



# JUSTICE EQUITY DIVERSITY & INCLUSION

## DISCUSSION SUMMARY

IMFC Xchange: 25 January 2022

# REFLECTIONS

“General & Definitional”

- We define these issues as *keadilan, kesetaraan, keragaman dan inklusivitas*—but where is the Indonesian for “inclusivity”?
- These issues are about “equal treatment.”
- You cannot be neutral in the face of injustice.
- Is justice universal or private and contextual? Can justice be interpreted differently? Is it enough to rely on your conscience to say “this is wrong”? What is correct and what is wrong?
- On diversity—it can feel like it is “us against them”. The sense—and importance—of divergent opinions from different groups or communities is often undermined.
- JEDI is not an academic discussion. It is what we live now and have done so throughout history. These issues are a fact of life.
- COVID provides an example of how these issues play out: COVID regulations have been made for the benefit of those who made the regulations—the rest do not necessarily benefit. Why is there such a divergence in health services depending on your position and how much you can pay?

# REFLECTIONS

## Progress or Not?

- We have not yet seen much progress on these issues. It is not as fast as we might have hoped from our advocacy. We have to be consistent on this going forward—so that we don't keep seeing the same problems over and over again.
- These can become latent problems if not addressed properly. But there needs to be understanding. JEDI needs to be a default. Is it right we should be working in development if we are not just, equal, diverse and inclusive?
- There is often a sense that we can't or shouldn't do anything. The tendency is just to follow and accept conditions/situations due to culture and power dynamics (the sense there are things you cannot control). Is this about the bravery to speak up?
- JEDI issues relate to value systems and culture. And shifting culture takes time!

# REFLECTIONS

## Professional Experience

- We work with small scale fishers who experience this in their daily lives. Access and opportunities are not the same. That is the cause of injustice.
- We also experience power relations that are not balanced. The issue is privilege. There are those that have more power over natural resources.
- Local communities are often ignored (Mentawai and Papua examples). Government and industry act in ways that are not approved by the local communities. Communities can end up being upset and angry because of decisions that were not made collectively.
- We can focus too much on the communities we work with and not pay enough attention to ourselves and the changes we can make in our own lives and organizations.
- These are not easy issues to talk about when we ourselves might lead lives of relative privilege: how often do we call out injustice when we see it?
- We should acknowledge the selective sense of justice even within our own organizations. We can promote some rights (e.g. rights of small scale fishers) but may personally or institutionally be less progressive on other issues (eg LGBTQ rights).

# WHAT CAN WE DO?



Within Our  
Personal  
Circles

— “

*I decided to join today because this is very personal. Not just a checklist. This should be an understanding...a default when we plan our work. This is something we should own as people.*

” —

We need to raise these issues with those closest to us—family and friends.

These issues are part of our lives. They are very personal, which we need to own.

# WHAT CAN WE DO?



## In Our Organizations

We should raise issues of gender within our organizations. Look at our internal regulations, too. This should accompany a common understanding among staff.

Funders ask us to deliver outputs that often do not relate to these issues. But not all funders are like that. Some funders want to discuss and learn. Funders: are you interested to push partners on these issues?

Are these issues simply something we need to cross off on a checklist or really commit to pushing through all that we do? This comes back to our values. This is something that we need to be partisan about. We need to think about what we can do better through our advocacy.

We can better incorporate these into our existing work (eg existing surveys).

# WHAT CAN WE DO?



## In Our Sector

### **Fisheries are dominated by men**

Women are often not “seen”. We need to confirm the feasibility that women could contribute more into the fisheries economic system (for example, via women’s cooperatives).

### **It's all about power**

Speaking about **JEDI**, we face an oligarchic system which is not small. At the micro level—the village level—there is also a political and economic oligarchy that we face.

### **We need a shift in our value system**

Speaking about justice, you cannot be neutral, you need to be clear what you stand for and who you stand with, and you need to be firm in that commitment.

Our role is not to speak on behalf of those suffering injustice, but to empower them to speak out for themselves and to stand in solidarity with them.

### **We need permission from the local community**

Otherwise, this could lead to conflict. Better that at the beginning of any environmental project the residents are involved. Usually, the only dialogue is government-government or government-private sector, but the people own the land. Local regulations should be based on *adat* (customary law) to reaffirm the rights of local people.

### **We need a shift the way we work**

Critical education is one mechanism that is important. We cannot promote these issues through violence. How can we do this so it is not seen as brainwashing? Local stakeholders have to identify the problem—even if they don't know how or why that problem emerged. Dialogue can start from there.

We also need to build a network of practice, and regular exchange and dialogue, on JEDI, connecting partners working directly with marginalised communities.



yulies@saraswati.global  
a.wells@73-ltd.com

---