academic is an habitual offender.” Another author said, “I contacted the journal, sending along copies of the sections of my dissertation that closely mirrored text from the article. I received no response. The editor I contacted claimed later that he had never received this material.”

Table 1. Responses to the Question of “Have You Ever Been Plagiarized” by Decade Receiving Ph.D.

Decade of Receiving PhD	Number and Percentage of Receiving PhD	Ever been plagiarized by decade
1960-1969	65 (5.43%)	27 (9.4%)
1970-1979	187 (15.6%)	57 (19.8%)
1980-1989	272 (22.7%)	72 (25%)
1990-1999	413 (34.5%)	91 (31.6%)
2000-2004	261 (21.8%)	41 (14.2%)
Total	1,198	288

Out of a total of 1,198 Ph.D. economists who responded to Hoover’s survey, as many as 288 (or 24 percent) stated that they had been plagiarized at some time in their career. This proportion of plagiarized economists was highest (32 percent) among those receiving their Ph.D.s in the 1990s. (See Table 1.)

Hoover also asked whether these economists would be in favor of an established *code of ethics*, which he defined as a “Clear statement regarding what does and what does not constitute plagiarism; consistent standards across journals/institutions for dealing with plagiarism so that individuals know a) what the consequences are, and b) how to deal with the situation.” Sixty-seven percent of those surveyed support the idea, while 33 percent did not.

Gary Hoover’s research on plagiarism in economics can be found in:

Enders, Walter and Gary Hoover, “Whose Line Is It? Plagiarism in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, XLII(2004): 487-493.

- Enders, Walter and Gary Hoover, "Plagiarism in the Economics Profession: A Survey," *Challenge*, Volume 49, No. 5 / September-October, 2006, pp. 92-107.
- Hoover, Gary, "Game-Theoretical Theory of Plagiarism," *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 34(2006): 449-454.
- Lederman, Doug, "Arguing Against Free-Market Plagiarism Prevention," *Inside Higher Ed*, December 17, 2007. <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/12/17/econ>.

Essays on Ethical Economics

AIRLEAP invites essays (and book reviews) from its members for possible publication in *Ethical Economics Support*, subject to review and approval by AIRLEAP's Newsletter Committee. Such essays may include editorial comments or rebuttals to previously submitted essays. Authors may choose to remain anonymous in the publication, but they are asked to let the Newsletter Committee know who they are to verify their membership. The Committee will honor the anonymity of authors who choose this option. Authors are offered considerable latitude in expressing critical or provocative ideas; however, essays must not critically accuse any particular individuals or organizations of wrong doing. The motivation of the essays is to exchange ideas and learn from each other — not to point fingers. For additional information about submitting essays see the instructions at the end of this section.

The essays presented here reflect only the opinions of the authors, not the opinions of AIRLEAP®.

Ethics of Globalization and Development

Globalization is the closer integration of economies and societies around the world which has been brought about by the enormous reduction of costs of transportation and communication, and the breaking down of artificial barriers to the flows of goods, services, capital, knowledge, and (to a lesser extent) people across borders (Stiglitz, 2002). Since the 1990s, the international political economy landscape has seen the advance of globalization through free market capitalism, driven by factors including the demise of the communist ideology and by the "East Asian Miracle" of rapid economic growth. Countries such as China and India—considered impoverished decades ago—have also begun to reap the economic benefits of globalization. However, there is clear evidence (and acknowledgement even on the part of institutions such as the International Monetary Fund) that the benefits of globalization have not addressed issues of poverty and inequality. While globalization offers economic opportunities such as access to international markets, its impact in terms of environmental degradation, poverty, unequal wealth distribution and the accompanying social ills raises important



(Courtesy of AgriSupportOnline Image Gallery
www.agrisupportonline.com.)

ethical issues that should inform the global development agenda.

Ethics evaluation is as important as economic evaluation in globalization because economic policies impact different people differently around the world. Economic policies are based on theories of how the economy functions and how it should function, with an underlying assumption that economic agents (households both as consumers and workers, corporate business and government) have ethical values that help in shaping their behavior. Lack of

moral codes and ethical practices by any of these agents would lead to rational self-interest and socially irrational results. For example, the movie "The Constant Gardener" portrays the consequences of moral corruption and unethical behavior of a pharmaceutical company from an industrialized country, as poor people in parts of Africa were used in a human experiment to test a potentially profitable drug.

Corporate behavior is perhaps the most central issue in the debate about the ethics of globalization. The movement of capital across borders has also meant a shift in job opportunities as firms in industrial economies shift operations to developing economies in search of cheap labor, giving rise to ethical issues of human trafficking and child labor in developing countries. Growing international attention to these issues have resulted in the establishment by some multinational corporations of systems to monitor and report on the economic, environment and social dimensions of their activities particularly in the host country and at the same time to allow independent third parties to audit their community and social policies. The accusations in 1996 of Nike promoting child labor and sweat shops in Pakistan have prompted greater social responsibility by the company, but the recent evidence of a similar situation with GAP in India demonstrates that the problem remains.

While international bodies such as the United Nations have conventions and protocols governing issues such as child labor, the absence of enforcement mechanisms and issues of legal jurisdiction do leave loopholes for multinational companies. However, the power of global communication is also exerting pressure on international companies to adopt best practices of corporate citizenship and responsibility, including the articulation of their social philosophy and community goals.

While capital mobility and its impact on labor have dominated the discussion about globalization, an emerging shift in Europe is

now on bringing migrants to the European Community (EU) labor market. The main motivation behind the plan is the fall in the population of working age, and the requirement for modern skills. If Europe is to remain competitive with the US and Japan, it requires skilled workers, and European companies are welcoming the "open door" migration plans. However, EC politicians are concerned about the social impact of migration, while developing countries worry about the loss of skilled labor and the consequent impact on their economies.

Corporate behavior regarding the restrictions on use of knowledge in the form of patents has also undermined the promised benefits of globalization. The pharmaceutical industry is a case in point: companies direct their research where the money is, regardless of the relative value to society. Thus, diseases that afflict the world's poor (e.g., malaria) get little attention in terms of research (as the poor cannot pay for the drugs), while the needs of the world's rich motivates research on life style drugs to address impotence and hair loss. Further, the patenting of drugs often places the cost of medication beyond the reach of the poor in both developed and developing countries.

For those societies seeking to reap the benefits of the globalization, what role are their governments playing? Development is viewed as a process governed by three critical variables; political independence (in the form of democratic institutions), social stability and cohesion (access to health and education facilities, and institutional safeguards for addressing human rights and freedoms) and economic security (sustainable economic growth). However, development dilemmas vary by nation. For instance, in developing countries, political and economic upheaval could constrain social development and lead to increased poverty, unemployment and social injustice, such as gender inequality. Industrialized countries may enjoy political freedoms but they face social and economic consequences of an ageing population and of migration. Developing

country governments face a number of challenges to globalization. On the one hand, they are caught in the winds of liberalization, which implies less government intervention; on the other hand, they face the downsides, including income inequality, unemployment (as some industries decline), and outbound migration.

The situation is further exacerbated in countries facing political turmoil or weak governance. These conditions create fertile ground for corruption and for multinational companies to use self-serving leaders (political, military or militia) to their advantage, as illustrated in the movie “Blood Diamond,” but often at the cost of the society. The role of Chinese capitalism in countries such as Sudan and Burma is a key case in point. In both countries, China has huge economic investments, but the Chinese government is slow to respond to international demands for it to mount pressure on the Sudanese (on Darfur) and on Burma (on human rights and freedom) out of a fear that changing the political *status quo* in these countries would undermine Chinese economic security.

Former French President Jacques Chirac once noted that globalization was not making life better for those most in need of its promised benefits. Erick D. Beinhocker in *Origin of Wealth* notes that “wealth may not buy happiness but poverty does buy misery for millions around the world” (pp 5). The administration of new-found wealth from globalization is becoming an important issue in the developing world, and good governance is probably the most important factor in reducing poverty and improving human and social development. A critical issue in countries such as India and China is the extent to which rural populations are left behind in the development push. Typically uneducated and farm-based, these populations have seen declining agricultural incomes, unemployment and population shifts to the urban centers, resulting in the disintegration of traditionally strong family ties. Successful globalization depends on

the ability of countries to translate economic growth into economic opportunities for all sectors of its population and in a manner that observes cultural and social norms and values.

From a wider perspective, the fruits of globalization are closely linked to peace and security, sustainable development and elimination from threats of terrorism at all levels: country, regional and international. Successful and all-inclusive development strategies in some countries continue to be plagued by civil unrest and political instability arising from threats to national freedoms (e.g., the instabilities in Sudan’s northern and southern regions). In the aftermath of 9/11, the importance of assuring national security has become more apparent as policymakers recognize that countries cannot achieve sustainable development or benefit from globalization if significant parts of the population remained marginalized and disempowered. Further, the income benefits of globalization, when unequally distributed, fan the flames of unrest.

International financing agencies, such as the IMF and the World Bank – while actively involved in assisting the very poor countries in achieving improved economic and social development – do not have a good track record on reducing income inequalities and poverty reduction in borrowing countries. Critics argue that these organizations (along with the World Trade Organization) are the work horses of American interests. IMF tools, such as cutting government expenditures and raising taxes to reduce the deficit, raising interest rates, and currency devaluation, have often swelled the ranks of the poor in borrowing countries by creating unemployment, cutting off subsidies and raising the cost of living. In response to criticism about their policies not addressing the human face of development, international organizations have developed the so-called Millennium Development Goals that set broad standards for measuring the progress of human development. However, underlying these goals

is the assumption that economic growth should bring positive material outcomes, such as access to water, and to education and health care facilities; broader ethical issues about the negative impact of globalization, such as environmental degradation, are not addressed.

As evidenced by the Enron corporate scandal, sound progress on corporate social responsibility is still lacking in the industrialized world; the question is whether companies are ready to be more transparent on environmental accounting. For the US to regain its role as a strong advocate of globalization, political leaders need to work in collaboration with corporate executives in developing policies both nationally and internationally to strengthen the economy and promote responsible and eco-friendly capitalism. A more ethical approach to globalization focusing on global warming (including the

implications of switching from fossil to bio-fuels) is crucial.

The reality is that for poor nations to effectively compete in the global market, they need the technology and skills to produce quality products at competitive costs. The actions of developed countries — by governments in terms of migration and trade policies, and/or by companies in knowledge transfer — continue to undermine efforts to make the playing field level for the developing world. Paradoxically, while global economies are converging on this unlevelled playing field, widening cultural differences and the assertion of religious and national identities appear to have placed the world into an arena of conflict, inequality and segmentation.

– Vishnu Narine, Johns Hopkins University

Instructions for Submitting Essays and Book Reviews

Instructions for submitting essays are subject to revision, so please ensure this is the latest issue of the newsletter before executing these instructions. Proposed essays may range from 200 to 4,000 words, and must relate in some significant way to an AIRLEAP-related topic. These essays should be sent as attached Microsoft Word files to AIRLEAP_News@airleap.org, and write in the subject line, “Essay for EES.” Authors must state explicitly in the email message whether they wish to be anonymous in the essay’s publication. AIRLEAP will only publish essays where membership is verified, regardless of anonymity. As mentioned above, essays will not be accepted if they critically accuse, either directly or indirectly, any particular individuals or organizations of wrong doing.

Of course, all essays submitted must be the original work of the author, and any ideas or text that is not original must be properly cited. In addition, essays that present statistics must provide the full references to these statistics in the essay, and provide the Newsletter Committee with an easy means for verifying the statistics presented (such as providing links or attachments to those sources in the email message that provided the essay). AIRLEAP claims no property right to essays in *Ethical Economics Support* — authors are free to recycle their essays to other publications.

ABOUT AIRLEAP

AIRLEAP® (www.AIRLEAP.org) is an international, nonprofit organization seeking to study and promote integrity and responsible leadership in economics and related professions. Please contact us (AIRLEAP_news@airleap.org) if you would like to help in organizing our meetings, preparing our newsletter, contributing to our research efforts, or participating with us at economic conferences. You do not need to be a member of AIRLEAP to join us as a volunteer. Membership fees are \$75 per year for regular membership, \$100 for family membership, and \$25 for student membership. For United States residents, all membership payments and contributions to AIRLEAP are exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (EIN 36-4600302). If you would like to join us as a member, and/or contribute to AIRLEAP, please send us your contact information and a check (in US dollars) to "AIRLEAP" to: AIRLEAP, 7481 Huntsman Blvd., # 505, Springfield, VA 22153, USA.

Association for Integrity and Responsible Leadership in Economics and Associated Professions

Caring about what is most important in economic discourse, economic decision making, and the career development of economists and related professionals.