The Road to Global Citizenship?
Human Rights Approaches to Global Social Policy
Der Weg zu globalen sozialen Bürgerrechten (*social citizenship*)?
Die Menschenrechtsperspektive in der globalen Sozialpolitik

Leitung: Benjamin Davy (Dortmund), Ulrike Davy (Bielefeld) und Lutz Leisering (Bielefeld)
1. April – 30. Juni 2011

Die klassische Idee von Bürgerrechten (*citizenship*) entstand in der antiken Stadt und wurde
später auf den Nationalstaat bezogen. Im Zeitalter der Globalisierung stellt sich die Frage: Kann
und soll sich die Idee, dass alle Menschen gleiche Rechte der Teilhabe am gesellschaftlichen
Leben haben, auf die Ebene der Weltgesellschaft übertragen werden? In welcher Form, unter
welchen Voraussetzungen und mit welchen Folgen? *Global citizenship* wird in neueren Debatten
oft als Idee verstanden, allen Menschen weltweit gleiche Wertschätzung entgegen zu bringen,
oder auch als Gefühl der Einzelnen, Mitglieder einer Weltgemeinschaft – ›Weltbürger‹ – zu sein.
Die Kooperationsgruppe fragt nach anderen, bislang unterbelichteten Dimensionen von *global
social citizenship*: inwieweit Rechte auf soziale Sicherung und einen angemessenen Lebens-
standard – die nach T. H. Marshall ein wesentliches Element nationaler Bürgerrechte sind,
neben bürgerlichen Freiheits– und politischen Teilhaberechten – auch auf globaler Ebene
vorstellbar oder schon realisiert sind.

   Historisch sind sowohl ›Sozialpolitik‹ als auch ›Wohlfahrtsstaat‹ Projekte westeuropäischer
Nationalstaaten. Die Kooperationsgruppe fragt: Sind die grundlegenden Konzepte Sozialpolitik,
Wohlfahrtsstaat und das ›Soziale‹ auf eine bestimmte Gruppe (westlicher) Staaten beschränkt,
oder können wir annehmen, dass die Konzepte – oder vielleicht nur einige ihrer Elemente –
auf globaler Ebene aufgegriffen werden, wie im neueren Forschungsgebiet *Global Social Policy*
angenommen wird? Unter ›global‹ verstehen wir die weltweite Verbreitung bestimmter Konzepte
und Politiken sowie eine neue, genuin weltumspannende Ebene sozialer Organisation, mit glo-
balen Akteuren, Diskursen, Rechten und Politiken. Die Kooperationsgruppe orientiert sich in
theoretischer Hinsicht am Konzept einer »Weltgesellschaft«, wie es von Niklas Luhmann, John
W. Meyer und Bettina Heintz entwickelt wurde.

   Bei der Untersuchung dieser Fragen behandelt die Gruppe nicht die gesamte Bandbreite
sozialer Sicherung, sondern fokussiert auf soziale Grundsicherung, die in wachsendem Maße von
internationalen Organisationen wie die Internationale Arbeitsorganisation (ILO) und seit 2009
auch von den Vereinten Nationen im Rahmen ihrer *Social Protection Floor Initiative* als Konzept
propagiert wird. Wir gehen davon aus, dass in der letzten Zeit in drei unterschiedlichen und
bisher nicht miteinander in Verbindung stehenden Politiksträngen Grundsicherung zum Thema
geworden ist, nämlich in der Menschenrechtspolitik, der globalen Sozialpolitik und in der Boden-
politik. Um diese neuen Entwicklungen zu analysieren und die Theorieentwicklung anzustoßen,
haben die Antragsteller ihre Expertise in den Bereichen Menschenrechte, Sozialpolitik und
Bodenpolitik mit dem Fachwissen führender Wissenschaftler aus der ganzen Welt zusammen-

Die Mitglieder der ZiF–Kooperationsgruppe *The Road to Global Citizenship? Human Rights Approaches to Global Social Policy*: Armando Barrientos, Lutz Leisering, Manfred Nowak – er hielt im Rahmen der KG einen öffentlichen Vortrag über ›Folter im 21. Jahr-hundert‹, Sony Pellissery, Hartley Dean, Ulrike Davy, Harvey Jacobs und Benjamin Davy (v. l. n. r.).

gebracht. In der Gruppe sind die Disziplinen Rechtswissenschaft, Soziologie, Bodenpolitik, Politikwissenschaft und Entwicklungsökonomie vertreten.

Die Gruppe zielt auf theoretische wie politiknahe Klärungen, was *global social citizenship* bedeuten kann, und zielt hierbei auf innovative Beiträge unter den Gesichtspunkten soziale Menschenrechte, Sozialpolitik und Bodenpolitik, etwa: Welche ›sozialen‹ Verpflichtungen leiten sich von sozialen Menschenrechten ab? Was ist das ›Soziale‹ in der globalen Sozialpolitik? Und was ist ›global‹ an der globalen Sozialpolitik? Gibt es eine ›soziale‹ Bodenpolitik und worin bestünde sie? Alles in allem: Gibt es im globalen Raum die Idee eines sozialen Minimums (auf der staatlichen Ebene umgesetzt etwa in Form von Geldleistungen oder bodenpolitischen Maß– nahmen) als Kern einer sich entwickelnden globalen sozialen Teilhabe (*citizenship*)? Welches sind ihre menschenrechtlichen, politischen und sozialmoralischen Grundlagen und Folgen? Der Hauptbeitrag (von Armando Barrientos und Sony Pellissery) analysiert die großen neuen Sozial– transfersysteme in Brasilien, Indien und Südafrika, ihre Entstehungsbedingungen, ihre Probleme und Perspektiven im Spannungsfeld zwischen Sozial– und Entwicklungspolitik. Der Beitrag von Ulrike Davy weist auf die ungeklärten menschenrechtsdogmatischen Fragen globaler sozialer Teilhabe hin. Lutz Leisering formuliert für die Sozialpolitikforschung die Frage, inwieweit die globale Verbreitung von Sozialtransfers auf globale Diffusionsprozesse zurückführbar ist. Die Beiträge von Benjamin Davy und Harvey Jacobs fragen nach der möglichen Rolle privaten wie gemeinschaftlichen Bodeneigentums für globale Bürgerrechte. Hartley Dean skizziert Postulate einer normativen Theorie sozialer Teilhabe, darunter Solidarität als Voraussetzung globaler sozialer Teilhabe.

Lutz Leisering

Armando Barrientos and Sony Pellissery

The Road to Global Citizenship?

Armando Barrientos, Ph. D.

Professor and Research Director,
Brooks World Poverty Institute,
The University of Manchester, UK

Sony Pellissery, Ph. D.

Associate Professor,
Institute of Rural Management,
Anand, Gujarat, India

Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that the most pressing issues facing the world today—climate change, poverty, development, security, to name just a few—demand global responses. The main threats to our standards of living, such as the financial crisis which began in the United States of America in 2008, have the capacity to spread quickly through the global economy and affect billions of people across the world. Thinking locally as well as thinking globally is a must for life in the 21st century.

Formulating and implementing global responses to common problems has worked better in some areas of policy than in others. The rules-based institutions of international trade remain skewed towards the interests of the North, as demonstrated by the interminable Doha round. At the same time, it is noticeable that toleration for gross human rights violations is declining sharply. To an important extent, the variation in the effectiveness of policy responses to global issues reflects the relative scope for top-down and bottom-up strategies. Increasing democratisation in the South, as shown for example by the sharp reduction of autocratic regimes in Latin America and Africa in the last two decades, strengthens the scope for bottom-up responses. Emergence of fiscal capacities in some of the countries like Brazil, South Africa, India, China (BASIC) through strong economic growth has seen many innovative solutions to important global problems coming from these countries themselves.

The nature of individual lives has changed tremendously in a connected globe. Individuals are legitimately benefiting as well as influenced not merely by other individuals and market forces in the respective territorial states, but by other states and global actors. This necessitates reorganisation of

the concept of 'citizenship'. Citizenship is commonly understood to be associated with the exercise of civil and political rights at the national level, most notably at elections. At a deeper level, citizenship signifies that the well being of individuals, their households, and communities, are valuable. This well being enables citizens to participate meaningfully in the life of community (or exercise civil or political rights). Therefore, there is an intrinsic value attached to individuals achieving satisfactory standards of living and fulfilling their life plans. The term 'global citizenship' in this context underlines the principle that the lives of others, whether or not they belong to our communities, matter. (There is an intense academic debate on what constitutes 'global' in this context, an issue we do not intend to settle here. Some emphasise a supra-national perspective on citizenship. The discussion below uses global to draw attention to the extension of citizenship in developing countries.)

This meaning of global citizenship, and its underlying principle, has been formulated in international instruments, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, but here the concern is primarily with the way in which it has been advanced in social policy, and among countries in the South. The focus is on the rapid growth of antipoverty programmes in the South, and the extent to which they are mapping a road to global citizenship.

Social Policy in the South and their Poverty Focus

In developed countries, ensuring that individuals, households, and communities secure adequate standards of living and are able to pursue their values and objectives is the province of a range of policies and programmes which are usually referred to as 'welfare regimes' and those under the responsibility of governments as 'welfare states'. They include the provision of basic services, education and health, but also an array of transfers from social insurance and social assistance schemes. In developing countries, many of these policies and programmes are missing or incomplete. A key reason for this is the wide-spread informal labour market. For instance, India's social insurance scheme covers only seven percent of the labour force, who are primarily in the formal labour market. In developed countries social assistance is largely residual and reveals in some ways a failure of other programmes. In developing countries, on the other hand, the high incidence of poverty and the deficits in other social policies imply that social assistance is important.

The incidence of absolute poverty in developing countries is high and serves as a reminder of how far we are from achieving global citizenship, adequate livelihoods for all. One in five people in the world today have no choice but to survive on less than US $ 2 a day, and 1.5 billion people struggle to live on less than US $ 1. The vast majority of those affected are children, each an individual story of unfulfilled hope and potential.

Until recently, few developing countries had paid any attention to social assistance programmes providing direct support to households in poverty. This situation is changing very rapidly. The discussion below takes up the experience of Brazil, South Africa and India.

Brazil, South Africa and India

It is widely acknowledged among researchers and policy makers in the South that importing social assistance institutions from the North is not the way forward. The challenge for developing countries is to design and establish programmes and institutions that reduce extreme poverty, and contribute to economic and social development. This is the premise behind large scale social transfer programmes such as Brazil's *Bolsa Família*, South Africa's *Child Support Grant*, and India's *National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme*. They all provide regular transfers of money to households in extreme poverty with the aim of improving their standards of living.

Brazil is one of the most unequal countries in the world, with vast natural resources. It had its share of financial crises and, until recently, poor growth performance. Today, Brazil is better known for its social policies and its success in reducing poverty and reversing longstanding rising inequality. The change came in 1988, with a new Constitution which signalled a renewed 'social contract' after 20 years of dictatorship. The debates around the new Constitution incorporated the right to social protection for all, based on citizenship and independent of people's capacity to contribute to social insurance. Government was held responsible for poverty and vulnerability reduction. The following decade witnessed a large expansion of direct transfers to older and disabled people as well as informal workers left out of social insurance schemes and to families and children in extreme poverty.

Bolsa Família is the largest social assistance programme. It reaches over 12 million households in extreme poverty in Brazil, and provides transfers in cash together with guaranteed access to education and health care. The transfers are conditional on children attending school. They are also conditional on all household members, but especially infants and expectant mothers, accessing primary health care. The programme is delivered by municipalities, and they are able to add complementary services and transfers. It has proved an effective means of reducing poverty in the country, and was especially successful in protecting poor households from the impact of the global financial crisis in 2008–2009.

South Africa is also a highly unequal country, with a high incidence of poverty and deprivation, the product of the racial discrimination policies enforced under apartheid. The fall of apartheid and the new ANC government led by NELSON MANDELA in 1994 placed a strong emphasis on social policy as a means to reduce inequality and poverty. The main policy instrument provided grants to highly vulnerable households. The largest of them was an old age and disability grant which provided much needed income to black households. The progressive elimination of racial differences in the level of the social pension in the 1980s and early 1990s meant that the amounts transferred made a significant difference for recipient households, but demographics ensured that a large number of poor households without older people were excluded.

The ANC government decided to introduce a grant specifically aimed at supporting young children living in households in poverty. It was prompted by the high levels of malnutrition among children in the country. The *Child Support Grant* provides a monthly transfer to children in households considered to be in extreme poverty. Interestingly, the legislation introducing the programme explicitly established the grant as a right of children. This ensures that in the context of high mobility of children within households in South Africa, the grant follows the child. The *Child Support Grant* was initially introduced for children up to the age of 7, but has been gradually extended to 15. The government is committed to extending the grant to 16 and 17 year olds. It currently reaches over 9 million children in South Africa, and has made an important contribution to improvements in child nutrition and health status.

India is a country of huge social and economic inequality with sharp division between rural and urban geographies. Economic growth had been slow since independence in 1947, but economic liberalisation in 1991 has been followed by much improved economic performance. However, this economic growth increased the already yawning gap between the rich and the poor. While the middle class and small towns prospered, the lives of the poorest became more difficult. According to the government's own calculations about 28 percent of Indian population does not have the income to meet sufficient calorie requirements. These challenges in a prospering economy required specific strategies to 'include' people in the development process and to reach the benefits of economic growth to everyone.

The *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act*, initiated in 2005, is one of the large scale responses towards this aim. Earlier, similar employment guarantee used to be restricted to the citizens of

Maharashtra, the western state of India. Expansion of the programme to the whole of India constitutes a significant extension of coverage in South Asia, though within the same nation-state. The Act provides up to 100 days guaranteed employment to each household in rural areas, in exchange for work improving community infrastructure. This guarantee has provided tremendous opportunity for rural households, which traditionally depended on very small scale farming of seasonal rain-fed agriculture while landless households relied on wage labour. The minimum wage element in the *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act* also has pushed up agricultural wages in the private farms, and removed many exploitative practices, particularly against women. Improvement in the community infrastructure has seen construction of new roads which has increased market access, revitalisation of traditional water bodies has made planting a second crop possible, and similar efforts. Since its inception 45 million rural households have been provided jobs every year (33 percent of the rural population).

The Developmental Dimension of Social Transfers

Social transfer programmes are developmental. They do not replace the need for investment in economic growth and basic services. Rather, these dimensions of development function as complementary to the objectives of social transfer. For instance, in an increasingly urbanising world, space for individual well being is becoming extremely challenging. In India 50 percent of the slum population do not have toilet facilities. Improvement in this situation would change tremendously the public health profile, and household spending on health. (In India, out-of-pocket expenses for health care account for 83 percent of total health expenditure, in the context of limited insurance coverage.) Similarly, access to safe drinking water is denied to 341 million persons in Africa; infrastructure improvement would result in miraculous changes in nutrition levels, and thus expenditure on health.

Social transfer programmes, while considering the context of poor basic services, do not address them directly. Instead, they are designed to ensure households in extreme poverty can be included in economic activity and are able to access basic services. Small transfers to very poor households help provide access to new economic opportunities and vital health and education services. Without such transfers, the costs of transport, school uniforms, medicines, and job search could well be prohibitive.

Social transfer programmes carefully select and monitor recipients, ensure they are well informed about objectives, and track outcomes. In Latin America, transfers are paid directly to mothers thus strengthening their voice within the household. The responsibilities of the government and the households are carefully discussed at registration. There is a strong emphasis on monitoring and evaluation, enabling the relevant agencies to learn from the implementation of the programmes but also helping protect successful programmes from political interference.

Social transfer programmes are most often national responses to local problems. Brazil's *Bolsa Família* began as a municipal programme in Campinas in 1994–1995 and is built on domestic learning and experience of what works to reduce poverty. India's *National Employment Guarantee Scheme* also builds on a careful assessment of public works programmes designed for 'drought relief' in the state of Maharashtra and elsewhere. Social transfer programmes have high set up costs and for this reason international assistance is important in low income countries. Nonetheless, sustainability and legitimacy requires domestic political support and finance in the medium term. Direct transfers to households in poverty are a 'Southern project', as the considerable diversity of programmes around the developing world demonstrates.

Search for Alternative Avenues to Ensure Welfare

The diversity of population in southern countries has often caused challenges for state governments implementing homogenised social cash transfer programmes. The acceptance of the programme varies among regions and contexts. There are two ways this issue can be addressed. First, encourage different types of institutions which can translate the variety of aspirations of individuals into social rights; second, design different types of social cash transfer programmes to suit the needs of citizens. The second approach is often undertaken when the responsibility for welfare is jointly undertaken by central government, provincial governments and municipal governments. For instance, in India many provincial federal states have widows' pension programmes. In this section the focus is on the first dimension of new emerging institutions in the global south to ensure welfare.

In many of the southern countries civil society institutions have more vitality and force than their formal states. Especially in remote areas (often hilly), where bureaucrats had limited access, these NGOs can provide sufficient social infrastructure for the reach of the social transfer programmes.

Middle income countries like Brazil, India and South Africa could rely on well-resourced public agencies to implement the programmes. But they are finding that effectiveness in reaching and supporting households in poverty requires a range of services and expertise that only a network of agencies, including public, not for profits, and private organisations, can provide. Key components of the programmes—information systems, training, financial disbursements, programme evaluation—engage members of these networks. NGOs often help bureaucrats to tailor-make the programme to come out of the straight jacket and to be suitable for the needs of the local poor people. Many such NGOs also act as watchdogs to check corruption and insensitivity by state officials. Many voiceless poor people are given voices either through advocacy of certain policies or mediation for justice. For example, 'Lawyers Collective' is an NGO in India that provides legal aid for women in difficult circumstances such as domestic violence, inheritance to land, inter-caste marriage etc.

Delivering an integrated set of transfers and services to beneficiary households is a challenge that can only be met with the contribution of antipoverty networks. Civil society organisations have, in addition, an important role in ensuring oversight and accountability of programme agencies. For instance, all the NGOs in the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh are brought together as Andhra Pradesh NGOs Alliance (APNA) by the initiative of government for the implementation of *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act*. There are monthly meetings of NGOs at district and state levels for designing the work and to monitor the implementation of the Act.

In low income countries, the capacity of public agencies is limited, and in places non-existent. In countries like Zambia or Malawi, antipoverty programmes are delivered only with the support of community and civil society organisations. In Zambia, community organisations identify potential beneficiaries, collect funds from district offices, and deliver transfers and support to those in need. In Bangladesh, local poverty committees are seen as an essential part of a successful antipoverty programme. BRAC's *Targeting the Ultra-Poor Programme* in Bangladesh, which provides health and nutrition interventions, as well as training and assets, to women heads of household begins by engaging village political elites to ensure their participation and support in the antipoverty effort.

Another important trend is the emergence of social entrepreneurship firms providing complementary welfare services. For instance, Renascer is a Brazil NGO which joined hands with corporate firm Johnson & Johnson to provide medical and education aid to mothers with chronically ill children living below the poverty line. 'Honey Care' is another social entrepreneurship model that provides employment opportunities and training for rural farmers in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, at the same time connecting their products to the global market. These models are innovative, and their financing is not dependent on the state; one result is that their reach is very limited. Where excep-

tional cases of reach have been reported, they had been linked with strategic corporate social responsibility programmes of trans-national corporations.

Revolution of micro-finance is another alternative avenue. Group lending and repayment of loans, based on mutual trust and social capital within small areas, have proved to be extremely effective for poor people largely excluded from the formal banking system. Usurious money lenders often took away the collaterals of these poor people. Micro-finance as an alternative has brought confidence for connecting with each other and to celebrate business successes through mutual aid. The purposes for which loan have availed have varied, but all of them indicate welfare outcomes such as buying a goat to raise for income, or buying a mobile phone when travelling as migrant labourer or covering sudden health care expenses, etc. Some of the micro-finance firms such as SKS Micro-finance in India have connected smaller firms in a network fashion to emerge as a nationally share-listed firm. Many such micro-finance ventures have received support from government in terms of subsidy. In India, some micro-finance groups worked as groups in the *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act*.

All the above instances indicate how a 'welfare mix' is possible through a synergy among the state, market, civil society and households.

Unfinished Task

The positive story about global citizenship is that 'all of us together are better than each of us alone'. In this spirit, an opportunity to address global challenges opens up. Many of the global challenges force us to think that new opportunities can be consciously adopted to stop the institutions that create poverty. A closer integration of international agencies, such as WTO, IMF, World Bank, UNDP, and a stronger focus on supporting effective policies in Southern countries, could go much of the way to achieving this. Often, attempts to advance development through externally imposed, top-down, policies has proved counter-productive. Enabling and facilitating domestic responses has proved a more effective approach for multilateral organisations. South to South policy diffusion has emerged as an important option in the context of poverty reduction. In many developing countries the institutionalisation of antipoverty programmes is precarious. Brazil, India and South Africa have chosen to embed rights to income security and protection in their Constitution. Citizens have legal avenues to ensure their rights and entitlements are fulfilled. In other countries, the absence of a legal framework means that citizens must rely on the discretion of public agencies. Political instability often delays the institutionalisation process.

The existing social transfer programmes need to be seen as a first stage in the development of strong and stable institutions, able to protect poor and vulnerable populations in the South from the volatility and crisis of the global economy. Introducing innovative programmes addressing extreme poverty should eventually lead to strong and effective social security institutions in the South able to integrated responses to the multidimensional nature of extreme poverty. This form of institution building is already in evidence in some countries in Latin America, in Chile, Brazil, and Mexico.

In all likelihood, the social security institutions emerging in the South will be quite different from the welfare states of developing countries. Facilitating the emergence of these new institutions is a global responsibility. This responsibility has two dimensions: first, the dominance of Northern interests in the international economic architecture means that developing countries have limited scope for regulating labour markets, raising tax revenues from personal and corporate income, and pursuing redistribution. Innovative responses will be needed from developing countries. Second, the emergence of innovative antipoverty programmes in many developing countries demonstrates that knowledge on how to eradicate poverty is already freely available. It is a seed which has sprouted and now needs watering and tending to grow.

The efforts in countries of the South towards extending social protection and provision to all amounts to a considerable step forward in the road to global citizenship.

What Role for Global Policy?

Lutz Leisering, Ph.D.

Professor for Social Policy and Director
at the Institute for World Society Studies
Bielefeld University

BARRIENTOS and PELLISSERY show that social cash transfers to the poor like social assistance and non-contributory pensions are spreading in countries of the global South, signaling an extension of global social citizenship in the field of social security. They describe the domestic forces behind that move. By contrast, authors under the new research paradigm 'global social policy' argue that national social policies are increasingly shaped by global ideas, actors and movements. It is an open research question to what extent and in which ways the rise of social cash transfers in the global South is a case of global social policy. If it is, social cash transfers would reflect 'global' citizenship in the sense of global policies geared to social citizenship rather than just a spread of social citizenship among nation states worldwide.

Social policy and welfare state have been projects of Northern nation states. Proponents of the research paradigm 'global social policy' assume that since the 1990s social policy is increasingly taking shape on the global level. BOB DEACON postulates a 'socialization' of global politics, that is, global politics increasingly deals with 'social' issues. In conjunction, we can observe a 'globalization of social policy', that is, national social policies are increasingly shaped by global actors. In this view, international organisations have become agents of global social citizenship. The notion of a 'global social policy' is supported by the sociological theory of 'world society' and 'world culture' by JOHN W. MEYER. However, it would be misleading to see global and national forces as alternative explanations. Rather, the task for research is to trace interactions between the two.

Formal social security in Southern countries has traditionally been confined to social insurance which covers only (parts of) the formal employment sector, hence a minority of the population. That is, social citizenship in the field of social security was and still is highly selective. The social insurance tradition is represented by the International Labour Organization (ILO). Social cash transfers are designed to extend the coverage of social security by granting minimum provisions to persons in the informal sector and the rural population, if often in a rudimentary way. Global actors like the ILO and the World Bank and development agencies like German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) have for long been reluctant to espouse the idea of social cash transfers because it seemed to clash with both liberal and social-democratic doctrines of development policy. But since the mid-2000s a global consensus that social cash transfers are desirable has emerged. If global social citizenship is predicated on the idea of recognising the value of each individual, then social cash transfers could be an avenue of materializing that recognition, by global standard setting and institution building in the field of social security. With the *Social Protection Floor Initiative* launched by the UN in 2009, the idea of basic material citizenship has moved to centre stage of world politics supported by the G20.

What Role for Social Solidarity?

Hartley Dean, Ph. D., Professor
Department of Social Policy,
The London School of Economics
and Political Science

Any concept of citizenship capable of meaningfully addressing the global challenges addressed by BARRIENTOS and PELLISSERY must encompass a social dimension. This, I would argue, means a concept of citizenship that:

1. transcends territorial boundaries. The term 'citizenship' originally denoted membership of an exclusive, albeit self-governing, city-dwelling elite. In the course of history the term evolved so as to refer to the status, rights and responsibilities attaching to the lawful inhabitants of a sovereign nation state. More recently, citizenship as a concept has acquired a certain elasticity of meaning such that it can encompass not just a person's nationality and their associated civic status, but a deeper sense of her relationship to society at large, whether locally or globally defined; whether constituted with reference to a specific community or humanity as a whole. Citizenship is not something bestowed upon us by the various tiers of government, but something that is socially negotiated in a multiplicity of ways and at a multiplicity of sites.

2. is rooted in human solidarity. The rights and responsibilities of citizenship may be variously conceived. What has become, arguably, the dominant conception is fundamentally liberal or 'contractarian'. Citizenship is seen as a bargain struck by autonomous individuals with a legally constituted state whereby the individual agrees to obey certain rules, in return for the protection of her freedom from unwarranted interference and her formal equality under the law. The alternative conception of citizenship is more solidaristic. Citizenship is seen as an association between inter-dependent and potentially vulnerable human beings; an association that affords mutual protection; a form of citizenship that embraces social or collective responsibility.

3. seeks to optimise human wellbeing. Social citizenship entails 'social rights': an encompassing short-hand term that includes what might also be construed as economic rights associated with the means of livelihood and an adequate standard of living (including water, food, clothing and shelter), but also rights to essential human services (such as education, health care and other social services), and rights to participation in the life and culture of the society where one belongs. Just as citizenship itself can be variously conceived, so can the nature of social welfare or human wellbeing. Human wellbeing entails more than the avoidance of starvation; more, even, than the pursuit of personal happiness. It requires the pursuit of human fulfilment; a fulfilment founded in the essential sociality of human existence.

This is what I mean by social citizenship. It is sometimes supposed that concepts of citizenship and human rights which are seen to have emanated in the global North are inimical to the cultural traditions of the global South. However, this understanding of social citizenship has resonance, for example, with: the Islamic principle of *Zakat* (the obligation upon Muslims to share wealth); the ancient Confucian concept of *Rén* (a state of virtue achieved through inter-connectedness); the pan-African philosophy of *Ubuntu* (that holds that a person is only a person through other persons). Social citizenship by its very nature is open to continual reinterpretation and negotiation. This is where its potential lies.

What Role for Human Rights?

Dr. Ulrike Davy

Professor of German Constitutional and Administrative Law, International Social Law, and Comparative Law and Director at the Institute for World Society Studies Bielefeld University

BARRIENTOS and PELLISSERY argue strongly that concepts of 'citizenship' be re-organized, *inter alia*, in the light of the growing body of human rights law which has been developed under the aegis of the United Nations since 1945. Yet, what role can human rights possibly play with respect to 'citizenship', a concept primarily pertaining to sociology and rarely used in law?

In the dominant citizenship discourse, human rights are either ignored, seen as a separate but useful add-on, or deemed a threat to citizenship. In any case, citizenship is closely tied to the nation State. A legal perspective suggests otherwise. I believe the dominant citizenship discourses in sociology overestimate what's left to the discretion of States when they decide upon the citizenship-status of individuals. Over the past decades, human rights (civil, political, social rights) went international as well as global. Human rights were integrated into a body of binding international law and they became applicable worldwide, as more and more States ratified pertinent human rights treaties promoted by the UN. What T. H. MARSHALL termed 'citizenship' is nowadays no longer limited to the State's own nationals, and it is no longer exclusively restricted to individuals staying in the State's territory. 'Citizenship', I suggest, is much better understood when re-conceptualized as a layered (legal) status, partly determined by international human rights law, partly by national law. I know of the questions that arise with such a re-conceptualization: what is the meaning of rights when they are construed as layered? What exactly is the role of States, especially when it comes to guaranteeing social security and an adequate standard for everyone, within their jurisdictions and in a global perspective? How does a human rights approach deal with weak States, with non-state-actors (e.g., transnational corporations), with the cultural embeddedness of rights, and with the growing phenomenon of informality?

In some human rights quarters these questions are already being addressed. Since 1998, an independent UN expert investigates the question of human rights and extreme poverty on a global scale. The right to food is a matter of UN concern since the 1980s; the same holds true for the right to adequate housing. In 2006, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights issued guidelines addressing the link between human rights and poverty, the first systematic attempt to bridge the gap between issues of development and human rights. The Committee under the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) has begun to flesh out in more detail what the member States have signed up to when they recognize the rights canonized in the Covenant (general comments). And the vast majority of the member States of the ICESCR (now 160) seem to accept that they have a duty to combat poverty. However, whether all these activities and approaches add up to substantive answers and changes on the ground still needs to be researched. Only then will we have a clearer understanding of the role of human rights with regard to global 'social citizenship'.

What Role for Privately Owned Land?

Harvey M. Jacobs, Ph.D., Professor

Department of Urban and Regional Planning,
University of Wisconsin–Madison, USA

For much of the 20th century land tenure and private ownership had a central position in the discussion about alleviating the poor from poverty. Many of the world's poor were rural and many of these were landless. While they worked the land, it was often for a landlord, and what they reaped was, at best, little above a subsistence existence. Especially in the post World War II era, when social and economic reformers looked at the matters of poverty and national development, redistributing land became a key issue. The argument was that if the poor owned land, and that ownership was robust and secure, then the poor's investment of labor would benefit them, their families, their communities and their nations. And the poor strongly endorsed this argument; they wanted land!

The 20th century was replete with experiments in land reform, some of which succeeded (for example in Mexico and Taiwan), but many of which yielded more mixed results. Yet in the final 20 years of the century, many of the former socialist countries undertook robust programs in rural and urban land reform, often as an early parliamentary action, to address perceived socialist era inequities.

What role does private land ownership have to play in the 21st century, in an increasing urban world, where many of the poor live in informal settlements that are part of mega-cities? What is the link between privately owned land and global social citizenship?

For some—Peruvian economist HERNANDO DE SOTO is the most prominent spokesperson globally—the rationale for urban land reform is analogous to that of rural land reform. DE SOTO argues that the key to poverty alleviation in the informal settlements of mega-cities is to provide the poor with formal title to land—secure private property. Once the poor own they can invest and build capital and realize their own and their nation's betterment. His argument informs major global actors, such as the World Bank.

But is DE SOTO correct? Studies suggest the urban poor can be ambivalent about private land ownership. They do not necessarily feel insecure in informal settlements. But the public sector can support formal land titling for exactly the reason the poor can oppose it—it obligates the owner to pay land taxes. Private ownership can actually lead to less security for the urban poor. Once they own land the poor may be forced to sell it and move elsewhere if they can not pay their land taxes (and thus, perversely, land titling can actually increase the extent of informal settlements). But the urban poor do want what ownership of urban land has traditionally offered the owner—access to a secure site for housing, the opportunity for a supply of clean water and human and solid waste disposal services, and access to a range of social, public services (such as schools and health clinics).

So, what is the role for privately owned land in the 21st century, as part of global social citizenship? It is not clear. Without a doubt there is a role (everything humans do occurs in physical space), but its exact form has not yet been articulated or agreed upon.

What Role for Common Property?

Dr. Benjamin Davy

Professor of Land Policy, Land Management,
Municipal Geoinformation School of Spatial Planning,
TU Dortmund University

In 1988, when ELINOR OSTROM started writing her ground-breaking book *Governing the Commons* at the ZiF, there was a wide agreement in academic and political discourses that the shared use of land and other natural resources was an outdated practice. After the demise of communist regimes in Europe, the sweeping privatization of public land and the formalization of private property titles became the preferred choice of policymakers around a neoliberal world. Hardly anybody recognized, as OSTROM did, that common resources are not limited to the village pasture or other bucolic uses of commons (in German: *Allmende*), but are a persistent phenomenon. Cyberspace spawned the most remarkable commons (such as the Internet or Wikipedia), but the shared use of common spaces affects everyday life everywhere: Public spaces like the High Line Park in Manhattan or the refurbished Trafalgar Square in London improve the quality of life. The crowds attracted by opportunities to 'public viewing' of sports events in wealthy cities clearly demonstrate the high use value of urban commons. But is common property not also vital for the poor?

Blick auf einen Slum in
Ahmedabad (Indien)

Since 1992, when the UN conference in Rio de Janeiro inaugurated the fuzzy concept of 'sustainable development', the global discourses on environmental policy, poverty reduction, and human rights have advanced fresh ideas on pro-poor land policies. In contrast to earlier attempts at sweeping land reforms, the new socio-ecological land policy is not limited to the redistribution of land titles, but emphasizes the many ways in which poor people can have, and direly need, access to vital land uses. The World Bank advertises land policies for growth and poverty reduction, the *Cities Without Slums* alliance focuses on landlessness and poverty in the urban context, and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food demands that customary land tenure systems be strengthened. Although socio-ecological land policies emerge from plural rationalities, many emphasize how important common property relations are for the poor. Urban public spaces, like parks or pavements, are indispensable for street vendors and social exchange. Slum improvement often includes the building of shared sanitation facilities and water supply. Urban agriculture and community gardens not only provide food to the poor, but also help build up social capital. Community forests or payments for environmental services (PES) programs are examples for shared land uses in the rural context.

Slum land and communal rural land are under pressure from land grabbing, real estate development, and environmental degradation. Climate change poses an enormous burden on marginal land uses. In cities worldwide, urban commons are lost to unbearable traffic congestion. Moreover, women claiming their rights to land often face violence and discrimination. Access to vital land uses is not just a matter of property law. However, common property relations help protect the land uses of the poor, provided that a suitable management for the common pool resource is in place and the government respects and supports local initiatives for the improvement of shared land uses.

Bibliography

Barrientos, Armando (2009): Introducing Basic Social Protection in Low Income Countries: Lessons from Existing Programmes, in: P. Townsend, ed., *Building Decent Societies: Rethinking the Role of Social Security in Development*. London: Palgrave and ILO, pp. 253–273.

Davy, Benjamin (2009): The Poor and the Land: Poverty, Property, Planning (Centenary Paper), in: *Town Planning Review* 80, 3: 228–265.

Davy, Benjamin & Sony Pellissery (2011): Climate Change and Global Social Policy, in: *Global Social Policy* 11, 1: 106–113.

Davy, Ulrike (2009): Soziale Gleichheit – Voraussetzung oder Aufgabe der Verfassung? in: Veröffenlichungen der Vereinigung der Deutschen Staatsrechtslehrer, Band 68, *Erosion von Verfassungvoraussetzungen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, pp. 122–176.

Deacon, Bob, with Michelle Hulse & Paul Stubbs (1997): *Global Social Policy. International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*. London: Sage.

Dean, Hartley (2010): *Understanding Human Need*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Deininger, Klaus (2003): *Land Policies for Growth and Poverty Reduction*. A World Bank Policy Research Report. Washington, DC: The World Bank; New York: Oxford University Press.

de Soto, Hernando (2000): *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Hanlon, Joseph, Armando Barrientos & David Hulme (2010): *Just Give Money to the Poor: The Development Revolution from the South*. Sterling VA: Kumarian Press.

Isin, Engin F., ed. (2008): *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jacobs, Harvey M. (2011): Private Property in Historical and Global Context, in: M. Valiante & A. Smit, eds., *Private Property, Planning and the Public Interest*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, (forthcoming).

Jacobs, Harvey M., ed. (2004): *Private Property in the 21st Century*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Leisering, Lutz (2009): Extending Social Security to the Excluded: Are Social Cash Transfers to the Poor an Appropriate Way of Fighting Poverty in Developing Countries? in: *Global Social Policy* 9, 2: 246–272.

Mann, Michael (1987): Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship, in: *Sociology* 21, 3: 339–354.

Marshall, Thomas Humphrey (1950): Citizenship and Social Class, in: *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–85.

Meyer, John W. et al. (1997): World Society and the Nation State, in: *American Journal of Sociology* 103, 1: 144–181.

Nash, Kate (2009): Between Citizenship and Human Rights, in: *Sociology* 43, 6: 1067–1083.

Ostrom, Elinor (1990): *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pellissery, Sony (2009): Social Embeddedness of Informal Labour Market in India: How Effective Are Public Works Programmes in India, in: *Labour and Development* 15, 2: 119–141.

Turner, Bryan S. (2006): *Vulnerability and Human Rights*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.