



Inclusiveness Index 2016 Webinar Transcript

Webinar transcription plus visual descriptions of each slide.

Visual Descriptions by: Ebonye Gussine Wilkins

Updated: October 7, 2017



Cover Slide/Slide 1

Stephen (voiceover): Welcome everyone to our webinar launch event for the Haas Institute’s first annual Inclusiveness Index report. The Haas Institute is a multi-disciplinary research institute housed at UC Berkeley. Opened in 2012, we bring together researchers, organizers, stakeholders, communicators, and policymakers to identify and eliminate the barriers to an inclusive, just, and sustainable society. Our work is focused on structural marginalization and inclusion, with our primary mission being to create transformative change toward a more equitable world.

[**Cover slide/Slide1 Visuals:** A white background with top and bottom stripes of green and blue along a gradient. The center has “measuring global inclusion and marginality” in small brown upper-cased letters, and “inclusiveness index” in large green all lower case letters. The year 2016 appears in brown letters below “inclusiveness index” and below the year in small caps orange letters reads “webinar, September 2016”]

Slide 2

Stephen (voiceover): I’m Stephen Menendian, the Assistant Director of the Haas Institute, and joining me today are my colleagues and Inclusiveness Index project researchers:

Elsadig (voiceover): Hi, my name is Elsadig Elsheikh, Global Justice Program director at the Haas Institute.

Samir (voiceover): Hi, my name is Samir Gambhir. I work as a Senior GIS Specialist and manager of Equity Metrics program at the Haas Institute.

[**Slide 2 Visuals:** Brown background. White text header says “Webinar Presenters.” Photo of Stephen Menendian. Text right of this photo says “Stephen Menendian, Assistant Director, Haas Institute.” Below Stephen’s photo is Elsadig’s photo. Text right of this photo says “Elsadig Elsheikh, Director, Global Justice Program, Haas Institute.” Final photo below Elsadig’s is a photo of Samir. Text right of this photo says “Samir Gambhir, Manager, Equity Metrics Program, Haas Institute.” The Haas Institute logo in white is on the lower hand corner.]

Slide 3

Stephen (voiceover): Today, we begin by providing an overview of the Inclusiveness Index, our goals and methodology.

- We will then present our global index map, and a selected table of nation-state rankings.



- Next, we use this report to highlight a few findings and global trends that deserve additional commentary.
- Then we will turn to the US map, and present a table of states ranked according to our measures.
- We will then present a few critical findings and themes in the US context, including marriage equality and incarceration.
- We will close by inviting you into the conversation with questions and comments.

[Slide 3 visuals: Brown background, White and blue text with outline of the sections covered in this webinar.]

Slide 4

Stephen (voiceover): The Inclusiveness Index is a very unique instrument. There are many indices that seek to measure well-being, equity, health, or related ideas. Some of these indices include the UN Human Development Index or the Youth Vulnerability Index. We believe that ours is the first index constructed on a sharply defined conception of inclusivity rather than a more generalized assessment of equity or well-being. Our goal in developing the inclusiveness index is to measure holistically and better understand inclusivity and group-based marginality across a range of geographic settings and social dimensions.

[Slide 4 visuals: Brown background. White text that says “the goal of the inclusiveness index is to measure holistically and better understand inclusivity and group-based marginality across a range of geographic settings and social dimensions.” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 5

Stephen (voiceover): The Index is a diagnostic instrument to help us achieve that goal by identifying how regions, states, and nations fare relative to each other. Our aspiration is that the inclusiveness index may serve as a tool to identify places, policies, and interventions that prove effective in promoting inclusivity, belonging, and equity. Our findings should prompt further inquiry and deeper investigation.

[Slide 5 visuals: Brown background. White text that says “The index is a diagnostic instrument intended to help us pursue that goal by illustrating how different regions, states, and nations fare relative to each other in terms of inclusivity and marginality.” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]



Slide 6

Samir (voiceover): Here we present an Inclusiveness Index map of 138 countries for which we had consistent data on all indicators. Index values are ordered and categorized into quintiles or five categories with equal number of countries. Each nation has a ranking representing high or low inclusiveness based on the index value—higher values represent high inclusiveness and vice versa. Darker shade on this map represents high inclusiveness whereas lighter shade represents low inclusiveness. The countries for which we could not compute the index are labeled as 'No data' and are shown in a hatched pattern. This map is a visual representation, but we will share a few scores in a bit. First, let us explain our methodology and principles that informed our selection of indicators.

[**Slide 6 visuals:** Brown background: Global map with select countries bearing their names on the map. Each country has a single color that matches its level of inclusiveness. The color scale is based on a scheme of green in five shades with a light green indicating low inclusiveness and a dark green indicating high inclusiveness, and three shades in between. Countries that have no data available have a diagonal right sloping hashing on a white background. Text below the map says: “Our global inclusiveness index and rankings are for 138 countries. National index scores are particularly sensitive to individual indicator rankings. A very high or very low value on any given indicator may be responsible for the relative position of any given nation.”

Slide 7

Elsadig (voiceover): The indicators we selected had to satisfy a few key criteria. First, our focus is on groups, not individuals. We wanted to understand how subgroups fare, so we only included indicators for which data could be collected on various subgroups. In this report, the sub-groups – or dimensions of difference—we focused on are gender, LGBTQ populations, people with disabilities, and racial, ethnic, and religious subgroups. We wanted the experience of each of these groups to be reflected in our index.

Second, every indicator we included had to be scalable from the regional to the nation-state level. Although we enjoy access to more data than ever before, there are limits to the global data sources for which we sought indicators. If we could not find a data source for an indicator at the state and nation-level, then we did not include it.

Stephen (voiceover): Third, we sought indicators that were non-economic in nature, and reflected policies, laws, cultures and institutions instead. For us, this is critical. Many of the equity indices that exist rely on economic factors that reflect fiscal or tax base capacity or economic strength. It’s important that inclusivity not



be dependent upon GDP. Thus, in our methodology, the poorest nation on the planet is capable of faring the best in terms of inclusivity, and the wealthiest is capable of faring the worst.

[Slide 7 visuals: Brown background. Far left has three stencil-style images. The first has people of various ages and sizes, The second has two overlapping squares, a small one on the left and a big one on the diagonal right, with a upward right leaning diagonal arrow going through both squares. The third and final one has a dollar sign that is circled with an upward left diagonal line that crosses over the dollar sign. The text notes that “As a multi-factor index, each inclusiveness indicator had to measure how various subgroups fare (illustrating the first image), be scalable to the global level (illustrating the second image), and be non-economic (illustrating the third and final image).” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 8

Stephen (voiceover): Based upon these criteria, we selected the following 6 indicators. We will now explain why we selected these indicators in more detail, and how they relate to inclusivity.

[Slide 8 visuals: Brown background. White text that reads: “We selected six core indicators of inclusivity that reflect group-based marginality in any context, while relying on datasets for those indicators that can be measured across a range of social groupings: group-based violence, political representation, income inequality, anti-discrimination laws, rates of incarceration, and immigration/asylum policies.” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 9

Samir (voiceover): First, we included group-based violence. Violence against marginalized people is a direct indicator of vulnerability, discrimination and group-based marginality. Whether its gender, religion, sexual orientation, caste, or race-based violence, the underlying premise is "us" v "them." Violence against marginalized groups reflects group-status, power, and the degree to which a society tolerates such behavior. Whether it is in the US or internationally, marginalized groups being victimized leads to many social ills such as rape, harassment, domestic abuse, police and other state-based violence, and ethnic and religious conflicts, with genocide being an extreme expression.

[Slide 9 visuals: Brown background. Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: group-based violence. Stencil-style image of a person kneeling down and covering the head while a standing person kicks the kneeling person. White bullet points read: direct indication of social marginalization and oppression;



disproportionate violence suffered by discrete social groups reflects animus towards those groups, as well as group vulnerability. Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 10

Elsadig (voiceover): Second, we looked at political representation. Political representation mirrors the opportunity of all citizens to design and participate of their political, legal, economic, and cultural institutions. It is an important mechanism to assess the degree to which all members of a society are allowed to participate, through electoral processes, regardless of race/ethnic, gender, class, religious, linguistic, and/or other social difference. In particular, we looked at the degree to which subgroups, such as women, were represented in elected bodies, such as parliaments and legislatures. Nations with greater gender or other group representation are viewed as generally more inclusive.

[**Slide 10 visuals:** Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: political representation. Stencil-style image of a voter ballot box that reads: “vote” and a ballot sticking out of the hole at the top that says “vote” with a checkbox checked. Text reads: Extent to which citizens are able to participate in governance; in democratic societies, ethnic, racial, or religious majorities are capable of outvoting minority groups in electoral politics. Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 11

Stephen (voiceover): Third, we selected group based income inequality as a measure of inclusivity. Although an economic measure, income inequality does not, technically, depend upon the degree of wealth in a nation (although nations with greater wealth may have a greater scope for inequality). Income inequality is a complex phenomenon with many drivers, but group-based income inequality generally reflects both inputs and outputs with respect to inclusiveness and marginality. Inputs such as family or community wealth are a source of investments in human capital in the next generation. Group-based income inequality may also reflect discrimination in labor markets and segregation in social networks.

[**Slide 11 visuals:** Brown background. Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: income inequality. Stencil-style image of a stack of paper money. White text reads: “Reflects discrimination not only in the provision of education resources, investment in human capital, and employment opportunities, but also in private markets and segregation in social networks.” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]



Slide 12

Stephen (voiceover): Fourth, we looked at the presence of national anti-discrimination laws. Although we believe that group-based discrimination contributes to group marginality, it does not explain it. And the selection of this indicator is not based on that dynamic.

Rather, the presence of anti-discrimination laws, and the challenges and efforts in getting them enacted, are broadly symbolic of a nation's commitment to inclusion. Anti-discrimination laws that protect particular subgroups reflect a policy response to a generally recognized or socially acknowledged problem. Therefore, the presence of such laws is indicative of a desire to promote inclusion, especially for protected groups.

[**Slide 12 visuals:** Brown background. Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: anti-discrimination laws. Stencil-style image of overlapping Mars-male and Venus-female symbols with an equal sign at the center. Text reads: "These laws reflect not only a society's commitment to equality norms but also the presence of a discriminatory problem requiring a policy and legal response." Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 13

Samir (voiceover): Our fifth indicator focuses on incarceration. Use of criminal law against the oppressed and marginalized communities is a form of social control exercised by state machinery in the name of law and order. Disproportionate incarceration of subgroups is broadly reflective of inequality and group-based marginality. Incarceration not only impacts lives of immediate family members adversely, cumulative disadvantages create a sense of exclusion from society for already marginalized communities. At a community level, higher rates of incarceration is a reflection of cultural and social biases, whereas at civic administrative level it is a reflection of institutions and structures that impede inclusivity.

[**Slide 13 visuals:** Brown background. Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: rates of incarceration. Stencil-style image of a person behind bars. Text reads: "Marginality and inclusivity are often most evident in a nation's use of criminal law enforcement and incarceration; disproportionate violence suffered by discrete social groups reflects animus towards those groups, as well as group vulnerability." Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]



Slide 14

Elsadig (voiceover): Finally, we looked at immigration and asylum policies. As evidenced by contemporary debates over these issues, immigration and asylum policies reflect the degree in which a society is seeking inclusivity by designing public policies and infrastructures that are welcoming and tolerant to refugees and asylum-seekers that invite and enable them to integrate rather than isolate. The more a society is welcoming and integrating new refugees and asylees through deliberate policy design, the more inclusive that society appears to be.

[**Slide 14 visuals:** Brown background. Heading reads: Six core indicators of inclusivity: immigrations/asylum policies. Stencil-style image of a person scaling a fence. Text reads: “As evidences by contemporary debates over these issues, immigration and asylum policies reflect the degree in which a society is seeking inclusivity by designing public policies that are welcoming and tolerant to new comers, refugees, an asylum-seekers.” Haas Institute logo in lower right hand corner.]

Slide 15

Samir (voiceover): The scores presented here are a subset of index score for 138 nations. Based on data on 10 or so indicators that we used for this project, we categorized each country into one of the five inclusiveness categories based on the index score. We scaled our scores from 0 to 100, 0 being lowest inclusiveness score while 100 being the highest. As you can see in this table, Netherlands scored the highest ranking using our scoring rubric. Likewise, Belize scored the lowest based on the same rubric. Though United States falls in the bottom most category mainly due to having the highest rates of incarceration, United States lags other nations on a number of other indicators as well.

[**Slide 15 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Sample, global inclusiveness rankings. Left hand side has white text that reads: “The composite scores and the relative rankings within the Inclusiveness Index convey an overall, holistic assessment of the institutional inclusiveness of many of the world’s nations.” On the right hand side, is a table with a small sampling of four countries rankings for each of the 5 levels of inclusiveness, corresponding to the 5 color-scale used for the global map/ The shades are based on a scheme of green in five shades with a light green indicating low inclusiveness and a dark green indicating high inclusiveness, and three shades in between. A legend of the color scheme is on the lower left hand corner.]



Slide 16

Elsadig (voiceover): Moving beyond the numbers, we also selected a few areas that warrant greater discussion, including, how military interventions, climate change, austerity measures, and land dispossession have led to, and worsened the situation, particularly as it related to the refugee and migrant crisis in Europe, and migrant labor conditions in Southeast Asia.

[**Slide 16 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: “Sample, global inclusiveness rankings continued.” Left hand side in white text, it reads: The holistic scores and relative position may mask important patterns or trends that are worth illuminating, including: global migration, income inequality, marriage equality, violence against women, and religious discrimination. On the right hand side is the same table of sampled global rankings that was in the previous slide.]

Slide 17

Elsadig (voiceover): Since 2014, the world continues to witness the largest migratory waves since World War II. This massive human movements call into our ability to rethink of not only to help those in need but also to question our morality and to align our legal, economic, and social institutions in order to respond to such humanitarian tragedies. Specifically, to access and understand the mechanisms that expels and pushes people out of their own social and cultural environments.

[**Slide 17 visuals:** Heading: Global findings and themes. Text reads: “Global Migration: as many as 65.3 million people have been forcibly displaced worldwide, the largest since World War II. Why? Bulleted list: military intervention, environmental degradation and climate change, austerity measures and land dispossession. They are a product of expulsion and othering connected to human development, geopolitics, and violent conflict, not simply natural disasters or economic patterns. Bottom image: stencil-style silhouette of many persons carrying luggage, walking in a straight line.]

Slide 18

Elsadig (voiceover): The current refugee and migrant crisis in Europe exposes the political environment of most of the European countries, and their struggle to practice tolerance in their policies towards those who fleeing foreign and civil wars, climate change, religious, ethnic, and gender persecutions. Specifically, when we recognize the identities of the newcomers into European shores, mostly Muslims, Blacks, young, which all together cast a stubborn negative moral shadow on



European Union institutions and governments' ability to deal with such humanitarian tragedy.

[**Slide 18 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Global Findings and Themes, the migrant crisis in Europe. Left hand side, chart with the title “626,065 asylum applications in Europe in 2014.” The chart shows the top three countries of Europe’s asylum seekers from 2013 to 2014: Syria (144% increase), Afghanistan (57% increase), Kosovo (87% increase). Text to the right of the chart reads: “More than a million migrants and refugees crossed into Europe in 2015. The recent wave are mostly Muslims and of Syrian, Afghani, Somali, Eritrean, and Sudanese backgrounds.” Text below reads: A perfect storm: European Union (EU) institutions and Euro-zone countries have been less receptive and slower in their humanitarian response than previous migrant waves. How come? 1) Concerns over migrant group social identities, 2) economic stagnation/crisis and austerity regimes, 3) defunding of humanitarian agencies.” Haas Institute logo in lower right hand corner.]

Slide 19

Stephen (voiceover): Economic inequality is also one of the major issues of our time. Global income inequality has risen remarkably since 1980. This trend has occurred in both high and low inequality nations. The most common measure of income inequality, the GINI coefficient, here illustrates this trend over the last 50 years, in terms of global income inequality. Despite this trend, there is one region that deserves additional comment. South America has experienced one of the greatest reductions of income inequality in the world in the 21st century. This has been a result of both economic forces as well as political choices and redistributionist policies.

[**Slide 19 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Global Findings and themes, income inequality in South America. Line graph of Gini coefficient scores since the 1960s. Text reads: Income and wealth trends over the last thirty years reflect growing inequality within most nation. Since the 1980s, the Gini coefficient—which measures the top of the income distribution against the bottom—has risen, a trend evidenced in both low and high inequality countries. Relative to other regions, the 17 nations in Latin America have historically higher degrees of income inequality than the world.” Haas Institute logo in lower right hand corner.]

Slide 20

Stephen (voiceover): As you can see in this map, 16 of the 17 nations in this region experienced declines in income inequality between 2000 and 2011. Although this



was one of the most unequal regions in the world, this decline in income inequality merits further inquiry so that we might better understand both the structural and policy forces that produced this outcome.

[**Slide 20 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Global Findings and themes: Income inequality in South America. Text on the left reads: In the late 1990s, these nations had a weighted Gini coefficient score of .548 — more unequal than Sub-Saharan Africa and East Asia. Between 2000 and 2011, the Gini coefficient declined in 16 of 17 nations in this region. On the right, map of South America. The map's color scale is based on a scheme of orange in five shades with a light orange indicating low inclusiveness and a dark orange indicating high inclusiveness, and three shades in between. The countries for which we could not compute the index are labeled as 'No data' and are shown in hatched pattern.]

Slide 21

Elsadig (voiceover): Another major trend we examine in our report is the rising incidence of religious discrimination and islamophobia. The rise of Islamophobia particularly in Europe and United States is an alarming concern for the freedom of religious and civil liberties of Muslims in both Europe and the United States. For example, several legal and political decisions proposed, enacted or struck down in France and the United States, suggest that Islamophobia is not only a matter of religious difference, but it is closely tied to judgments and associations to skin color, heritage, nationality, language, and even naming. The rise of religious discrimination and Islamophobia in particular, indicates how a society and its legal and political system is far less inclusive in protecting the civil liberties of religious minorities.

[**Slide 21 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Global findings and themes, religious discrimination: Islamophobia in the US and Europe. On the left hand side, stencil-style crescent moon and star, and a woman wearing a hijab. Text reads: Islamophobia refers to fears, suspicions, hostility, or hate towards Muslims, Islam, or Islamic cultures, as well as policies and practices that subject Muslims to additional scrutiny, religious profiling, or other discriminatory practices. Islamophobia is not only a matter of religious difference: it is also closely tied to judgments and associations to skin color, nationality, language, naming, and even attire. Such practices assume the construction of a homogenized Muslim identity and an undifferentiated religious group, oftentimes presented as the opposite of a “Judeo-Christian western identity” and liberal western values.”]

Slide 22

Samir (voiceover): Using the same rubric as our global inclusiveness index, and with consistent and current data available in the US for most indicators, our inclusiveness index for the US by states was far more robust than our global index. In the next two slides we'll show the visual representation of the index and the state rankings, but the most notable issues that stood out in our analysis were:

- Income Inequality
- Mass Incarceration
- State & Local Immigration policies
- Refugee Admissions
- Marriage Equality

[**Slide 22 visuals:** Brown background. Text reads: With more data reported and collected in the United States, we offer a slightly more robust assessment of the relative inclusivity of states and regions. Five key areas of critical importance emerged: Income Inequality, Mass Incarceration, State & Local Immigration Policies, Refugee Admissions, and Marriage Equality.”]

Slide 23

Samir (voiceover): Here is the map that shows relative ranking of inclusiveness of each state in the US. You can find more about the indicators, data sources and methodology in the report, and we are going to share the raw data as well that was used in both the global and the US index. Similar to our global map, darker shade of blue on the map represents states with high inclusiveness based on the index value, and the lighter shade represents states with low inclusiveness. States like Washington in the west, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine in the Northeast and a few states in the middle show up as being highly inclusive whereas a large block of adjacent southern states show up as being low on inclusiveness.

[**Slide 23 visuals:** Heading: US Inclusiveness Index Map. Map of the continental US and Alaska and Hawaii are detached and in the lower left hand corner. Each state bears its two-letter abbreviation. Each state has a single color that matches its level of inclusiveness. The color scale is based on a scheme of green in five shades with a light green indicating low inclusiveness and a dark green indicating high inclusiveness, and three shades in between. A matching legend appears below the



map.]

Slide 24

Samir (voiceover): This table lists all the states in the US by ranking of inclusiveness. The scaled score shows that Vermont leads the high inclusive states, and Mississippi ranks the lowest. We note, without comment, that per census data, Maine and Vermont are the whitest states in the nation with nearly 94% of White population. Arizona shows up as being in the top category of inclusiveness despite its controversial SB 1070 which is considered a draconian measure to address undocumented immigration. The following data points might contribute to Arizona's ranking:

- higher levels of political representation by women than other states
- lower levels of income inequality
- relatively higher levels of refugee intake per capita, and
- State Medicaid programs that serve people with intellectual and developmental disabilities well

[**Slide 24 visuals:** Brown background. On the right hand side, is a table with each state countries rankings for each of the 5 levels of inclusiveness, corresponding to the 5 color-scale used previously. The shades are based on a scheme of green in five shades with a light green indicating low inclusiveness and a dark green indicating high inclusiveness, and three shades in between. A legend of the color scheme is on the lower right hand corner.]

Slide 25

Elsadig (voiceover): Mass incarceration reflects an extreme form of othering. For example, in the United States, mass incarceration reached a tipping point in the 1980s, era that witnessed the heighten of the drug war at home and abroad, increase the number of women and youth among the prison population, and also the proliferation of private prison system. Today, there are more than 2.2 million people incarcerated, that represents almost about 500% increase since the 1980s. Our index suggest that a society that have more punitive sentencing laws, is less inclusive society. For example, as many incarcerated and ex-incarcerated lose their voting rights, and as a result their communities as well will lose their political voice.

[**Slide 25 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: US Findings and Themes, Mass Incarceration as a Historical Trend. Upper right hand corner: a stencil-style American flag with the white stripes removed and a pair of hands hanging out between the stripes, as if the stripes were horizontal prison bars. Text reads: The



U.S. is the world's leading incarcerator with 2.2 million people in prison or jail. Despite having 5% of the world's population, it has 25% of the world's prison population. Regional Variations: Southern states have the highest rates of incarceration while New England states have the fewest. Racial Impact: More than 70% of those incarcerated are Black or Latinx. As many as 1 in 3 black males between the ages of 18 to 29 are under the supervision of this system." Haas Institute logo in lower right hand corner.]

Slide 26

Elsadig (voiceover): Regional variation of incarceration among the US states follows the southern-northern political divide with southern states incarcerate their population as much as 5 times as the New England states. Moreover, the rate of incarceration also associated with increase of racial biases and punitive sentencing against black and brown people and follows nationwide racial employment opportunity pattern. For example, as a recent study by Pew Research Center suggests that the rates of incarceration rose for both blacks and whites from 1980 to 2000, and it was especially sharp among the less educated black men which rising from 10% in 1980 for those ages 20 to 24 to 30% in 2000. In 2010, the incarceration rate for this group dropped to 26%, but, as was the case in 2000, they were more likely to be incarcerated than they were to be employed.

[**Slide 26 visual:** Brown background: Heading: Ranking: US Incarceration by State. Table shows 50 states and Washington DC's ranking by number of incarcerated individuals per 100,000 people. Bottom image is a stencil-style illustration of a prison with search lights.]

Slide 27

Stephen (voiceover): Marriage Equality has been one of the most prominent legal and cultural debates in the United States in the twenty-first century. In just twenty years, the United States has transformed from a country with widespread state and federal bans on same-sex marriage to nationwide legalization.

[**Slide 27 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: US Findings and Themes, Marriage Inclusivity. Upper right hand corner: stencil-style images of two brides together and two grooms together. Text reads: Within a generation, the U.S. has transformed from a nation that generally prohibited same-sex marriage to one that constitutionally permits it.



- 1996—U.S. prohibits same-sex marriage under DOMA
- 2004—Massachusetts becomes first state to permit same-sex marriages
- 2014—United States v. Windsor strikes down part of DOMA; at this time, only 9 states permitted same-sex marriage
- 2015—Supreme Court rules marriage as a fundamental right in *Obergefell v. Hodges*

It is important to note that exclusionary laws and practices have long governed marital relations. For example, laws prohibiting interracial marriage were prevalent until ruled unconstitutional in *Loving v. Virginia* in 1968.” Haas Institute logo in lower right hand corner.]

Slide 28

Stephen (voiceover): In thinking about which states are more or less inclusive along dimensions of human difference, this map suggests a striking image. At the peak of the state-bans on same-sex marriage, 35 states enacted such bans in one form or another. This map illustrates which states had such bans and which didn’t as of 2013.

[**Slide 28 visuals:** Brown background: Heading: US States, Laws Banning Same-Sex Marriage, 2013. Map of continental US with Alaska and Hawaii detached and in the lower left hand corner. Dark purple states indicate that same-sex marriage is banned. Light purple states indicate that same sex marriage is allowed. Most of the states are in dark purple. The legend at the lower right hand corner reflects the color scheme.]

Slide 29

Stephen (voiceover): As suggested a few slides earlier, fights over marriage equality aren’t new. States that are institutionally inclusive with respect to same-sex marriage – or aren’t – were in most cases the same states that had enacted or prohibited interracial marriage, so called anti-miscegenation bans. This map shows the states that had enacted inter-racial marriage bans as of 1948, the peak of such bans in the United States. Note the general pattern.

[**Slide 29 visuals:** Brown background: Heading: US States, Laws Banning Interracial Marriage, 1948. Map of continental US with Alaska and Hawaii detached and in the lower left hand corner. Red states indicate that anti-miscegenation laws exist. Light grey states indicate that no anti-miscegenation laws exist. Most of the



states are in red. The legend at the lower right hand corner reflects the color scheme.]

Slide 30

Stephen (voiceover): This slide shows the overlay, and suggests there is something either culturally or institutionally similar about these states. Nearly every state that had enacted an interracial marriage ban also had a same-sex marriage ban. With marriage equality now the law of the land, we will pay close attention to the debates over discrimination against LGBT persons in employment, services and public accommodations such as bathrooms in future reports.

[**Slide 30 visuals:** Brown background: Heading: Overlap Map: Same-sex and Interracial Marriage. Map of continental US with Alaska and Hawaii detached and in the lower left hand corner. Red states indicate that anti-miscegenation laws exist. Light grey states indicate that same-sex marriage is banned. Dark purple states (the majority of them) indicate that same sex marriage and anti-miscegenation laws exist. Blue states indicate that same-sex marriage is allowed. The legend at the lower right hand corner reflects the color scheme.]

Slide 31

Elsadig (voiceover): Our rankings are not the final word on inclusivity nor a definitive assessment of any national or state performance, but intended to spark a conversation and generate further inquiry into how and why some places, communities, and nations are more inclusive than others, and how we can all do better and learn from one another. Our Inclusiveness Index is designed to be an evolving measure of inclusivity, and we hope to improve upon it with each annual edition. And as more data becomes available, we will also continue to use the Inclusiveness Index to examine major trends and findings. In that spirit, we invite you to contribute by sending us your suggestions, feedback, and ideas to the Index webpage at our website. Also, please be sure to go to our website where you can download the full report and the online appendices and data tables (where you will be able to see how each nation and state fared on each indicator), and much more.

[**Slide 31 visuals:** Brown background. Heading: Conclusion, a work in progress. Text reads: Our rankings are not the final word on inclusivity nor a definitive assessment of any national or state performance, but intended to spark a conversation and generate further inquiry into how and why some places,



communities, and nations are more inclusive than others, and how we can all do better and learn from one another. Questions, suggestions, and feedback should be submitted on our website.

<http://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/inclusivenessindex>.” Haas Institute logo on lower right hand corner.]

Slide 32

Stephen (voiceover): We would like to close by thanking all of you for your time and participation, and your interest in Haas Institute and its work. Now we will open up the presentation for your questions and comments.

[**Slide 32 visuals:** A white background with top and bottom stripes of green and blue along a gradient. The center has “measuring global inclusion and marginality” in small brown upper-cased letters, and “inclusiveness index” in large green all lower case letters. The year 2016 appears in brown letters below “inclusiveness index” and below the year in small caps orange letters reads “<http://haasinstitute.berkeley.edu/inclusivenessindex>, webinar, Q&A session.”]