



Roatch Global Lecture Series on Social Policy and Practice
2003

***G**lobalisation and Citizenship:
New Issues, Challenges and Opportunities*

Presented by
Lena Dominelli, Ph.D.

April 18, 2003

In Opening



*With gratitude
to Mary Roatch
The Future*



The John F. Roatch Endowment was created by gifts made to the university by John and Mary Roatch. The endowment provides support for the Global Lecture Series on Social Policy and Practice, organized through the Office of the John F. Roatch Distinguished Community Service Scholar. We thank Mary for her continued support and her son David for his enthusiastic participation in the endowment's activities.



Celebrating
John F. Roatch's
The memory
Legacy



The University Club of Phoenix

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

The John F. Roatch Lectures on Social Policy and Practice have become an intrinsic part of our ASU scholarly discussions. Through the years, we have hosted a number of renowned international academics and practitioners who, in the spirit of our donor, John F. Roatch, contribute to the development of a richer and better informed Phoenix community. Our lecturers give generously of their time and knowledge and our respondents contribute the expertise in globalization and citizenship.

Once again, our lecture was a great success. Community leaders, agency directors, administrators, volunteers and social workers had the opportunity to visit with Lena and to hear her presentation on "Globalisation and Citizenship: New Issues Challenges and Opportunities." They asked great questions and offered great comments on the implications of a global economy for Arizona.

Our two respondents, Astair Menghesha, Professor of Women Studies at ASU West, and Kyle Longley, Associate Professor of History at ASU Main, helped the audience make the connections between what goes on across the oceans and our own situation in Arizona. Both Astair and Kyle brought up concerns about people, especially women, in the developing world that we are too inclined to forget. Yet, even in their critique, there was hope as to what we can do as citizens concerned about social justice.

In memory of John F. Roatch, and celebrating the ongoing support of Mary Roatch and her son David, a reception was hosted after the lecture. All participants were invited to join the speaker and the Roatch family.

We want to take this opportunity to thank, again, John and Mary Roatch for making all this possible. We also want to express our gratitude to Lena Dominelli and to our respondents, Kyle Longley and Astair Menghesha, for their valuable contributions.

We are pleased to offer this published version of this year's lecture to our friends and community. Disseminating the ideas presented by our guest lecturers is an important part of the Office of the Distinguished Community Service Scholar and of the College of Extended Education.

With best wishes,

Emilia E. Martinez-Brawley
John F. Roatch Distinguished
Community Service Scholar
College of Extended Education



Above: Emilia Martinez-Brawley opens the lecture.



Left: Emilia Martinez-Brawley thanks Mary Roatch with flowers.



Above: Registering at the entrance.
Below: A moment at the reception.





“I am going to argue that in the 21st century, globalisation has become a social geo-political system that has spread into every aspect of daily life ... Despite its integration into the interstices of daily routines, globalisation has failed to enhance the quality of life for all.”

Lena Dominelli, Ph.D.

President, the International Association of Schools of Social Work
 Academician, the Academy of the Learned Societies for the Social Sciences
 Director, Centre for International Social and Community Development
 Department of Social Work Studies
 The University of Southampton, England

LENA DOMINELLI has published extensively in refereed and professional journals in sociology, social policy and social work practices. Her books include *Love and Wages; Anti-Racist Social Work; Feminist Social Work Theory and Practice; and Anti-Oppressive Social Work Theory and Practice.*

She has a rich and extensive career in action research, and her projects have covered a variety of subjects in social work, social policy and probation. Her work has focused on poverty, inequality, employment, immigration, child sexual abuse, and globalisation.

In addition to her appointment at the University of Southampton, Dominelli is the current president of the International Association of Schools of Social Work. Also, she has a long-standing commitment to public service and has served on several boards and advisory groups in the UK. Her public service has included chair of the Equal Opportunities Sub-Committee for the Manpower Services Commission Area Board for Coventry and Warwickshire, member of the Trades Union Council Regional (West Midlands) Training Advisory Group, chair of the Working Party on Bail and Persistent Young Offenders for South Yorkshire, and member of the Community Work Training Unity.

Dominelli received her Ph.D. in sociology of development from Sussex University, a postgraduate diploma in applied social studies, and certificate of qualifications in social work from Leeds University.



Above: Warm thanks from Mary Roatch to Lena Dominelli.

Left: Lena Dominelli, Emilia Martinez-Brawley, and the respondents, Kyle Longley and Astair Menghesha



Above: Exchanging gifts.

Right: An attentive audience.



Above: From left to right, Jim Ewing, Emilia Martinez-Brawley, Jim Patzer, and Mary Roatch.



Below: The lecturer and the respondents.



Above: Dialogue after the lecture was most rewarding.



Globalisation and Citizenship:

A Challenge for the 21st Century

April 18, 2003

INTRODUCTION

Globalisation has traditionally been defined as an economic relation—the penetration of capitalist relationships throughout the planet (Cox, 1981). As such, globalisation is not a new phenomenon, but one that has featured prominently in the spread of economic growth since the Industrial Revolution. However, it has assumed new forms and posed new challenges as it has expanded over time and space for the past five centuries. In this paper, I am going to argue that in the 21st century, globalisation has become a social geo-political system that has spread into every aspect of daily life and has touched every region of the globe. Despite its integration into the interstices of daily routines, globalisation has failed to enhance the quality of life for all. In this context, social workers as the professionals charged with promoting human well-being have a key role to play in ensuring that its progressive elements become accessible to all. This is a critical challenge facing contemporary practitioners. Promoting the realisation of citizenship rights is central to their response.

GLOBALISATION PENETRATES EVERY SPHERE OF LIFE

I define globalisation as the organisation of social relations in ways that promote the penetration of capitalist forces of production and reproduction into arenas of life hitherto deemed sacrosanct from market-driven imperatives. Globalisation involves the global spread of capitalist social relations and their integration into every aspect of life—the social, political, cultural, economic and personal, and the consequent reordering of social relations in all these spheres (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996a). Globalisation has been created as a force for change by capitalist entrepreneurs who have allied with governments to find new arenas for profitable exploitation with little regard to its impact on the lives of those it touches and heedless of the merit of keeping some areas of life outside its ambit.

These changes include regulating the conduct of private life through consumerism and the commodification of interpersonal social relations; opening up public services to private providers; emphasising *value for money*; reasserting managerial control over the workforce staffing the caring professions; and introducing new forms of governance. As a result personal relations, working relations and the relationship between citizens and the state have altered in profound ways from those practised traditionally. Moreover, these changes have blurred the public/private divide, reduced state responsibility for the welfare of its individual citizens and perpetrated the Americanisation of cultural forms across the world (Reitzer, 2000).

Whilst the dynamics of globalisation act to promote the spread of these capitalist relations, there is also the growth in those challenging these. This resistance is not generated because globalisation is in and of itself a force for evil, but that its organisation as a set of capitalist relations that penetrate every aspect of life produces winners and losers. As people are not content to be on the losing side, individuals and groups attempt to change the nature of the hegemonic discourses that endorse globalisation and identify the negative aspects of it that contribute to the diswelfare of people rather than fostering its opposite.

The interventions of New Right theorists and politicians have been critical to the spread of globalisation. These have supplanted discourses about the social contract based on a welfarism that pools risks collectively with one endorsing individual self-sufficiency, market rationality, 'contract government' and bureaucratic controls to govern the provision, delivery and quality of services (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996a). Social life is guided by choices individuals make in the marketplace and not through the tenets of welfarism.

Globalisation has five interactive features that have extended its reach into different regions of the world. These are:

- a global market principle that shapes national decision-making and domestic economic behaviour to integrate the nation-state into global economic relations;
- altered national and international divisions of labour;
- the deregulation and liberalisation of financial markets;
- the establishment of the conditions for 'flexible accumulation'; and
- the increased regulation of the personal sphere (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996; Dominelli, 2002, 2002a).

Their interactive dynamics have contradictory outcomes. Producing as they do moves towards the centralisation of power and decision-making alongside deregulated markets in which corporate elites are given freedom to construct economic realities that produce highly profitable conditions for investment purposes, they limit the space within which the private individual without resources can exercise choice when their expectations for doing so are at their height.

These interactive features of globalisation have changed the nature of social relations and had a direct impact on the local state. Globalisation is accompanied by the internationalisation of the state (Cox, 1981) whereby the nation-state has become a vehicle for promoting the adjustment of the domestic economy to the imperatives of the global

market (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996a) and the emergence of 'contract government' (Greer, 1994).

The cultural paradigm for contract government includes the definition of overall strategic goals and the identification of sequential performance objectives within these; the operationalisation of performance targets; the clear and detailed specification of input and output measures and the costing of these, including a critical scrutiny of *value for money*; concrete specification of the relevant contributions and responsibilities of all the actors involved; and, among other things, the formulation of reporting and monitoring tools for quality control and management purposes (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996a). Contract government intensifies the commodification of relationships within the public sector and hastens the development of a corporatist managerialist culture to accompany the contract culture and has spearheaded the commodification of culture.

Known as the 'new managerialism' (Clarke and Newman, 1997), this managerialist culture has altered professional relationships by reducing the scope for professional autonomy through the use of bureaucratic controls that contain professional behaviour and options; altering professional-client relationships in ways that promote the impersonal delivery of *packages of care* rather than engaging workers in getting to know their clients whilst delivering services as promoted by relational social work; and increasing control and surveillance of the workforce.

Globalisation has altered the labour process in professional practice by bringing the methods of industrial production into professional labour. The proletarianisation of professional work has been referred to as Taylorisation or Fordism and describes how complex qualitative *relational* tasks involving several processes of interaction and multiple levels of judgment have been simplified into neat, discrete separable elements that can be quantified or measured and monitored. In social work, this is epitomised in competence-based social work with its routinised checklists and risk assessment schedules—tools invented to provide security in complex professional judgments where certainty of outcome cannot be guaranteed. Professionals are not omniscient as they do not control all aspects of an intervention process, nor do they know all factors that go into producing a particular outcome.

The Taylorisation of professional work has intensified trends towards technicist approaches to social work and undermined the relational aspects of its interventions in favour of codified professional knowledges and rule-based behaviour (Currey et al., 1993; Barnett, 1994). This has been identified as competence-based practice. Through it, bureau-professionals have been replaced by the bureau-technocrats who simply follow rule books rather than use their professional judgment in ascertaining the best possible plan of action for a particular client. Competence-based social work has provided the means whereby management has been able to impose its requirements upon the labour process, and reinforce the regulatory regime known as the 'new managerialism' (Dominelli, 1996).

Globalisation and the state's fragmenting project of modernity have augured in a new phase in an employer-led orientation to the profession that privileges bureaucratic competence-based social work interventions and the requirements of the *new managerialism*. The fragmentation of the labour processes under globalisation has encouraged the professionalisation of practice at lower pre-qualifying levels, and its *deprofessionalisation* at higher qualifying levels (Dominelli, 1996, 2002). It does so by feeding moves to improve qualifications amongst social care workers, primarily untrained women who have provided personal and physical services in the social care arena for many years.

In Britain, these women are now receiving minimum training in the form of recognised qualifications at the national vocational qualification (NVQ) level. Although now performing duties previously undertaken by social workers, NVQ holders are not guaranteed access to jobs requiring higher qualifications. So, they may become locked into a fragmented, low status, low paid gendered

ghetto. At the same time, a three year basic qualification has been set for social workers. A significant improvement over the previous two year limit, this qualification has yet to establish the professional credentials of social work and its practitioners still spend substantially less time in training than do key professionals they work with, whether doctors, psychologists or lawyers. Additionally, as the qualification is driven by competence-based approaches to social work, the chances of this driving the professionalisation of practitioners to higher levels are limited. It is more likely to turn them into competent technocrats. The reign of the bureau-technocrat is replacing that of the bureau-professional and cooling even the possibility of dissent while relational social work is taking a back seat.

Corporate elites have achieved these changes by drawing the state into global capitalist networks on the basis of making the domestic economy more competitive and its workforce more flexible in order to turn production capacity into a commodity and produce goods at the lowest global price (Jaikumar and Upton, 1993). This is a basic tenet of neo-liberalism. Social services provisions have been drawn into this ambit to create new opportunities for capital accumulation, that is, making service provision a profitable activity (Dominelli and Hoogvelt, 1996a), a concern that drives the commodification of the service provider-service user relationship.

Subjecting the private realm to external scrutiny is crucial to this overall objective. Reducing the costs of service delivery, particularly that apportioned to staffing which constitutes the largest item of expenditure and direct service provision, commits the state to cost-cutting endeavours as the state realigns its responsibilities to individuals away from direct service provision and towards a commissioning one which requires it to manage private behaviour through public regulatory codes. Meeting this objective requires politicians to redefine their relationship with citizens who have been excluded from full participation in public life. They have to promise choice while cutting public financing of the required provisions. Since they rely on professionals to enforce these codes, politicians have to change their relationship with them, too. Reducing professional autonomy and increasing managerial control is critical to sustaining this part of the state's project. Fragmentation and individualisation help contain resistance to the state's neo-liberal programme of change. Consequently, governments attempting to strengthen social cohesion by bringing people together simultaneously implement policies that drive individuals further apart. And, the ties that bind individuals, families, communities and society are severely strained. In some cases, they have burst.

Interestingly, the link between the vagaries of the market and the regulatory regime of the state is one that has been consistently missed in Foucauldian analyses of the disciplinary state (Foucault, 1977; Chambon et al., 1999). These *assume* the context of capitalist social relations and reduce the power of its analyses despite its significance in intellectual discourses. But the implications of this context for the (re)formulation of cultures of control at both individual and institutional levels and in the social lives of individuals are enormous, and have to be made explicit for practitioners to intervene effectively in difficult circumstances.

Globalisation has also facilitated the internationalisation of social problems (Dominelli and Khan, 2000). These involve the spread of poverty between countries and within countries (Wichterich, 2000); the importation of social problems from one part of the globe to another, as in the sex trade in children; and the impact of migratory trends often expressed as people crossing borders, as cross-country adoptions, asylum seekers and refugees. These developments have challenged the locality-based nature of social work and encouraged practitioners to think about the international dimensions of the work they do in a more systematic and organised manner. In a study undertaken by Dominelli and Khan (2000), social workers demanded training that would enable them to meet these conditions.

“Marketising and commodifying the personal social services has become structurally exclusionary because poor people, already excluded by low income, cannot participate fully in exercising choices about service acceptability.”

The internationalisation of social problems has ruptured the tight national boundaries that were previously featured in the profession. In bringing new issues to their attention, globalising trends have enabled social workers to appreciate the interdependent nature of the world and the social problems that mark its social landscape. Tackling these social problems requires solutions that cross borders and bring social workers into the political arena in both the national and international domains. Central to their engaging in these activities are citizenship-related questions.

The changing contexts of social work indicate a realigning of power relations at the local, national and international levels. Under neo-liberal social regimes, the interests of the employers and state through its managers are given prominence over those of professionals and clients. Individual or group responses to the changes to their daily lives can be those of acceptance, accommodation or resistance (Dominelli, 2002). The boundaries between these options are often blurred and contested. Moreover, an individual can switch from one to the other in any given interaction with others as she or he weighs the options.

Marketising and commodifying the personal social services has become structurally exclusionary because poor people, already excluded by low income, cannot participate fully in exercising choices about service acceptability. Nor are they engaged in designing these facilities and evaluating their performance. Their choice is limited to commenting upon individual practitioner's work after services are given. This is indicative of the commodification of those relationships.

GLOBALISATION REFRAMES THE SOCIAL WORK AGENDA

Social work is being reshaped by actors involved at the meso and micro levels of practice while macro-level forces emanating from the dynamics of globalisation are reformulating the social work agenda. The importance of globalisation and its attendant neo-liberal ideology for social workers is that they have become redefined as part of the problem of modern life for failing to deal with issues of poverty, disintegrating family structures, increased juvenile delinquency, a declining respect for authority, and the loss of individual responsibility in providing for one's welfare needs (Gilder, 1981; Murray, 1984, 1990, 1994).

A crucial part of global capitalist ideology is that globalisation works for the good of all, through its *trickle-down effects*. Rising levels of poverty, crime and alienation are symptomatic of the failure of the *trickle-down* society to deliver the goods in a way that is inclusive of all human beings in the nation-state and globally. In the UK, there are increasing signs of immiseration and social exclusion (Craig, 2001), despite attempts by New Labour to place social inclusion high on its wish list for changes in the body politic (Giddens, 1998; Jordan, 2000). Similar trends are evident in the U.S.A. Evidence compiled by the United Nations (UN) and others highlight increasing levels of poverty and social exclusion both within and between countries (UN, 2000; Wichterich, 2000).

Of the six billion people who live in the world, about 500 million live in comparative comfort whilst the remaining 5.5 billion experience varying degrees of poverty. Of these, 1.3 billion live in absolute poverty on less than \$1 a day, and a further 1 billion on less than \$2 a day (UNDP, 2000). Of these, one-half are children. A number of these poor people are refugees, of which the UN has estimated 50 million world-wide. One-half of these are also children. Women and children carry a disproportionate share of the burden of poverty and armed conflict whether refugees or not (UNHCR, 2001). These developments have created a one-third/two-thirds world in which the norm is intensified poverty, underemployment/unemployment, and social disintegration. Under these conditions, the citizenship of the people living in these circumstances cannot be realised. I return to this point below.

Poverty and other forms of exclusion provide important contexts of practice that have been created by policymakers, capitalist entrepreneurs and international intergovernmental organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank through structural adjustment programmes (Wichterich, 2000). But these rarely feature in a practice guided by residualism and the blaming of poverty on the personal inadequacies of the individuals involved. Integrating structural analyses with the contributions of personal behaviour to social problems is a key challenge currently facing practitioners (Dominelli, 2002, 2003).

Meeting this challenge requires innovation and ingenuity to overcome the limitation of a technocratic approach to practice. Under the *new managerialism*, the relationship between social workers and clients and between the state as employer and social workers as professional employees features managerial control and surveillance rather than trust and empowerment. The *new managerialism* assumes absolute control. Yet, contingent control is the sole possibility because clients expose only fragments of their realities to practitioners who then select amongst these and those other aspects that they can uncover through their own investigations for intervention. An assumption of absolute control features heavily in the *what works* school of thought. Rooting professional practice in the idea of absolute control is done at the peril of client and practitioner because it stymies innovation—a critical ingredient in finding new solutions to old social problems such as poverty and alienation.

Globalisation, particularly its tendency towards the internationalisation of the state and the exploitation of public welfare resources for the purposes of flexible production and profit accumulation, has added its own demands on social workers. These include the duty to realise the three *Es* of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in service delivery; monitoring of these requirements through performance indicators; and outcome-oriented assessments of their work. These subject practitioners to forms of surveillance and regulation similar to those experienced by those clients with whom they work. Alongside responding to managerial imperatives these problems require practitioners to work collaboratively across national borders as well as within them, often with a range of clients and other professional groupings that have varied experiences.

People embedded in resistance responses are keen to demand changes in the positions in which they are located. They are also more likely to develop alternative provisions and look to other ways of defining their situation than those proffered by supporters of the status quo. Current resistance to globalisation has been rooted in locality-based humanistic responses that contrast with the impersonal and bureaucratic initiatives favoured by corporate elites (Gilbert and Russell, 2002) and provide openings that social workers and clients can utilise to develop new ways of securing their welfare needs. The complexities in the dynamics of these responses indicate that resistance is not an inherent part of power as is signalled by Foucauldian analyses (Foucault, 1980). Rather, it has to be worked for, or brought into being.

CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship refers to an individual's status in society, particularly that involving their sense of belonging and being part of a greater whole. When linked to nationality and ethnicity tied to a particular geographic area, citizenship contributes towards social integration and stability. However, I will argue that limiting citizenship status to those living within particular geographic boundaries is exclusionary and inadequate in today's fast moving and shrinking world. Globalisation has socially reconfigured spaces for human agency and belonging. The expression of citizenship rights and expanding its inclusivity are essential ingredients in formulating responses to these changes.

Diasporic elements of particular populations have undermined static notions of citizenship by settling in geographic locations other than those traditionally associated with them while retaining their ethnicity, nationality or culture of origin. These are groups of people who have spread across the globe historically as a result of adventure, colonisation, dispossession, or a search for security and a better life linked to their desire to maintain key aspects of their identity intact (Brah, 1996). These people are increasingly defining themselves as *dual nationals* or *hyphenated* nationals, a move that indicates the shifting boundaries of a citizenship linked to identity. These developments also demarcate citizenship as a contested concept.

Recognition as a citizen grants an *individual* certain rights. The term is associated with T.H. Marshall's (1970) claim that modern citizenship covers three sorts of rights—political rights, civil rights and social rights represented through the welfare state. Marshall (1970) envisaged citizenship as a progressive development through which an individual acquired more and more rights or entitlements. But these rights or entitlements are restricted to individuals residing within particular borders and meeting certain stipulated criteria linked to residence and immigration status.

Some countries are more restrictive than others in granting others citizenship. In many parts of Europe, including Britain since the 1981 Nationality and Immigration Act, people born in a particular locality no longer automatically qualify for citizenship status. Acquiring citizenship status to belong to a specific national community exemplifies participation in exclusionary practices for the purposes of inclusion. One continued illustration of the exclusion practised by citizenship communities is evident in citizens'

reactions to those excluded from citizenship through the label (im)migrant. Discourses referring to them are hostile and depict them as strangers who abuse welfare rather than as contributors to the social and economic life of the country. These negative images reinforce their position as those who do not belong (Dominelli, 2003). Yet, (im)migrants have helped to make countries what they are. This is particularly true of North America which has a lengthy history of incoming migration.

Bulmer and Rees (1996) have critiqued Marshall's (1970) view of citizenship for being overly simplistic and optimistic. Others have criticised it for being gendered in ways that exclude women from accessing its benefits in their own right (Williams, 1989; Dominelli, 1991; Lister, 1997); racialised by privileging those of white origins (Gilroy, 1987; Williams, 1989; Dominelli, 1988, 1991); and linked to an imperialist project (Gilroy, 1995).

Welfare rights are key social rights (Bulmer and Rees, 1996). However, their potential to eliminate structural inequalities, particularly those related to low income and poverty, has never materialised. This is partly because Marshall's (1970) formulation of these did not endorse economic equality. The equal (re)distribution of income amongst citizens has not been supported by British social policies. Even the Social Justice Commission set up by John Smith when Labour was in opposition rejected demands for a Citizen's Income (Bulmer and Rees, 1996). Similar attitudes prevail in the U.S.A. And, in both countries, the link between income security and low wages has made policymakers reluctant to endorse a benefit system that does not require people to work or 'earn' their living despite critiques about the exclusion of women and those requiring care (Pascall, 1986; Dominelli, 1991; Bulmer and Rees, 1996; Zucchini, 1997).

A group rarely considered in discourses about citizens are children. Children have suffered a considerable loss of citizenship rights, a condition that has been exacerbated by their lack of voice around the decision-making tables controlled by adults. I have termed the exclusion of children by adults who deprive them of decision-making capacities by enforcing power over relations upon them *adulthoodism*. Adulthoodism encourages the exploitation and abuse of children by adults (Dominelli, 1989) and plays a key role in depriving children of the conditions necessary for the realisation of their citizenship. In addition to the physical and sexual abuse of children which is an everyday occurrence in our societies, there are other problems that have a particularly damaging effect on children's potential for growth. Above, I have referred to the condition of being a refugee and to poverty. Alongside these children we have to place 6 million who have been wounded, 1 million orphaned and 2 million who have been killed in armed conflicts; 300,000 who are serving as child soldiers; and 3.8 million killed and 13 million orphaned by HIV/AIDS in the past decade (these figures exclude children suffering as a result of the recent invasion of Iraq).

Thus, discrimination and oppression have limited the expression of citizenship status amongst many individuals residing within the geographical boundaries of the nation-state and exacerbated its exclusionary potential. Additionally, citizenship has been criticised as a Western concept imbued with individualism and fragmenting the bonds of solidarity (Jordan, 1996). In a globalising world that brings people into closer proximity, these limitations are barriers to both social and economic cohesion.

Agency is important for the realisation of citizenship. Displaying agency presupposes a degree of autonomy in people's capacity to act and embeds them in taking action to control their lives. This involves them in negotiations with others to reach agreement in contested terrain. Poor people have to negotiate degrees of constraint that hinder their ability to employ autonomy in their lives. But they remain agents of their own choices within those constraints and continue to be held responsible for their actions.

These limitations have encouraged a rethinking of the concept. And so, the independent individual citizen popular in the dominant discourses of the West is being countered with the interdependent citizen who operates within a social order that

“The regulatory state has to rein in the excesses of the market if it is to respond to people’s demands for a rights-enabled existence and ensure a stability that goes beyond the provision of band-aid solutions to social problems. Doing nothing is not an option because in doing nothing, politicians confirm existing social exclusions and inequalities.”

coheres around a person receiving entitlements that are accompanied by a set of mutual obligations. This promotes the view that the collective provides the space wherein the individual flourishes and fosters reciprocal relationships between people. Reciprocity ensures that the individual contributes to the collective good.

But in this contested terrain, neo-liberal ideologues argue that the market can replace the (failed) interventionist welfare state. Supporting the withdrawal of the state from the lives of its citizenry, New Right ideologies have loosened the links that exist between members of society and fragmented the bonds of solidarity between individuals. Yet, these are essential in linking citizens to each other. The atomised individual was turned into a virtue and glorified in Margaret Thatcher’s claim that there is ‘no society, only individuals’. This view authorises a Hobbesian social order in which life is ‘nasty, brutish and short’ (Hobbes, 1968). Their discourses also conceptualise the citizen as customer—a consumer who purchases what she or he wants in a market. In Britain, this idea has been taken to its logical conclusion in the citizens’ charters promoted by John Major (Taylor, 1992). But, in Britain, as in the U.S., this approach ignores the large numbers of clients who are excluded from the market through lack of funds.

Citizens, whether acting as individuals or collective groupings, have to be mindful of the rights of others and respond to the enhancement of others’ well-being alongside their own. The state as the guarantor of people’s rights has to accept responsibility for ensuring that the structures and resources necessary for realising these are in place. At minimum, this requires governments to underpin citizenship in the activities of all service providers whether public, commercial or voluntary. Leaving matters to the laissez-faire mechanisms of the market is an abrogation of the state’s duty to uphold the rights of its weakest citizens.

The regulatory state has to rein in the excesses of the market if it is to respond to people’s demands for a rights-enabled existence and ensure a stability that goes beyond the provision of band-aid solutions to social problems. Doing nothing is not an option because in doing nothing, politicians confirm existing social exclusions and inequalities. I call the patchwork of policy initiatives based on the *presumption* that claimants abuse publicly funded benefit systems to obtain public funds through deception *punitive welfarism*. It is an essential element of contemporary residualism (Dominelli, 2003).

Punitive welfarism is currently being encouraged in workfare type approaches to poverty. Under this, paid work rather than citizenship entitlement is the main avenue through which income security is assured. This approach ignores those who are unable to work for a range of reasons (Levitas, 1986, 1997) and employees in low-paid work (Dominelli, 2003). It also fails to appreciate the wealth of strategies that poor people have developed for dealing with insecurity which make asking for state help their last resort (Morris, 1995; Zucchini, 1997). This view is brilliantly encapsulated by one young mother. She claims:

I didn’t choose to go on welfare. If I could have had a great career fallen on my lap, I would have taken that over welfare any day. But a lot of financial aid workers and sometimes social workers too, think we choose this lifestyle. I chose nothing, I mean there may be people out there that do. But it’s so stereotyped...They think a single parent on welfare is this typical welfare case. That all we’re going to do is sit on welfare and pop out more kids. Well, not everybody is like that. I’m trying to get off welfare (Dominelli et al., forthcoming).

Recent political debates have focused on citizens’ obligations towards others, including their responsibility not to ask the state for assistance in realising their welfare rights. New Right ideologies have appropriated this critique to emphasise individual self-sufficiency and state withdrawal. These responses have increased social exclusion amongst poor people, particularly those encompassed by the term, ‘underclass’ (Gilder, 1981; Murray, 1990, 1994). Powerful elites have demonised the ‘underclass’ and subjected the people encompassed by the term to intensive technologies of control administered by welfare professionals and those in charge of the criminal justice system (Zucchini, 1997). Growing inequalities and crime statistics expose the bankruptcy of this worldview (Dominelli, 2003).

Neo-liberal approaches to welfare have denied individuals their citizenship entitlements and left many casualties who can rightly claim an ensuing loss of citizenship. However, many of them are not in a position to enforce these rights. This includes those who have never been waged labourers, those who have left the labour market as a result of redundancies, old age, disability, disease or caring responsibilities, and those on low wages. These citizens cannot purchase their welfare needs in the welfare market and are unable to exercise either active citizenship or consumer rights. They are also the groups that social workers should be assisting to claim their status as active participants in society. Social workers can assist them to mobilise in favour of non-commodified welfare provisions.

The view that work combined with education is the only way out of poverty has created a new ‘normative’ consensus (Peters, 1997). Neo-liberal emphases on the market as the provider of services have led to the creation of the workfare state as a replacement for the welfare state and reaffirmed the link between work and rights to citizenship entitle-

ments. Although this trend is more evident in the United States, it is apparent to a substantial degree in Britain and has been heightened by New Labour's modernising agenda. In this, the *New Deal* has shifted discourses to a normative dimension in which waged work becomes the basis for social integration, and citizenship imposes duties on individuals rather than conferring entitlements upon them. Consumerism with its emphasis on individual preferences and choices goes hand-in-glove with a less rights-oriented approach to welfare.

Social policies such as Britain's *New Deal* seek to reinforce the work ethic and labour discipline for those receiving welfare benefits (Craig, 2001), despite the unavailability of work that pays decent wages, that is, enough to lead an active citizenship-based life (Dominelli, 2003). Additionally, workfare type policies do not acknowledge that these people's work is devalued and considered marginal to the overall economy. Thus, these approaches legitimate the current global (re)structuring of social relations and ignore structural inequalities despite a rhetoric that acknowledges them. This new consensus also takes no notice of the sponging off the state perpetrated by rich people who benefit from unquestioned, formally legitimated schemes that reduce tax liability including tax avoidance mechanisms and state grants for businesses (Barlett and Steel, 1998).

The rise in poverty amongst the working poor exposes the paucity of workfare or welfare-to-work type policies (Craig, 2001). New Right politicians since Ronald Reagan in America and Margaret Thatcher in Britain have dispensed with worrying about such problems by blaming individuals for structural problems and accusing them of being over-reliant on handouts from the welfare state. Their 'welfare queen' (Zucchini, 1997) discourses have reconfigured claimants as being on the make by abusing a system that aims to help only those most in need (Murray, 1990, 1994).

Promoting an active citizenship (Lister, 1997) amongst socially excluded people is crucial to a framework of social justice because it endorses claims to social resources that foster well-being. Social workers, as the professionals concerned with individual and collective well-being, should be aware of the theory and practice of active citizenship and operate within its remit. They also have to be critical of society's failure to make it happen for all inhabitants. In other words, social workers can identify the gap between theoretical and actual citizenship.

Social workers are the professional grouping that has a responsibility for ensuring the realisation of citizenship rights. This commits them to argue for, defend and uphold clients' position as citizens with social, political and economic rights. Adopting this stance requires practitioners to endorse human rights within a framework of social justice, work in ways that acknowledge interdependence between different groups in society and facilitate reciprocity in their interactions with each other. At the same time, social workers have to recognise differentiation amongst groups and the significance of multiple cleavages that make up an individual's identity. Differences should be treated with sensitivity and within an arrangement that promotes equality and agency. In other words, clients are agents who contribute to the social work relationship as well as take from it.

Although social workers are charged with upholding the human rights of vulnerable groups (Ife, 2001), what constitutes these has been hotly contested. A human rights orientation to practice is an extension of social workers' endeavour to promote citizenship in clients' daily lives. This commitment makes social work a politicised profession. The politics of practice may place its practitioners on a collision course with employers, politicians, policymakers and the general public.

Social work practice can endorse citizenship and social justice by applying the principles of reciprocity and interdependence. Social workers' commitment to human rights and values that are underpinned by respect for the person and entitlements to welfare resources without pre-conditions challenges practitioners to argue for universally accessible services available to all at the

point of need without stigma, and without writing a cheque underwritten by the deeds to one's home first.

Contemporary discourses countering neo-liberal insights are opening up new terrain that endorse a more active and holistic citizenship. This is embedded in quality of life issues that encompass rights to safe and healthy physical and social environments. These include pure food, clean air, earth and water; decent lifestyles; economic solvency for individuals; corporate accountability for commercial enterprises; leisure time; and caring services (Dominelli, 2003). The anti-globalisation movement has opposed a materialism based on greed and the pillage of natural resources that belong to all inhabitants of the planet by the few (Jubilee 2000) and called for a more equitable sharing of the earth's resources.

Even before the advent of the dot.com millionaires, the UN had calculated that 387 individuals owned 45 percent of the world's wealth (UNDP, 1996), an iniquity that blights the future of the many. Those involved in the disparate anti-globalisation movement led by non-government organizations (NGOs) active in civil society at both national and international levels argue for a socially responsible citizenship that recognises the interdependent nature of human existence between and within countries and the importance of safeguarding the welfare of all human beings and the environment (Jubilee, 2000). Social workers have been involved in these activities as advocates for excluded people to be included in shaping a world that meets their needs.

Mass migration challenges the denial of citizenship rights to individuals merely because they have crossed borders from one country to another and undermines the rooting of citizenship in the nation-state. The concept of *global citizenship* is supplanting this view by emphasising inclusivity over exclusion. However, the idea is not without its own controversies. Key amongst these are questions about who confers the rights associated with this status, who pays for the entitlements attached to it, and what administrative system is necessary to run it.

Modern political and economic discourses of citizenship have tended to ignore the 'moral' dimension of life. Rawls (1973) advanced universal principles of justice that are morally binding on all to deal with this issue within an individually based ethical framework. Neo-liberal ideologies have carried amorality and immorality to extremes by disregarding wasted human potential as indicated in indices of poverty and social exclusion and by failing to take responsibility for peoples whose lives are destroyed by corporate action, whether this is by depriving people of their pension savings as occurred in the John Maxwell and Enron scandals, polluting the physical environment or seriously damaging people's health as occurred in Bhopal and Chernobyl. Those arguing for social justice have sought to include these considerations in their initiatives. However, their contributions have been unable to steer clear of the danger of moralising with a righteousness that brooks no counter arguments (Webb, 1990). Social workers, with a tradition of non-judgmental approaches to people are well placed to promote moral activities without moralising about people's behaviour.

A citizenship of equals has to acknowledge 'difference' and individual uniqueness without falling into the 'false equality trap' (Barker, 1986; Dominelli, 2002a). Achieving this outcome requires hard work and a commitment to redistributing power and resources so that no one is excluded. This calls for structural changes that become a concern of every member of society, not just social workers. Bringing this to fruition demands political will and strategies for bringing it about. Social workers advocate for these by pricking the public conscience with calls for action at the political level. They can become catalysts in the change process by providing information and working with both those who are included and excluded in society.

Ensuring citizenship entitlements for society's weakest members is crucial for a just society, where the citizenship of one

“Interdependence and solidarity are values that link people to one another. They underpin citizenship by articulating one person’s commitment to the well-being of others and pooling risks within the wider collective. Interdependence and solidarity support collective action.”

underpins and is underpinned by the citizenship of all. Achieving this requires a partnership between all parts of society—the state, civil society, business, social movements seeking to end various oppressions and more traditional organisations such as trade unions. Each has a role to play in creating the wealth that provides for the needs of citizens and each has a voice to be heard regarding its redistribution to meet everyday needs for everybody and provide for its constant renewal within a framework that maintains the sustainability of the earth’s physical and social environment (Dominelli, 2003).

The rule of law regulates how citizens relate to each other. Equality before the law is an important dimension of this although equality in the abstract is not enough to ensure social justice. Equality is an end that has to be achieved. As people are at different starting points, each person has to be brought up to the same one for a level playing field to exist. Without levelling the playing field, equality of opportunity becomes blocked. This change has to be created through explicit endeavours rather than being presumed.

Formal observance of equality before the law can create situations in which some people feel disregarded by the principles of fairness and equity. The Bakke case in California where a white man was denied a place in medical school in favour of a less-well qualified black applicant highlights the importance of addressing scarcity for equality for all to be enacted. Given that resources are not unlimited, a key way for dealing with existing inequalities is to share resources equally amongst everyone. If determined by equal outcomes, sharing resources equally requires different treatment in the short-term to bring each individual to the same starting point. Inequalities of condition and injustices have to be confronted in particular situations if social justice is to be realised. In the Bakke case, the white man does not recognise the unequal conditions that exist between him and the black person.

To reach a just outcome, these have to be addressed through a differential treatment that is transparent to all parties and accepted as necessary in righting the privileging previously enjoyed by white people. If scarcity is not tackled, an individual from a privileged group who is not personally privileged will feel aggrieved, even if he or she is able to accept the unjustness of the benefits obtained earlier by others in the group. This is because *isms* are rationing devices that do not have to be justified before being exercised without question. The dynamics within these processes have to be exposed for relationships between individuals to be reconfigured in mutuality. Reciprocity becomes a means for bridging the gap between the position of one person and another.

Interdependence and Solidarity

Interdependence and solidarity are values that link people to one another. They underpin citizenship by articulating one person’s commitment to the well-being of others and pooling risks within the wider collective. Interdependence and solidarity support collective action. Solidarity creates a community of interests that brings people together while interdependence acknowledges the mutuality of these concerns by recognising the dependency of one upon others. Solidarity dissolves the binary divide that constructs one party as dependent and the other independent, and thereby affirms mutuality. A holistic active citizenship draws on relationships of interdependence and solidarity to meet the needs of one and all. But such values are counter to those contained in the neo-liberal ideologies that embed the globalised capitalist ethos in everyday life.

Reciprocity and Entitlements

Reciprocity is the attribute of both receiving and giving in social interactions between individuals and groups. Those involved in a relationship anticipate getting something in return for their endeavours even if this is deferred to a future period. Reciprocity is inclusive because it applies obligations and constraints in all interactions for all those drawn into a given relationship (Jordan, 1996). Reciprocity implies agency through an agreement to reciprocate that makes the interaction mutual. Reciprocity commits an individual to improving the conditions of others as well as oneself.

Entitlements are what people receive as a result of reaching a particular agreement or meeting certain criteria. The term is used interchangeably with rights, but unlike rights which have a legally enforceable element based upon a collective accord, entitlements are claims that are specified through an agreement between participating parties. For example, poor white people living in stigmatised estates in Britain are entitled to live in decent environments. However, this is not a right that they can enforce as it has not been granted through a collective agreement. They will have to establish it as a right before this can occur. The boundary between entitlements and rights is often blurred, and one can easily become the other. In the case of living on stigmatised British estates, it would be interesting for a case to be taken to the European Court of Human Rights to argue that the right to full development has been denied because people living on such estates will not be lent money by large financial institutions. Thus, items that could improve their life chances through substantial injections of cash would be beyond their reach, e.g., starting a business, purchasing homes, acquiring a university education.

CONCLUSIONS

Globalisation has challenged the way we think about citizenship—its meaning and practice. The voices of increasing numbers of people, whether *citizens* of a particular nation-state or not, are arguing for it to become a more inclusionary status. If this were to become the case, women, children and people from other countries could be entitled to make demands for the safeguarding of their well-being as a matter of course in whatever country they lived. They would not be denied their rights to the benefits of citizenship simply because they had crossed a border. This course of action, encapsulated to some extent, by the notion

of a global citizenship, is contested and fraught with difficulties. Without the support of powerful Western states in promoting the development of a less oppressive form of citizenship that is based on solidarity, interdependence and reciprocity, it will be hard to see how progress in this direction can be realised. But living in a world where people can cross borders freely and respect each others cultures while doing so can only enrich human interaction. Social workers have a vital role to play in bringing this about. How to do so is a key challenge that will occupy practitioners during the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Barker, H (1986) 'Recapturing Sisterhood: A Critical Look at 'Process' in Feminist Organisations and Community Action' in *Critical Social Policy*, No. 16, Summer, pp. 80-90.
- Barlett, D L and Steele, J B (1998) 'Corporate Welfare: Special Report' in *Time*, pp. 4.
- Barnett, R (1994) *The Limits of Competence: Knowledge, Higher Education and Society*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Brah, A (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora*. London: Routledge.
- Bulmer, M and Rees, M A (eds) (1996) *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T H Marshall*. London: University College London Press.
- Chambon, A, Irving, A and Epstein, C (eds) (1999) *Reading Foucault for Social Work*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clarke, J and Newman, J (1997) *The Managerialist State*. London: Sage.
- Cox, R W (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory' in *Millennium*, No. 10, Vol. 2, p. 146-157.
- Craig, G (2001) 'Social Exclusion: Is Labour Working?' in *Community Care*, 27 September.
- Currey, L, Wequin, J and Associates (1993) *Educating Professionals: Responding to the New Expectations for Competence and Accountability*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Dominelli, L (1988) *Anti-Racist Social Work*. London: BASW/Macmillan. Second edition published in 1997.
- Dominelli, L (1989) 'Betrayal of Trust: A Feminist analysis of Power Relationships in Incest Abuse and its Relevance for Social Work Practice' in *British Journal of Social Work*, No. 19, pp. 291-307.
- Dominelli, L (1991) *Women Across Continents: Feminist Comparative Social Policy*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Dominelli, L (1996) 'Deprofessionalising Social Work: Equal Opportunities, Competence and Postmodernism in *British Journal of Social Work*, No. 26, April, pp. 153-175.
- Dominelli, L (2002) *Anti-Oppressive Social Work theory and Practice*. London: Palgrave.
- Dominelli, L (2002a) *Feminist Social Work Theory and Practice*. London: Palgrave.
- Dominelli, L (2003) *Social Work: Theory and Practice for a Changing Profession*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dominelli, L and Hoogvelt, A (1996) 'Globalisation and the Technocratisation of Social Work' in *Critical Social Policy*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 45-62.
- Dominelli, L and Hoogvelt, A (1996a) 'Globalisation, Contract Government and the Taylorisation of Intellectual Labour' in *Studies in Political Economy*, No. 49, pp. 71-100.
- Dominelli, L and Khan, P (2000) *Globalisation, Privatisation and Social Work Practice*. Paper presented at 'Rethinking Social Work Seminar', 30 November—2 December. Southampton: Southampton University.
- Foucault, M (1991) 'Governmentality' in Burchell, G, Gordon, C and Miller, P (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Giddens, A (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilder, G (1981) *Wealth and Poverty*. New York: Bell Books.
- Gilroy, P (1987) *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. London: Hutchinson.
- Gilroy, P (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Greer, P (1994) *Transforming Central Government: The Next Steps Initiatives*. London: The Open University Press.
- Jaikumar, R and Upton, M D (1993) 'The Co-ordination of Global Manufacturing' in Bradley, S P, Hausman, J A and Nolan, R I (eds) *Globalization, Technology, Competition: The Fusion of Computers and Telecommunications in the 1990s*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Jordan, B (1996) *A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jordan, B (2000) *Social Work and the Third Way: Tough Love as Social Policy*. London: Sage.
- Jubilee (2000) from the website <http://www.jubilee2000uk.org> Accessed on 18 May.
- Levitas, R (1986) *The Ideology of the New Right*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lister, R (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Macmillan.
- Marshall, T H (1970) *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century*. London: Hutchinson.
- Morris, L (1995) *Dangerous Classes: The Underclass and Social Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- Murray, C (1990) *The Emerging British Underclass*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Murray, C (1994) *Underclass: The Crisis Deepens*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Pascall, G (1986) *Social Policy: A Feminist Analysis*. London: Tavistock.
- Rawls, J (19) *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reitzer, (2000) *The McDonaldisation of Society*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Taylor, D (1992) 'A Big Idea for the Nineties? The Rise of Citizens' Charters' in *Critical Social Policy*, No. 33, pp. 87-94.
- UNDP (2000) *The Social Development Report, 2000*. New York: UNDP.
- UNDP (1996) *The 1996 Report on Human Social Development*. New York: UNDP.
- UNHCR (2001) *Refugees: Magazine of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Webb, D (1990) 'Puritans and Paradigms: A Speculation of the New Moralities in *Social Work' in Social Work and Social Sciences Review*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 236-241.
- Wichterich, C (2000) *The Globalized Woman: Reports from a Future of Inequality*. London: Zed Press.
- Williams, F (1989) *Social Policy: A Critical Introduction – Race, Gender and Class*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Zucchino, D (1997) *The Myth of the Welfare Queen*. New York: Touchstone Books.

Respondent Kyle Longley



Kyle Longley

*Associate Professor, Department of History
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Arizona State University*

Since my expertise is in international relations with a special emphasis on the nonindustrialized world, I would suggest we move beyond Dr. Dominelli's thought-provoking issues in relation to the United States and Great Britain and examine how these core powers' views of social engineering have affected citizenship rights and patterns in the third world. This is especially true in Latin America where the United States and Great Britain have played a substantial role in the region's development. Multinational corporations and individual entrepreneurs, often working in concert with governments, have promoted a capitalist model that has often clashed with efforts by Latin American reformers to guarantee basic human rights and acceptable living conditions for their citizens. Using organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, industrialized nations have often forced austerity plans that affect the most vulnerable citizens. Washington, in particular, utilized military and covert operations to displace socialist and populist reformers who threatened American business interests such as the overthrow of Salvador Allende in Chile in 1973.

I have personally spent a lot of time studying Costa Rica, where government had created a social welfare and democratic state. Developed largely in the 1940s and 1950s by the Partido Liberacion Nacional, the welfare state included universal health care, easy access to education, and subsidized services, including insurance, telephones and electricity. However, during the country's economic crisis of the 1980s and 1990s, the Costa Rican government began making significant cuts in benefits, in large part because of the pressure from the United States. While seen as more efficient in terms of basic economic numbers, the impact has been devastating for the most marginal members of society. These examples underscore Dr. Dominelli's thesis.

Moving beyond my area of expertise to my own experience as the husband of a social worker and a religious person, I think Dr. Dominelli is right calling on social workers to become even more vocal in defending the marginalized in society. I found, however, an important possibility missing from the presentation. Churches have been a historic cornerstone of charity and self-help agencies. Churches, with millions of members outside of the insular professional social worker community, remain an important source of allies in helping the less fortunate. Those allies could become the voices on a political front for changes that challenge the Right and their views. Of course, there are issues here. Over the past century, the professionalization and secularization of the social work profession has created animosity and competition with faith-based organizations. This is unfortunate because the Right has mobilized people in the more conservative denominations and religions to support their own harsh worldview of the role of government and society when dealing with the marginalized. Conservative denominations focus primarily on taking care of their own and ministering to those who they believe they can convert. Many new followers within these denominations, albeit not all, flock to the messages of the Right for many reasons and prove loyal foot soldiers in the Right's political crusades.

However, there are many mainstream denominations and religions with long-standing institutionalized histories of providing substantial assistance to the less fortunate, to people living on the margins of society.

It is imperative that secular social workers look to these groups as allies in affecting public policy because of the potential of millions of voices to rise against the often deafening crescendo of the Right. It is also important for churches to support the everyday struggles that all social workers face. While I understand the differences, I believe that the commonalities are strong and with the powerful influences arrayed against the poor and marginalized, it seems especially important to put aside differences and focus on the ultimate goal of helping people.



Respondent Astair Menghesha



Astair Menghesha
 Chair, Women's Studies
 College of Arts and Sciences
 Arizona State University West

While it is understood that globalization is the result of the processes related to restructuring of capital, the outcome of the process is multifaceted. In this progression, globalization has reordered the relationship between sexes and changed opinions and cultural values. It has affected the physical environment, created inequality across regions, socio-economic groups within regions, and between sexes, with consequences that erode people's quality of life. Moreover, much of the literature on globalization concentrates on broader economic, social, and political dimensions of contemporary global changes. The literature highlights the increased participation of women in the labor force, the feminization of poverty and economic oppression of women, and neglects the ways in which these changes reshape everyday lives of women in different parts of the world. Following the aspect of the preceding position, the discourse that follows will examine the section, *Reciprocity and Entitlements*, from Dr. Dominelli's document, with a focus on issues pertaining to half the population of the world, specifically women.

Reciprocity and entitlement should rightfully be part of the discourse on globalization, where, for example, almost half of the labor forces, women, are occupied with work in private corporations. Supporters consider offering employment opportunity as great corporations' contributions to workers. Women are not unaccustomed to work; their labor, which at times amount to 24-hour days, has been documented. So, one wonders if the claim of offering work opportunity is such a unique gesticulation. Moreover, women in the factories work for hours with a pay that cannot sustain their living conditions. If wage for labor can be translated as a form of reciprocity, where labor wages are below standard and the corporations' profits are phenomenal, reciprocity is imbalanced. The entitlement of fair wages is unanswered. In this context, *reciprocity and entitlement* can also be considered components of fairness and justice. Where there is no balance in the relationship of reciprocity, there is unfairness, injustice and exploitation.

Therefore, corporations are accountable, and the employees are entitled to fair wages, better living conditions or better quality of life.

Consider the recent tragedies involving women. For example, according to a number of newspaper sources, in the factory town of Juarez, Mexico, about 300 young women and girls, factory workers, were reported murdered over the past five years. Different reasons for the causes of the deaths appeared plausible, but a significant number of indicators point to cultural change. The reordering of power in gender relationships has caused much tension throughout the developing world. Are we, then, to assume that women are murdered because they are becoming economically more powerful than men or that the change in culture precipitated circumstances that led to their deaths? Regardless of the answers to these

questions, both the government and the factory are accountable for the deaths of these women. Furthermore, the locations where the bodies of the murdered women were found and the circumstances and times of their disappearance make the corporation responsible, at least, for failing to provide protection to the employees. Women are entitled to protection.

In conclusion, where there is no balance between reciprocity and entitlements, there is no justice, no true solidarity and no possibility of "global citizenship."

