

You asked me: how can we bring about social inclusion?

I answer in my theory¹ distorted speech: social inclusion you only bring about through system's change; this entails changing the elements and structures of the system and the expectations of people.

When we go into a village, install a wheat mill and insist on having women from the village on the managing board for the mill, it will not change the gender relations in that village – or will hardly change it. Maybe emphasise the slightly better status of women from the village elite, as usual. But not change the relations between men and women in this village, will not give them more possibility to voice their view or make decisions. It will not include women more.

When we leave without having changed the structures and elements of the system, so without having changed for example the guiding norms and habits and underlying values regarding managing village-owned property, people will follow their former ways. Men and women will 'expect' that things happen in the way as they have been happening before. They will expect that people behave according to the roles as they are allocated to them. Nothing will have changed – not the elements, structures, expectations and roles – by just physically putting women in a role, which is not embedded in the system. The system must change before the roles can change.

The structures and elements of a system, for example a village, are its institutions and guiding values, norms and habits; and people are influenced by the systems they are living in to behave according to the systems' demands – they have expectations about what the systems demand from them and have learnt it through their socialisation into different roles.

I, who is working at home, expect that my husband expects dinner, when he comes home from his higher paying place of work. His and my role we learnt through being socialised by our parents, family, friends, religious leaders, political leaders, songs, pictures ... To change – me not cooking dinner – his expectations and mine need to change; these expectations change, when the institution (law and norms) of marriage (a couple living together) is changed, and the general habits, norms and values relating to roles of men and women living in one household change.

Even writing this, I am not able to write without using expressions and terms imprinted by my own culture.

How can structures, elements, expectations (institutions, roles, norms, values) change?

1. Through external influences from outside of the system – destruction of existing structures through war and violence, and sudden changes in the natural, political and economic environment – external coercion by actors influenced by another system (do you need an example? Alright, the storm of the Mongols in Baghdad);
2. Through the (external) introduction and adoption of new technologies, new religions/philosophies, which bring about a transformation of structures and elements; these new element introduced into and adopted by the system, must build on existing structures and elements to be adopted in the first place; the elements and structures are therefore not changed by being wiped out and replaced by something new, but by being added on and thus tacitly

¹ Niklas Luhmann, Talcott Parsons and Peter Drucker really explained things to me – although I do not know, if I understood them correctly; I am adhering here to what I understood and not necessarily what they meant;

changing 'how things are done' and therefore the expectations 'how they should be done' (examples mobile phones role in alleviating poverty in Kenya; the change of portraying people after the introduction of Christendom in East Rome).

3. Through internal changes by tacitly doing things differently - by some actors influenced by the system and are not becoming part of another system; until the new ways turn into an 'expectation' and institutionalise themselves; (e.g. in Zanzibar, wearing the Kanga over the dress underneath).
4. Through a (tacit) change in communication within the system, by which existing power relations are not reinforced, and new power relations can emerge; (e.g. despite of the system's set power communication, a Pakistani girl continues schooling in her country town beyond her puberty, and thus changes expectations – first of some – and allows more and more Pakistani girls to do the same in Pakistan).

How can these changes be actively inspired, stimulated, encouraged? How can more social inclusion be brought about?

(Do we actually agree that social inclusion, a share in the decision making and a share in the economic benefits of a society – a combination of systems – is the basis for all sustainable human development?)

Through the art and power of convincing the administrators and influencers of the elements and structures of the system.

The art of convincing: employing art actually in convincing – where feelings come into play, changes and transformations are possible; art creates feelings; e.g. the case of soldiers citing a movie as the reason why they leave their army; the German author Goethe admiring in his Italian travel book the intellectual Jesuits using the pomp and splendour of baroque art and architecture in the churches to keep Christian believers believing;

The power of convincing:

- through the good argument for institutional change, which is promoted by the powerful – they are powerful through their positions and roles, through their knowledge, through their rhetoric skills, through their material resources; the convincing argument must then be re-iterated by the structures, until expectations within the system 'how things should be done' and 'who should play which role' are changed (e.g. observable in all successful organisational changes such as women in high positions in the German development agency GIZ).
- Or through the seemingly powerless, who start not to cooperate with the seemingly powerful in their exertion of power (e.g. the soldiers who won the Austrian Maria-Theresien medal, because they did not carry out an order of the superior and thus saved a skirmish, a battle even).
- Or through those of less power giving themselves the appearance, the semblance of power, and thus changing the game within the system and, through changing the expectations, the system itself (wasn't the changes and transformations occurring through the student and workers movements in 1969 e.g. in France, such a game and then system changer?).

With all this the question duly arises: when is a change a change? When is a transformation a transformation? Maybe, when the results change, when they are improving? Maybe, when a system becomes more viable - more resilient, effective, efficient, flexible, it has changed to the better?

You asked me, in a soft voice, how social inclusion can be done. I said now change of institutions and roles through employing art and power. How wrong is this? How right? And what is your answer?