

## Chapter 1 : The Equality of Opportunity Project

*Annotations "Equality of constitutional right and power is the condition of all the States of the Union, old and new." This doctrine, now a truism of constitutional law, did not find favor in the Constitutional Convention.*

Ratifications rescinded[ edit ] Although Article V is silent as to whether a state may rescind a previous ratification of a proposed "but not yet ratified" amendment to the U. Constitution, [47] legislators in the following four states nevertheless voted to retract their earlier ratification of the ERA: Refer to "Executive branch involvement in ratification process" below. Ratifying state with self-declared March 22, sunset provision[ edit ] The action of the 95th Congress in October to extend the ERA ratification deadline from March 22, , to June 30, , was not universally accepted. On December 23, , a federal district court ruled in *Idaho v. On January 25, , the U. Idaho and Carmen v. Idaho* that the controversy had been rendered moot by virtue of the fact that no additional state legislatures ratified ERA between March 22, and June 30, Senate and published verbatim in the Congressional Record of March 13, , at pages and Supreme Court ruled in *Hollingsworth v. Virginia* [54] that the President of the United States has no formal role in that process. Non-ratifying states with one-house approval[ edit ] At various times, in 7 of the 13 non-ratifying states, one house of the legislature approved the ERA. Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled two-thirds of each House concurring therein , That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress: However, the 92nd Congress did not incorporate any time limit into the body of the actual text of the proposed amendment, as had been done with a number of other proposed amendments. Carter signed the joint resolution, although he noted, on strictly procedural grounds, the irregularity of his doing so. In , seven female ERA supporters went on a fast and seventeen chained themselves to the entrance of the Illinois Senate chamber. In the final week before the revised deadline, that ratifying resolution, however, was defeated in the Florida Senate by a vote of 16 yeas and 22 nays. Even if Florida had ratified the ERA, the proposed amendment would still have fallen short of the required According to research by Professor Jules B. Gerard, professor of law at Washington University in St. Louis , of the 35 legislatures that passed ratification resolutions, 24 of them explicitly referred to the original deadline. Freeman, ruled that the extension of the ERA ratification deadline to June 30, , was not valid and that, ERA had actually expired from state legislative consideration more than two years earlier on the original expiration date of March 22, On January 25, , however, the U. After the disputed June 30, , extended deadline had come and gone, the Supreme Court, at the beginning of its new term, on October 4, , in the separate case of *NOW v. The Supreme Court* declared these controversies moot on the grounds that the ERA had not received the required number of ratifications 38 , so that "the Amendment has failed of adoption no matter what the resolution of the legal issues presented here. Miller , [75] the Supreme Court ruled that Congress has the final authority to determine whether, by lapse of time, a proposed constitutional amendment has lost its vitality before being ratified by enough states, and whether state ratifications are effective in light of attempts at subsequent withdrawal. The advisory also stated that even without such a further extension, a contemporary ratification of the ERA by the Virginia General Assembly could be found valid by Congress. Indeed, legislation currently pending in Congress seeks to exercise that very power. The equal rights amendment, in sum, would dedicate the nation to a new view of the rights and responsibilities of men and women. It firmly rejects sharp legislative lines between the sexes as constitutionally tolerable. Instead, it looks toward a legal system in which each person will be judged on the basis of individual merit and not on the basis of an unalterable trait of birth that bears no necessary relationship to need or ability. Between and , ERA supporters held rallies, petitioned, picketed, went on hunger strikes, and performed acts of civil disobedience. In her address, she pointed out how widespread sex discrimination had become and how the ERA would remedy it. She also said that laws to protect women in the workforce from unsafe working conditions would be needed by men, too, and thus the ERA would help all people. They argued that the amendment would

guarantee the possibility that women would be subject to conscription and be required to have military combat roles in future wars if it were passed. Defense of traditional gender roles proved to be a useful tactic. In Illinois, supporters of Phyllis Schlafly , a conservative Republican activist from that state, used traditional symbols of the American housewife. They took homemade bread, jams, and apple pies to the state legislators, with the slogans, "Preserve us from a congressional jam; Vote against the ERA sham" and "I am for Mom and apple pie. They could no longer count on alimony or Social Security.

**Chapter 2 : equality | Definition of equality in English by Oxford Dictionaries**

*Doctrine of Equality of States. One of the fundamental rights of a state is equality with all other states. This right is inherent in the concept of a state as a subject of International Law and is given general recognition by long-standing state practice.*

Our first task is therefore to provide a clear definition of equality in the face of widespread misconceptions about its meaning as a political idea. Thus, to say e. Two non-identical objects are never completely equal; they are different at least in their spatiotemporal location. Here usage might vary. In the case of descriptive use of equality, the common standard is itself descriptive, e. A prescriptive use of equality is present when a prescriptive standard is applied, i. The standards grounding prescriptive assertions of equality contain at least two components. On the one hand, there is a descriptive component, since the assertions need to contain descriptive criteria, in order to identify those people to which the rule or norm applies. The question of this identification “who belongs to which category? On the other hand, the comparative standards contain something normative “a moral or legal rule, in the example, the U. Such a rule constitutes the prescriptive component Westen , chap. Sociological and economic analyses of in- equality mainly pose the questions of how inequalities can be determined and measured and what their causes and effects are. In contrast, social and political philosophy is in general concerned mainly with the following questions: Such is the case in this article as well. Equality essentially consists of a tripartite relation between two or several objects or persons and one or several qualities. Two objects a and b are equal in a certain respect if, in that respect, they fall under the same general terminus. Every comparison presumes a tertium comparationis, a concrete attribute defining the respect in which the equality applies “equality thus referring to a common sharing of this comparison-determining attribute. There is another source of diversity as well: As Temkin , argues, various different standards might be used to measure inequality, with the respect in which people are compared remaining constant. The difference between a general concept and different specific conceptions Rawls , p. Depending on which procedural principle one adopts, contrary answers are forthcoming. Both equality and inequality are complex and multifaceted concepts Temkin , chap. In any real historical context, it is clear that no single notion of equality can sweep the field. But they believe that there is also a common underlying strain of important moral concerns implicit in it Williams Above all it serves to remind us of our common humanity, despite various differences cf. In this sense, egalitarians tend to think of egalitarianism as a single coherent normative doctrine “but one in any case embracing a variety of principles. Following the introduction of different principles and theories of equality, I will return in the last section of this article to the question how best to define egalitarianism and the value of equality. Principles of Equality and Justice Equality in its prescriptive usage has, of course, a close connection with morality and justice in general and distributive justice in particular. From antiquity onward, equality has been considered a constitutive feature of justice. On the history of the concept, cf. Albernethy , Benn , Brown , Dann , Thomson Throughout history, people and emancipatory movements use the language of justice to pillory certain inequalities. But what exactly is the connection between equality and justice, i. The role and correct account of equality, understood as an issue of social justice, is itself a difficult philosophical issue. To clarify this, philosophers have defended a variety of principles and conceptions of equality, many of which are mentioned in the following discussion. This section introduces four well known principles of equality, ranging from highly general and uncontroversial to more specific and controversial. Different interpretations of the role of equality in a theory of justice emerge according to which of the four following principles and which measure has been adopted. Through its connection with justice, equality, like justice itself, has different justitianda, i. These are mainly actions, persons, social institutions, and circumstances e. These objects of justice stand in an internal connection and order that can here only be hinted at. Justice is hence primarily related to individual actions. Individual persons are the primary bearer of responsibilities ethical individualism. Persons have to take responsibility for their individual actions and for circumstances they could change through such actions or omissions. Although people have responsibility for both their actions and circumstances, there is a moral difference between the

two justitianda, i. The responsibility people have to treat individuals and groups they affect in a morally appropriate and, in particular, even-handed way has hence a certain priority over their moral duty to turn circumstances into just ones through some kind of equalization. Hence one has to rely on collective actions. In order to meet this moral duty, a basic order guaranteeing just circumstances must be justly created. This is an essential argument of justice in favor of establishing social institutions and fundamental state structures for political communities; with the help of such institutions and structures, individuals can collectively fulfill their responsibility in the best possible manner. If circumstances can be rightly judged to be unjust, all persons have the responsibility and moral duty, both individually and collectively, to change the pertinent circumstances or distributive schemes into just ones. In the following sections, the objects of equality may vary from topic to topic. However, as indicated, there is a close relationship between the objects. The next three principles of equality hold generally and primarily for all actions and treatment of others and for resulting circumstances. From the fourth principle onward, i. This is the generally accepted formal equality principle that Aristotle formulated in reference to Plato: Of course the crucial question is which respects are normatively relevant and which are not. Some authors see this formal principle of equality as a specific application of a rule of rationality: But most authors instead stress that what is here at stake is a moral principle of justice, basically corresponding with acknowledgment of the impartial and universalizable nature of moral judgments. A form of treatment of others or as a result of it a distribution is equal numerically when it treats all persons as indistinguishable, thus treating them identically or granting them the same quantity of a good per capita. That is not always just. In contrast, a form of treatment of others or distribution is proportional or relatively equal when it treats all relevant persons in relation to their due. Just numerical equality is a special case of proportional equality. Numerical equality is only just under special circumstances, viz. Proportional equality further specifies formal equality; it is the more precise and detailed, hence actually the more comprehensive formulation of formal equality. It indicates what produces an adequate equality. Proportional equality in the treatment and distribution of goods to persons involves at least the following concepts or variables: Two or more persons  $P_1, P_2$  and two or more allocations of goods to persons  $G$  and  $X$  and  $Y$  as the quantity in which individuals have the relevant normative quality  $E$ . This can be represented as an equation with fractions or as a ratio. For the formula to be usable, the potentially great variety of factors involved have to be both quantifiable in principle and commensurable, i. When factors speak for unequal treatment or distribution, because the persons are unequal in relevant respects, the treatment or distribution proportional to these factors is just. Unequal claims to treatment or distribution must be considered proportionally: This principle can also be incorporated into hierarchical, inegalitarian theories. It indicates that equal output is demanded with equal input. Aristocrats, perfectionists, and meritocrats all believe that persons should be assessed according to their differing deserts, understood by them in the broad sense of fulfillment of some relevant criterion. And they believe that reward and punishment, benefits and burdens, should be proportional to such deserts. Since this definition leaves open who is due what, there can be great inequality when it comes to presumed fundamental natural rights, deserts, and worth " and such inequality is apparent in both Plato and Aristotle. The idea offers a framework for a rational argument between egalitarian and non-egalitarian ideas of justice, its focal point being the question of the basis for an adequate equality Hinsch Both sides accept justice as proportional equality. On the formal level of pure conceptual explication, justice and equality are linked through these principles of formal and proportional justice. Justice cannot be explained without these equality principles; the equality principles only receive their normative significance in their role as principles of justice. Formal and proportional equality is simply a conceptual schema. It needs to be made precise " i. The formal postulate remains quite empty as long as it remains unclear when or through what features two or more persons or cases should be considered equal. All debates over the proper conception of justice, i. For this reason equality theorists are correct in stressing that the claim that persons are owed equality becomes informative only when one is told " what kind of equality they are owed Nagel ; Rae ; Sen , p. Actually, every normative theory implies a certain notion of equality. In order to outline their position, egalitarians must thus take account of a specific egalitarian conception of equality. To do so, they need to identify substantive principles of equality, discussed below. This postulate collapsed with the advent of the idea of natural right and its assumption of an

equality of natural order among all human beings. Against Plato and Aristotle, the classical formula for justice according to which an action is just when it offers each individual his or her due took on a substantively egalitarian meaning in the course of time, viz. This is now the widely held conception of substantive, universal, moral equality. It developed among the Stoics, who emphasized the natural equality of all rational beings, and in early New Testament Christianity, which elevated the equality of human beings before God to a principle: This important idea was also taken up both in the Talmud and in Islam, where it was grounded in both Greek and Hebraic elements in both systems. In the modern period, starting in the seventeenth century, the dominant idea was of natural equality in the tradition of natural law and social contract theory. Hobbes postulated that in their natural condition, individuals possess equal rights, because over time they have the same capacity to do each other harm. Locke argued that all human beings have the same natural right to both self-ownership and freedom. Rousseau declared social inequality to be a virtually primeval decline of the human race from natural equality in a harmonious state of nature: For Rousseau , , the resulting inequality and rule of violence can only be overcome by tying unfettered subjectivity to a common civil existence and popular sovereignty. His transcendental and philosophical reflections on autonomy and self-legislation lead to a recognition of the same freedom for all rational beings as the sole principle of human rights Kant , p. Such Enlightenment ideas stimulated the great modern social movements and revolutions, and were taken up in modern constitutions and declarations of human rights.

### Chapter 3 : The Equality Act | Human Rights Campaign

*The doctrine of equality of states means one thing in legal effect, but it also must be reflected against the realities imposed by differences in political power. Political equality is in some sense a fiction, because in political terms few states are equals.*

The present provision was then adopted as a substitute. However, if the doctrine rested merely on construction of the declarations in the admission acts, then the conditions and limitations imposed by Congress and agreed to by the States in order to be admitted would nonetheless govern, since they must be construed along with the declarations. Again and again, however, in adjudicating the rights and duties of States admitted after , the Supreme Court has referred to the condition of equality as if it were an inherent attribute of the Federal Union. The enabling act for Alabama had contained both a declaration of equal footing and a reservation to the United States of these lands. Inasmuch as the original States retained sovereignty and jurisdiction over the navigable waters and the soil beneath them within their boundaries, retention by the United States of either title or jurisdiction over common lands in the new States would bring those States into the Union on less than an equal footing with the original States. This, the Court would not permit. To maintain any other doctrine, is to deny that Alabama has been admitted into the union on an equal footing with the original states, the constitution, laws, and compact, to the contrary notwithstanding *Land Association, U. Harbor Commissioners*, 85 U. See *Mayor of New Orleans v. United States*, 35 U. Finally, in , the Court invalidated a restriction on the change of location of the State capital, which Congress had imposed as a condition for the admission of Oklahoma, on the ground that Congress may not embrace in an enabling act conditions relating wholly to matters under state control. To maintain otherwise would be to say that the Union, through the power of Congress to admit new States, might come to be a union of States unequal in power, as including States whose powers were restricted only by the Constitution, with others whose powers had been further restricted by an act of Congress accepted as a condition of admission. There is a broader implication, however, in *Baker v. See also Bolln v. Race Horse, U. City of Chicago, U.* Examples include *Stearns v.* Until recently the requirement of equality has applied primarily to political standing and sovereignty rather than to economic or property rights. Consequently, it has jurisdiction to tax private activities carried on within the public domain although not to tax the Federal lands , if the tax does not constitute an unconstitutional burden on the Federal Government. *First Municipality*, 44 U. United States, U. Admission of a State on an equal footing with the original States involves the adoption as citizens of the United States of those whom Congress makes members of the political community and who are recognized as such in the formation of the new State. June 9, State Laws.

### Chapter 4 : Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | U.S. Agency for International Development

*DOCTRINE OF EQUALITY OF STATES. One of the fundamental rights of a state is equality with all other states. This right is inherent in the concept of a state as a subject of international law and is given general recognition by long-standing state practice.*

These subjects, whether they are small or large, powerful or weak, have created a framework of recognised values and principles within which to develop. Law is perceived as the element which binds the subjects together in their obedience to customary rules and doctrines. International law rules and the rule of international law imply authority over its subjects. Ultimately, the law allows individuals to institute their own legal relations with rights and duties, but the law also acts as a deterrent and punishes those who violate its regulations. Sovereign states are the primary subjects of binding international law norms. Interestingly, one of the main challenges to the legitimacy of international law is that it allegedly fails to respect the sovereignty of states, intruding upon domains in which they should be free to make their own decisions. International law is based on the concept of state and the state in its turn lies upon the foundation of sovereignty, which expresses internally the supremacy of the governmental institutions and externally the supremacy of the state as a legal person. When Kosovo declared its independence from Serbia in , the United States were the first country to recognise Kosovo as an independent state, followed by France, Germany and many others. However, from an international law perspective, what does this mean? Does this mean that any sub-region of a given country can simply declare its independence and enter statehood? And what are the effects of recognition by other states? It is peculiar that the provision does not mention anything about recognition by other states. Is recognition necessary for an independent state to exist? Some have advocated that it is the recognition by other states that makes an entity become a state, whilst others argue that by fulfilling the above mentioned criteria it is already considered a state under international law. However, these conditions have not been clearly established in a particular case and their determination ultimately depends upon assessment by other states by means of recognition. Internal sovereignty had been developed with a view to the relationship between the state or its institutions and non-state actors spatially located within the territory of that state the church, local rulers, and the estates; today arguably the people and organizations of civil society and it is ascribed to the state as a body-politic, and to persons or groups within that state. Benedict Kingsbury states that the concept of sovereignty has brought relief for international lawyers in the following three ways: Interestingly, one of the main challenges to the legitimacy of international law is that it allegedly fails to respect the sovereignty of states. 1. It underpins a principle of sovereign equality that has almost attained an ontological position in the structure of the international legal system. This ontological status makes enough difference in the processes of international law and politics to modestly vindicate the significance and effectiveness of the system of sovereign equality. Thus, very small states are procedurally on equal footing with the largest or most powerful states in the International Court of Justice and groups of small states have made some difference in the dynamics of multilateral bargaining on issues such as climate change. It allows questions of social and economic inequality among people to be treated in international law as a responsibility of territorial states. International law and legal institutions are able to promote market activity, while in theory leaving the responsibility of mitigating social and economic inequalities associated with markets to states. It provides the means by which people can express and be deemed to have expressed consent to the application of international legal norms and to international institutional competences. A state may wage war in individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs. A state may wage war if the UN Security Council determines the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression [10] and authorises that it is necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. What appears to be problematic is, although the fact that sovereignty is probably the most important legal concept in international politics, powerful states have long been capable of taking advantage and violating the sovereignty of others. What to expect now Sovereignty works best when all the states that enjoy such status get along reasonably well. It is vital to reinforce the concept that all sovereign states have equal responsibilities and rights. This would preserve the

sovereign state institution as a focal point to marshal cooperation and distribute rewards to those who help and to dole out retribution to those who aid the covert threat. Y Jennings and A. It has only been recognised by Turkey whereas it is considered by the international community as occupied territory of the Republic of Cyprus. L , at page [5] Ibid, at page L [7] Thomas H. Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression, Article 2 4 [9] Ibid, Article

### Chapter 5 : Equality of outcome - Wikipedia

*Sovereign equality is therefore juridical in nature in that, all states are equal under international law in spite of asymmetries of inequality in areas like military power, geographical and population size, levels of industrialisation and economic development.*

This is the state of the issues you care about, as told by organizations promoting social change and other policy experts. If you want to understand the state of the union for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender LGBT Americans, you should begin with the new faces in Congress. But no matter what President Obama says in his remarks about LGBT equality on Tuesday night, you can be sure that many of these new members will have other ideas in mind. Representative Hice has compared marriage equality to bestiality and incest. The truth is that the equality LGBT people have won in this country is incomplete, new, brittle, and it faces a blistering counterattack on all fronts. Supreme Court to rule on same-sex marriage Today, more than million Americans live in a state with marriage equality for committed and loving gay and lesbian couples. But fully half of those people live in a state where there is no statewide non-discrimination law on the books. That means LGBT people in these states risk being fired, evicted, or denied service on the basis of their identity. For transgender Americans in particular, living openly and honestly as their true self also means that they are denied opportunity, fairness, even basic dignity. Equality has not yet been achieved. From Russia, to Uganda, to Brunei, HRC has documented and exposed how these radical provocateurs are seeding hateful global laws that target LGBT people with arrest, jail time, or worse. In the coming years, it should be a national imperative to make that vision become a reality. Today, the state of the union for LGBT people is deeply imperfect, but progress is being made. LGBT people face big challenges, but at the root of all these challenges is a simple truth. LGBT people have the same hopes, dreams and aspirations as anyone else. Legal discrimination makes achieving these dreams much harder. Harassment, even violence, sometimes makes these aspirations seem out of reach. But LGBT people still seek fairness and opportunity, safety and security for our families, hope and optimism for the future, and the freedom that comes from knowing that the founding documents of this nation belong to us, too. So do many in both parties in both Houses of Congress. Most importantly, so do the vast majority of the American people. And in the LGBT movement will keep fighting until equality is a reality in all 50 states and no LGBT person has to suffer in second class citizenship.

### Chapter 6 : Equality from State to State & State Equality Index Archives | Human Rights Campaign

*The legislation has been endorsed by the Business Coalition for the Equality Act, a group of more than major companies with operations in all 50 states, headquarters spanning 24 states, and a collective revenue of \$ trillion.*

New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress. But the Legislature may make conditions with the new States concerning the public debt which shall be subsisting. Again and again, however, in adjudicating the rights and duties of states admitted after , the Supreme Court has referred to the condition of equality as if it were an inherent attribute of the Federal Union. The enabling act for Alabama had contained both a declaration of equal footing and a reservation to the United States of these lands. Because the original states retained sovereignty and jurisdiction over the navigable waters and the soil beneath them within their boundaries, retention by the United States of either title to or jurisdiction over common lands in the new states would bring those states into the Union on less than an equal footing with the original states. This, the Court would not permit. To maintain any other doctrine, is to deny that Alabama has been admitted into the union on an equal footing with the original states, the constitution, laws, and compact, to the contrary notwithstanding. To maintain otherwise would be to say that the Union, through the power of Congress to admit new States, might come to be a union of States unequal in power, as including States whose powers were restricted only by the Constitution, with others whose powers had been further restricted by an act of Congress accepted as a condition of admission. Consequently, it has jurisdiction to tax private activities carried on within the public domain although not to tax the Federal lands , if the tax does not constitute an unconstitutional burden on the Federal Government. *City of Chicago, U. The present provision was then adopted as a substitute. V, 5 Journals Of Congress* ed. *Land Association, U. Harbor Commissioners, 85 U. See Mayor of New Orleans v. United States, 35 U. See also Bolln v. Race Horse, U. Examples include Stearns v. First Municipality, 44 U. United States, U.*

**Chapter 7 : "The Concept of Sovereign Equality of States in International Law" by Alex Ansong**

*The Equality of States* QUINCY WRIGHT\* *The military intervention in Czechoslovakia in August, , led the Soviet Union with East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Polai.*

Generally, most senses of the concept of equality are controversial and are seen differently by people having different political perspectives, but of all of the terms relating to equality, equality of outcome is the most "controversial" or "contentious". This conception generally describes fair competition for important jobs and positions such that contenders have equal chances to win such positions, [5] and applicants are not judged or hampered by unfair or arbitrary discrimination. Equality of outcome attempts to ensure that everyone finishes at the same time. In a teaching guide, equality of autonomy was explained as "equality in the degree of empowerment people have to make decisions affecting their lives, how much choice and control they have given their circumstances". One view is that there is a moral basis for equality of outcome, but that means to achieve such an outcome can be malevolent. One writer suggested greater socioeconomic equality was "indispensable if we want to realise our shared commonsense values of societal fairness". Cauthen argued that this was a fundamental basis for both equality of opportunity as well as equality of outcome. According to this view, economic wealth and social status are rewards needed to spur such activity and with these rewards diminished, then achievements which will ultimately benefit everybody will not happen as frequently. If equality of outcomes is seen as beneficial for society and if people have differing levels of material wealth and social prestige in the present, then methods to transform a society towards one with greater equality of outcomes is problematic. A mainstream view is that mechanisms to achieve equal outcomes "to take a society and with unequal socioeconomic levels and force it to equal outcomes" are fraught with moral as well as practical problems since they often involve political coercion to compel the transfer. There is also general agreement that outcomes matter. In one report in Britain, unequal outcomes in terms of personal wealth had a strong impact on average life expectancy , such that wealthier people tended to live seven years longer than poorer people and that egalitarian nations tended to have fewer problems with societal issues such as mental illness , violence , teenage pregnancy and other social problems. Rawls further claims that all economically and socially privileged positions must be open to all people equally. In reality, Marx eschewed the entire concept of equality as abstract and bourgeois in nature, focusing his analysis on more concrete issues such as opposition to exploitation based on economic and materialist logic [ citation needed ]. Marx renounced theorizing on moral concepts and refrained from advocating principles of justice [ citation needed ]. Despite this, socialists, communists and Marxists believe that by eliminating exploitation their respective principle of compensation will lead to emancipation and greater equality than that found in capitalism because there would be no inequality arising from private ownership of productive property. Perhaps the most insistent proponent of equality of outcome in modern political discourse was Fabian socialist, political thinker and dramatist Bernard Shaw " As opposed to Marxists, Shaw would have socialists place more emphasis on distribution rather than production. He developed his ideas on economic equality and its implications for social, democratic, legal, military and gender concerns in lectures and articles in the ten years following the writing of his play on poverty and power, Major Barbara , at the same time as his Fabian colleague Beatrice Webb as primary author of the Minority Report on the Poor Law, along with her husband Sidney Webb, was proposing to abolish poverty in industrial societies by introducing what we now call the welfare state. In the end, the goal would have been achieved not at absolute equality, but when any remaining income differences would not yield any significant social difference. Like the later Fabian, W. Tawney, who further developed the equality debate, Shaw considered equality of opportunity as virtually meaningless without economic equality. When evaluated in a simple context, the more preferred term in contemporary political discourse is equality of opportunity or, meaning the same thing, the common variant "equal opportunities" , which the public as well as individual commentators see as the nicer or more "well-mannered" [16] of the two terms. A mainstream political view is that the comparison of the two terms is valid, but that they are somewhat mutually exclusive in the sense that striving for either type of equality would require sacrificing the other to an extent and that

achieving equality of opportunity necessarily brings about "certain inequalities of outcome". However, the two concepts are not always cleanly contrasted since the notion of equality is complex. Some analysts see the two concepts not as polar opposites but as highly related such that they can not be understood without considering the other term. One writer suggested it was unrealistic to think about equality of opportunity in isolation without considering inequalities of income and wealth. A person born into an upper-middle-class family will have greater advantages by the mere fact of birth than a person born into poverty. Furthermore, when comparing equality of opportunity with equality of outcome, the sense was that the latter type was "worse" for society. Moving towards a higher equality of outcome albeit not perfectly equal can lead to an environment more adept at providing equality of opportunity by eliminating conditions that restrict the possibility for members of society to fulfill their potential. For example, a child born in a poor, dangerous neighborhood with poor schools and little access to healthcare may be significantly disadvantaged in his attempts to maximize use of talents, no matter how fine his work ethic. Thus even proponents of meritocracy may promote some level of equality of outcome in order to create a society capable of truly providing equality of opportunity. While outcomes can usually be measured with a great degree of precision, it is much more difficult to measure the intangible nature of opportunities. That is one reason why many proponents of equal opportunity use measures of equality of outcome to judge success. Analyst Anne Phillips argued that the proper way to assess the effectiveness of the hard-to-measure concept of equality of opportunity is by the extent of the equality of outcome. Moreover, access to social institutions is affected by equality of outcome and it is further claimed that rigging equality of outcome can be a way to prevent co-option of non-economic institutions important to social control and policy formation, such as the legal system, media or the electoral process, by powerful individuals or coalitions of wealthy people. Purportedly, greater equality of outcome is likely to reduce relative poverty, leading to a more cohesive society. Critics of equality of outcome believe that it is more important to raise the standard of living of the poorest in absolute terms. A related argument that is often encountered in education, especially in the debates on the grammar school in the United Kingdom and in the debates on gifted education in various countries, says that people by nature have differing levels of ability and initiative which result in some achieving better outcomes than others and it is therefore impossible to ensure equality of outcome without imposing inequality of opportunity. The concept in political argument[ edit ] Debate about economic issues surrounding equality is as old as civilization

painting: Ancient Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle by Raffaello Sanzio The concept of equality of outcome is an important one in battling between differing political positions since the concept of equality was overall seen as positive and an important foundation which is "deeply embedded in the fabric of modern politics". In The Guardian, analyst Julian Glover wrote that equality challenged both left-leaning and right-leaning positions and suggested that the task of left-leaning advocates is to "understand the impossibility and undesirability of equality" while the task for right-leaning advocates was to "realise that a divided and hierarchical society cannot be fair". Friedman wrote that striving for equality of outcome leaves most people "without equality and without opportunity". Johnson argued for ending policies which promoted segregation and discrimination as well as steps to end "economic injustice" by turning "equality of opportunity into equality of outcome", [37] that is with programs to transfer wealth in varying amounts. Fairness is emphasized

one writer expounding a centrist position wrote "people would neither be left to fend for themselves nor guaranteed equality of outcome" they would be given the tools they needed to achieve the American dream if they worked hard". Julian Glover wrote that fairness "compels no action" and compared it to an "atmospheric ideal, an invisible gas, a miasma" and to use an expression by Winston Churchill, a "happy thought". Socialists often believe in both "inequality of opportunity and equality of outcome", according to Glenn Oliver. They often see greater equality of outcome as a positive long-term goal to be achieved, so that individuals have equal access to the means of production and consumption. Bernard Shaw was one of the few socialist theorists to advocate complete economic equality of outcome right at the beginning of World War One.

*The State Equality Index (SEI) - formerly referred to as Equality from State to State - is a comprehensive state-by-state report that provides a review of statewide laws and policies that affect LGBTQ people and their families.*

## Chapter 9 : Doctrine of the Equality of States - United States Constitution

*the quality or state of being equal: the quality or state of having the same rights, social status, etc. See the full definition for equality in the English Language Learners Dictionary equality.*