

Political and Economic Transition of People with Disabilities Related to Globalization

Jihye Jeon

Abstract—This paper analyzes the political and economic issues that people with disabilities face related to globalization; how people with disabilities have been adapting globalization and surviving under worldwide competition system. It explains that economic globalization exacerbates inequality and deprivation of people with disabilities. The rising tide of neo-liberal welfare policies emphasized efficiency, downsized social expenditure for people with disabilities, excluded people with disabilities against labor market, and shifted them from welfare system to nothing. However, there have been people with disabilities' political responses to globalization, which are characterized by a global network of people with disabilities as well as participation to global governance. Their resistance can be seen as an attempt to tackle the problems that economic globalization has produced. It is necessary paradigm shift of disability policy from dependency represented by disability benefits to independency represented by labor market policies for people with disabilities.

Keywords—Economic Globalization, People with Disability, Deprivation, Welfare Cut, Disability Right Movement, Resistance.

I. INTRODUCTION

GLOBALIZATION is one of the most important topics in the social sciences and economics over the past several decades. Most researchers agree that globalization influences every part of everyone in global society, including people with disabilities. However, there are few analyses of how globalization will effect on people with disabilities. People with disabilities have been largely marginalized throughout history and segregated in most societies; they continue to be ignored in the movement toward globalization.

Disability has been considered as a medical issue to be cured or rehabilitated, but disability study scholars have attempted to reconceptualize it as a social issue. The social model of disability, developed by British disability studies scholars, understands disability experiences as social oppression and separates disability from impairments, although the medical model is still powerful perspective on disability outside of disability scholars' discussion. There are many papers and discussion related to the paradigm shift on disability from medical model to social model. Nevertheless, there are few studies considering disability issue as to be evaluated in the global context.

Efforts to promote fair trade, equitable economic exchanges and the regulation of the global economy have gained support in recent years as activists, academics and progressive policy makers have challenged the market fundamentalism [1] that has

characterized much thinking about globalization. This study adds more challenge to market fundamentalism by highlighting disability issues within the global political economy.

The purpose of this study is to examine how globalization is integral to the field of Disability Studies. This study is not about whether globalization should be welcomed or rejected by the disability community, but it considers how globalization can be analyzed with regard to the independence of people with disabilities. This study aims to recognize the opportunities and barriers that globalization based on neo-liberalism [2] creates and to explore what problems people with disabilities are confronted with and how they resist against.

II. WHAT IS GLOBALIZATION?

Globalization is complicated term to define, though it is clear that globalization has changed many things, from world order to individual life. There have been lots of discussions about what globalization is. The Nobel laureate, Amartya Sen (2002) noted that globalization is neither new, nor in general a folly and through persistent movement of goods, people, techniques and ideas, it has shaped the history of the world [3].

The vast majority of globalization theorists present it as a characteristic of economic activity. It refers to the integration and merging of national economies as a result of the transnational activities of firms and global financial mobility. Hurrell and Woods saw globalization as integrated economic activities and insisted that globalization is to be welcomed because it is based on a powerful cluster of liberal assumptions, such as economic efficiency [4], [5]. Also they saw globalization as a more advanced form of internationalization and a more recent form of economic activity that implies "a degree of functional integration between internationally dispersed economic activities."

Most globalization theorists have focused on economic changes; however, not all theories concentrate on developments in the international economy. Some theorists emphasize evidence from political changes and the development of a global society. Bretherton and Ponton insisted that globalization must be viewed as a new, distinct phase in world politics [6]. They stated: *Political globalization refers to a growing tendency for issues to be perceived as global in scope, and hence requiring global solutions and to the development of international organizations and global institutions, which attempt to address such issues. More tentatively the concept also suggests the development of a global civil society, in which local groups and grassroots organizations from all parts of the world interact (P.26).*

Another central tenet among many interpretations of

globalization is the notion of culture. Roland Robertson asserts that globalization involves “the development of something like a global culture” [7]. Martin Shaw echoes the diverse aspects of globalization: *We have not just some global connections but the clear outline of a global society. We have a global economic system, with production and markets coordinated on a world scale; elements of a global culture of worldwide networks of communication; globally vibrant political ideas and the possibility of coordinated political action (p. 3)* [8].

Instead of focusing on distinguishing each part of globalization as economic, political, or cultural, Mark Neufeld suggested five dimensions that were born as the result of globalization: changes in production, types of states, world orders, community identities, and types of democracy [9]. According to him, globalization creates global enterprise capitalism and a hyper-liberal world order, and the generic culture of possessive individualism. The possessive individualism is based on three assumptions: “humans are individuals and are free because they possess their own capacities; society is the relations of exchange between free equal individuals as owners and users of their capabilities; and political society is to protect property including capacities.” Neufeld suggested that globalization creates this possessive individualism as common sense.

Through these discussions, It can be concluded that globalization has three aspects: economic, social/political, and cultural. The world works just like a single country. There is one government like the UN, a competitive liberal economy, a global mass culture and consumption, and high technology to tie the world as a comprehensive unit. Globalization is a new force in world history. There may have been integration and extension of international relationships previously, but globalization is qualitatively different than before. Nationalism once fulfilled an integrative role that met the needs of early capitalism, but those same economic forces are now encouraging the breakdown of national borders through the creation of a single, integrated world market. Globalization exists at the local, national, and global levels and affects how individuals live, how communities express themselves, how states make law, and how states and corporations interact with each other. Of course, globalization impacts the life of people with disabilities. The next section explores the relationship between disability and the economic aspects, and political aspects of globalization.

III. DISABILITY AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF GLOBALIZATION

While more of us enjoy better standards of living than ever before, many others remain desperately poor. Nearly half the world's population still has to make do on less than \$2 per day. About 1.2 billion people struggle on less than \$1..... Of a total world labor force of 3 billion, 140 million workers are out of work and a quarter to a third are unemployed. ... Globally, the 1 billion people living in developed countries earn 60 percent of world income, while 3.5 billion people in low income countries earn less than 20 percent. (UN Millennium Report) [10].

A. Labor Market in Global Economy and Disability

The global economic structure under globalization requires much more competitive labor market than a market based on classical capitalism. Goods, services, labor, capital and so on are able to move globally. Among them, labor costs are one of the important elements that determine the price of goods and services and labor mobility tends to increase the wage gap between skilled workers and non-skilled workers. This situation is spoken as following catchy phrases; “race to the bottom”, “leveling the playing field” and “low wage competition.” All of those phrases describe how globalization increases labor mobility and produces low wage competition.

International Labor Organization(ILO)'s study stated the problems globalization created as “many developing countries face serious social and economic dislocation associated with persistent poverty, growing unemployment, loss of traditional trading patterns and a growing crisis of economic security” and estimated the total number of migrant workers and family members to be about 120 million [11]. Globalization and trade liberalization have had impacts on employment conditions. Industrialized countries and developing countries have demands for cheap and low-skilled labor in agriculture, food processing, construction, unskilled manufacturing jobs, and low wage services like domestic work and sex sector. Immigrant workers meet the needs. At the same time, the factories, which prefer to employ unskilled workers with small salary, move to the underdeveloped countries. The wage differential is bigger between skilled workers and unskilled or less skilled workers in developed and developing countries through the inflow of cheap labor, while the wage differential is smaller between skilled workers and unskilled or less skilled workers in underdeveloped countries through the inflow of foreign factories [11]. However, the level of income in underdeveloped countries is akin to poverty so that the fact that the wage differential within underdeveloped countries is meaningless. Even, well-educated people from underdeveloped countries are ready to take up 3-D jobs in developed countries because the wage differentials between developed country and underdeveloped country justify their interest [12]. Inequality increased between skilled workers and unskilled or less skilled workers within developed countries and also between developed countries and underdeveloped countries.

Under this situation, what is the economic status of people with disability? For analyzing the status of people with disabilities in global context, Stienstra utilized the possessive individualism, which mentioned by Neufeld, and asked that if we are capable individuals, free and equal, whose capacities need protection via the state [9], [12]. When dividing people into two groups based on the concept of possessive individualism, there are capable persons and not-capable persons. People with disabilities fit into the category of ‘not-capable persons’ and cannot win on the competitive market. Within this structure of capitalism, it is natural that the labor value of people with disabilities is estimated lower than non-disabled people. Moreover, the belief that everybody is independent and own capacity separate people with disabilities from main society and excludes them from the benefit of

society like social protection [13].

In this global context, people with disabilities are more likely to stay in poverty [14]. More than 80% of people with disabilities live in the underdeveloped world and the level of their quality of life is located at the bottom [15]. People with disabilities who live in developed countries fit into less skilled or unskilled worker so that the inequality increases between people with disabilities and people without disabilities. Globalization creates an unstable market system so that unskilled workers and not-capable persons become excluded in labor market.

Although everybody is exposed to these conditions, people with disabilities are further burdened because the conditions are compounded by disability. Binde, Chossudovsky, Sklair, and Sassen observed that the causes of deprivation and inequality in the global economy are deeply rooted in structural inequalities and conflicts from economic and political changes [15]-[19]. Based on their arguments, povertization [20] is the unavoidable result of the global economy and people with disabilities, who are a marginalized group in every country, are likely to live in desperate poverty or at least relative poverty under globalization. World Health Organization reported that the 10% of people living in poverty is disabled person. The World Bank announced that 20% of all people living in absolute poverty, less than one US dollar a day, have a disability [21].

It is clear that that economic globalization creates and enforces a new hierarchy based on labor mobility and capability. The economic system that Karl Marx focused on created classes based on who had capital and productivity while the current global economy creates a new class based on who has capital, capability (skill), and labor mobility. If a person has capital but lacks capability and labor mobility, s/he can have also power. If a person has capability but lacks capital and labor mobility, s/he can have also labor value in the market. If a person has labor mobility but lacks capital and capability, s/he can try to find a job globally, although it will likely be low wage. People with disabilities do not tend to fit into any of these groups. Even flexible labor markets deprive people with disabilities of the leftovers of welfare states, which will be discussed in a following section. As globalization continues, people with disabilities suffer from poverty and deprivation. Although globalization greatly enhanced the opportunities available to those who have the capital, skills, or mobility to flourish in world markets, at the same time, it limits the opportunities available to those who do not have the capital, skills or mobility.

Amartya Sen presented at the international symposium on human security in 2000, "The economic predicament of the poor across the world cannot be reversed by withholding from them the great advantage of contemporary technology, well-established efficiency of international trade and exchange, and the social as well as economic merits of living in open rather than closed society (p.7)" [3] In 2002 he continued to state in American Prospect "it is often argued that the rich are getting richer and the poor poorer (p.4)... the apologists of globalization point to their belief that the poor who participate in trade and exchange are mostly getting richer (p.5)...the use

of market economy is consistent with many different ownership patterns, resource availabilities, social opportunities and rules of operation.... The arrangements for social security and other public interventions can make further modifications to the outcomes of market processes, and together they can yield varying levels of inequality and poverty (p.6)" In 2004, Amartya Sen talked in an interview with a reporter of People in Economics, "It is believed that globalization is such a good thing that it would be awfully bad if only some people benefited from it and not others... much of the world's prosperity is directly linked to the good results of economic exchange and economic interrelations. However market is just one institution among many. It needs to be accompanied by democracy, free press, and social opportunity (p.7)" According to him, globalization helped the development as a process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy and also it requires the removal of major sources of unfreedom: poverty as well as tyranny, poor economic opportunities as well as systematic social deprivation. His point is that the problem such as inequality and poverty is not on the globalization itself but on the institutions or policies. However, how about the poor who cannot participate in global economy, the people who are not free and dependent on others? The people Amartya Sen concerned seem to be the people who are independent, free and are able to work regardless of the capability of human. The expanding opportunities and freedom in worldwide market is given to non-disabled people. While people without disabilities get more benefits from the globalized market, people with disabilities still stay at the same position in poverty and difficulties so that they cannot enjoy the so called opportunity and freedom, which globalization expand. The relative poverty and relative deprivation are getting bigger to people with disabilities, compared that the benefits increase for people without disabilities.

As Sen pointed, institution and other social factors are important because market is just one among many. However, the institution tends to support market's way. Welfare states reduced social expenditures as political support for neo-liberal social policy gained favor. People with disabilities are kicked off from the welfare security as well as excluded from labor market. Following discussion about welfare-cut describes the status of people with disabilities in relation to social policies' trend.

TABLE I
 PREVALENCE OF DISABILITY IN OECD [22]

Canada	Denmark	Netherland	Poland	Sweden	UK	USA	Korea	Mexico
16.1	18.6	18.8	14.5	20.6	18.2	10.7	3.0	7.0

The number is a percentage of 20-64 population at late 1990s

B. Neo-Liberal Trend in Welfare Policy and Disability

Receding governments deregulation, and shrinking social obligations are the domestic counterparts of the intertwining of national economies [23]. International global pressure has shaped national responses to people with disabilities. Welfare systems, the typical national responses to people with disabilities, face extensive reform. In the process of downsizing

government and restructuring national policies, welfare reform is difficult to avoid. Holden and Beresford argued “international mobility of capital propels governments into competition with each other for investment [24]. They are constrained to follow policies of low inflation, low taxation, low public spending, flexible labor market and privatization – that is to minimize their economic and social involvement except where it facilitates capital accumulation”(p.195). All these policies is so-called neo liberal social policy, which aimed for deregulation of the market and flexibility of labor. Cox summarized the general characters of neo liberal policies as retrenchment in finance, restructuring of pensions, decentralization, tax reduction and reinforcement of citizen’s obligation: 1) Retrenchment in finance: Budget cut for social welfare. Welfare eligibility becomes stricter. 2) Restructuring of pensions: the portion of worker’s contribution increases and there are incentives for private pension. 3) Decentralization: it is stressed the delivery of benefits by enterprises in local community 4) Tax reduction: it is a way to strengthen the competitive position of private enterprises 5) Reinforcement of citizen’s obligation: neo liberal policies are created to reinforce the obligation to work and become a productive citizen [25].

Welfare has decreased in the OECD countries. Government-run welfare services have been replaced by private organizations or left as a responsibility of family or charities [13]. Rodrik explained this situation as follows: “Employers are less willing to provide benefits of job security and stability because of the increased competition but also because the global market makes them less dependent on the goodwill of their local work force. Government is less able to sustain a social safety net, because an important part of their tax base has become footloose because of the increased mobility of capital. Moreover, the ideological onslaught against the welfare state has paralyzed many governments and made them unable to respond to the domestic needs of a more integrated economy” [23]. Neo-liberal social policies emphasize economic efficiency and downsized social expenditures. Welfare-cuts have become a global trend and local governments have cut or reduced government services and expenditures regardless of how much they had offered previously.

A further implication of cuts in welfare services is that the disability population is increasing because the lack of services creates the conditions that can lead to disability. A study by the World Bank on poverty and disability notes, “Without resources for medical or social services, a remedial impairment can become a permanent disability [27]. Also, a research from Department for International Development supports this arguments showing there is a cycle between disability and poverty and lack of policies strengthen the adhesion [28].

The dependent population including people with disabilities increased; the problem is compounded by the fact that many people with disabilities are excluded from labor markets and they are unable to receive adequate welfare benefits because of cuts in services by national governments. Table I shows prevalence rate of disability and Table II shows the social expenditure for people with disabilities. The level of social

expenditure is low, compared to the size of population. Although the range of population with disabilities is 3% to 20%, the size of social expenditure is 0.1% to 6%.

TABLE II
 SOCIAL EXPENDITURE FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN OECD COUNTRIES
 [26]

Country	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2009
Australia	0.9	1.0	1.7	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.3
Austria	4.1	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.4	3.4
Belgium	3.7	3.7	2.6	3.0	2.8	2.3	2.5
Canada	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.9
Chile	1.1	1.2	1.0	0.8	1.1
Czech Republic	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.2
Denmark	4.2	3.2	3.7	4.2	3.9	4.5	5.2
Estonia	1.5	1.8	2.7
Finland	3.5	3.9	4.2	5.1	3.8	3.8	4.1
France	2.8	2.8	2.1	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.1
Germany	3.8	3.2	3.0	4.2	3.6	3.3	3.5
Greece	1.0	1.8	1.3	0.8	0.9	0.9	1.0
Hungary	2.6	2.8	2.7
Iceland	2.7	3.1	3.6	4.1	4.1
Ireland	2.3	2.6	1.8	1.9	1.3	1.6	2.4
Israel	2.1	2.5	2.9	3.1
Italy	1.9	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.3
Japan	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.1
Korea	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7
Luxem-bourg	4.0	3.9	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.5	3.5
Mexico	..	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Nether-lands	7.0	5.9	6.8	5.7	4.6	4.2	3.8
New Zealand	1.3	1.5	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8
Norway	3.6	3.8	5.9	5.6	5.9	5.6	6.2
Poland	3.4	5.7	3.5	2.7	2.3
Portugal	2.1	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.4
Slovak Republic	2.1	2.3	1.5	2.1
Slovenia	2.6	2.4	2.2
Spain	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.7
Sweden	4.8	4.6	5.5	5.3	5.6	5.9	5.4
Switzer-land	2.4	2.4	2.9	3.8	4.0	4.5	..
Turkey	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	..	0.1	0.4
United Kingdom	1.2	1.7	2.3	3.0	2.5	2.4	3.0
United States	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.7
OECD - Total	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.6

The number is percentage of GDP. Social Expenditure for people with disabilities include cash (disability pension, occupational injury pension, paid sick leave, other cash benefits) and benefits in Kinds (residential care, Home help service, rehabilitation service, and others) in public and mandatory private sector.

C. Paradigm shift from Dependency as Welfare to Independency as Work

Since 1980s, the neo-liberal world trend has influenced to social policy in the way of supporting global market. The welfare decrease, labor flexibility increases, and governments attempt to include people with disability into labor market. Rather than protecting people with disabilities through welfare system, letting them work is considered as one of the most cost effective ways to reduce poverty. It may be a natural phenomenon after welfare cut which is guided by neo liberal policies supporting globalization. International Labor Organization reported, “Economic rationality and human rights go hand in hand (p.4) [29]” Governments promote employment of people with disabilities not only for human right to work but also for economic benefits. According to the unemployment of people with disabilities contributes to the loss of between 1.37

and 1.95 US dollars in global GNP [29], [30]. This is a significant loss of productivity for global economy. From the perspective of social model on disability, unemployment of people with disabilities is due to the employment arena's failure in adapting and accommodating [31]. Disability scholars notes that medical model has been dominated most welfare programs and created a dependency of people with disabilities, with denying the independency of people with disabilities [32]. These days, it is said that there is a paradigm shift from welfare to human right, related to people with disabilities. From the perspective of social model, disabilities is seen as an indicator of decreased potential for productivity and associated with discrimination and decreased employment opportunities [33]. Therefore, UN standard rules encouraged governments to provide people with disability employment opportunity and governments try to develop the labor market programs for people with disabilities such as counseling and job search assistance, vocational rehabilitation, subsidized employment, grants, sheltered employment, supported employment, self-directed employments, and state enterprises etc. However, the effectiveness of those programs is not proved yet. Table III shows the employment rate of people with disabilities.

TABLE III
 EMPLOYMENT RATE IN OECD COUNTRIES [34]

Country	Percent	Year	Country	Percent	Year
Australia	39.8	2003	Korea	44.7	2005
Austria	48.3	2005	Luxembourg	50.2	2004
Belgium	34.4	2005	Mexico	55.4	2004
Canada	43.7	2006	Nether-lands	44.5	2006
Czech Republic	40.9	2005	Norway	44.7	2005
Denmark	52.3	2005	Poland	17.6	2004
Finland	54.1	2005	Portugal	43.5	2005
France	36.3	2005	Slovak Republic	40.4	2005
Germany	41	2005	Spain	34.9	2004
Greece	37.5	2005	Sweden	51.9	2005
Hungary	39.2	2005	Switzer-land	52.1	2005
Iceland	61.3	2005	United Kingdom	45.3	2006
Ireland	31.9	2005	USA	39.9	2004
Italy	36	2005			

Although there is labor market program as disability policies as it is mentioned above, still the employment rate of people with disabilities is low and they have difficulties to be included in labor market. People with disability seem to experience the paradigm shift not from welfare to right, but from welfare to nothing. The voice of paradigm shift from welfare to right, from dependency to independency seems to stay within disability scholars' community.

The current socio economic situation of people with disabilities can be described by following words: the neo-liberal policies that put a value on market efficiency, the exclusion and discrimination from labor market or lack of access to employment opportunity, the increase in relative poverty and inequality of people with disabilities, and from welfare to nothing. Now, what way do people with disabilities choose to tackle these disadvantageous circumstances under global economy and neo-liberal policies? Returning to the

dependency through rehabilitating welfare? Or searching to another way for getting independency? In next chapter, it will be discussed.

IV. DISABILITY AND POLITICAL ASPECTS OF GLOBALIZATION

A. Global Governance and International Organizations

So far, the principle policies and programs involved in global governance have historically overlooked the interests of people with disabilities. Fujiura classified 436 studies reported by the World Bank that have been conducted using the Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS) data system, and found that only one of the 436 studies covered the issue of disability [35]. The disability agenda was marginalized from the main policies of global governance. Similarly, Holden and Beresford argued that multilateral institutions like the World Bank and IMF strengthen globalization, marked by neoliberal ideology, and ignore the voices of people with disabilities [24].

However, global governance also tried to weaken neo-liberal ideology as listening of the voices from people with disabilities. When globalization began, they largely ignored the disability issue, but recently global governance attitudes towards disability issues have changed. In 1993, the United Nations adopted an international human rights instrument, the Standard Rules for the Equalization of Opportunities for People with Disabilities, for protecting the rights of people with disabilities. Further, the UN has created an Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly to reinforce the view of disability rights as a human rights issue. In addition, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe has adopted a recommendation entitled "Towards Full social Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities [36]." The World Bank has contributed to the spread of knowledge internationally about the deep linkages between disability and poverty. A recent study by the World Bank focused on the cycle between disability and poverty where disability adds to the risk of poverty and the conditions of poverty add to the risk of disability [37].

In addition to the attention given to disability issues by international organizations, there is the spread of national laws regarding people with disabilities and discrimination. The USA, UK, Germany, and Australia all have anti-discrimination laws that impact people with disabilities. These laws were not brought about by global governance, but by the voluntary networking of people with disabilities. In this way, the global disability movement has influenced national governments to adopt a human rights approach to disability and pass legislation promoting disability rights. Many scholars agree that the proliferation of disability discrimination laws is the achievement of local and global disability rights movements. Many international organizations have contributed to the spread of knowledge about people with disabilities.

It is interesting that economic globalization has created difficulties such as poverty, and deprivation for people with disabilities, while political response to the economic disadvantageous circumstances under globalization has allowed the protection through the various projects and programs of international organizations and the growing

number of national disability discrimination laws. It was possible because people with disabilities want to have their own power and independency. Rather than becoming dependent through claiming welfare, people with disabilities choose to be independent being and confront the issues that arise from globalization and neo-liberalism. Concerned that issue, it is discussed in next chapter.

B. Global Network of People with Disabilities

A final change initiated by political response to globalization is that it has helped a voluntary group of people with disabilities organize into different levels of disability rights movements. The organizations of people with disabilities are self-determined groups rather than groups 'for' people with disabilities. They are committed to change society through collective actions to secure their civil and human rights including the principles of participation, inclusion, independence and equality [38].

It is ironic that the issue of the rights of people with disabilities emerged at the end of the welfare state in the USA and European countries. Wherever the philosophy and theory of social welfare have been discussed, the welfare spirit has been based on human rights. However, the human rights provided by current welfare states restrict the level of minimum livelihood standards for people with disabilities. For example, many states have policies of quota systems for employment, institutionalization for housing, and segregated education, ironically, all of which contract the principles of inclusion and independence that guide disability rights movement. At this point, it is important to address the welfare cuts again because the potential exists to not provide anything for people with disabilities in the name of focusing on the independence. Cutting welfare budgets can affect the quality of life of poor people with disabilities negatively instead of promoting the spirit of equality and inclusion for non-poor people with disabilities. The slogan "welfare to rights" does not mean that people with disabilities do not need any social protection or policies. Beresford and Holden stated that "the conception of independence rests not on people doing without any help or support, but on them having adequate and appropriate individual support as well as appropriate social conditions to live their life on equal terms with non-disabled people (p.984)" [38].

In order to solve the problems that globalization creates, there seems to be no alternative. However, international organizations like Disabled Persons International (DPI) have begun to confront some of the issues that arise from globalization. Disabled people are now talking about the globalization of disability and the way that global and local forces impact the perceptions of and responses to disability [14]. They believe that they can change the nature of services and supports as well as the nature of their lives and society itself. Disability Rights Movements (DRM's), rooted in the ideals of human rights and empowerment, have begun in places all around the world and many have achieved dramatic advances for people with disabilities. For example, the USA shifted from a welfare approach to a human rights approach and

encouraged public accessibility, integrated public education, public transportation and civil rights protection. When the Americans with Disabilities Act passed in 1991, the DRM hits peak of achievement.

That self-help groups have flourished can be understood as a part of the achievement of the DRM. Self-help groups have the same philosophy and focus on the principles of independence and participation in society as the disability rights movement does. Charlton explained the principles of self-help groups as:

We are able to take responsibility for our own lives, and we do not need or want you to manage our affairs; we best understand what is best for us; we demand control of our own organizations and programs and influence over the government funding, public policy, and economic enterprises that directly affect us....we attack the ideology of paternalism and existing power structure (p.128) [14].

If global networks like DPI take a political role for supporting people with disabilities, self-help groups assume a role in the local economic survival of people with disabilities. The roles of self-help groups varies from empowering each other through peer counseling to training members in independent living skills to enabling the economic activity of people with disabilities through economic development projects such as collective gardening, industrial production, or commercial ventures. Self-help groups are networking nationally and internationally to enhance their voices. Through this network, they create markets on which they can sell their production and labor.

People with disabilities who are categorized as "not able to work" have started to make their own economic activity. For example, a small self-help group was organized at the village level in Daegu, South Korea. The group functioned as a self-help group running a commercial venture. A remarkable achievement of this group is that they forced their community to improve its accessibility. They used the power of public opinion through the Internet and broadcasting to boycott inaccessible stores and private institutions for people with disabilities and succeeded in changing their community step by step. These achievements were possible because globalization provided the opportunity to share information and empower each other. They learned the knowledge and skills they needed to change their community from other self-help groups they networked with nationally and internationally.

Ramesh Mishra, a famous scholar in the social welfare field, coined the term "social globalization," which is a global movement to establish social rights, including a basic minimum level of a standard of living and full inclusion in community [39]. The global network of people with disabilities and the disability rights movements fit into the category of social globalization. Within social globalization, people with disabilities become more independent, confront the everyday realities of disability oppression, make their voices heard, and control their lives.

Moreover, the social globalization of people with disabilities contains another goal beyond social political economic integration of people with disabilities. James Charlton, a leader in the international independence movement, described a goal

of disability rights movements as, “We are looking for power, not integration. If we have power, we can integrate with whom we want” (p.127) [15].

C. Citizenship: Remaining Political Issue of People with Disabilities

Although there are paradigm shift from welfare to right and people with disabilities keep trying to make their own voice for power, because still liberal individualism rules the day, almost people with disabilities as oppressed group have the right of recognition as citizens by demonstrating their capacity at whatever level into the labor force. And for those who are not able, liberal policies still support special education programs, rehabilitation programs, in attempt to create “docile bodies” [40]. Those who resist such treatments are relegated to the philanthropic protection. Especially, people with severe disabilities continue to be stigmatized as non-autonomous and dependent citizens. This is well represented by US Senator Patrick Moynihan’s claims: “*the issue of welfare is an issue of dependency. It is different from poverty. To be poor is an objective condition; to be dependent, a subjective one as well... Dependency is an incomplete state in life, normal in the child, abnormal in the adult. In a world where completed men and women stand on their own feet, persons who are dependent – as a buried imagery of the world denotes –hang.*”(p.21)[41].

This situation makes disability right activists and scholars rethink the concept of citizenship of people with disabilities. If the general concept of citizenship is based on freedom of individual or autonomy, the citizenship of people with disabilities is rooted in social conditions that nurture interdependence and community. It can be achieved by providing access to the social and material resources necessary for living independently with human dignity as an autonomous individual. The current liberal society need to support “the de-commodification of labor” which enables the decoupling of living standards of citizens from their labor market value so that they are not dependent on selling their labor power in the market. Also, government needs to change community to more accessible. Without changing community, people with disabilities cannot gain their citizenship.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper analyzed the political and economic issue of people with disabilities related to globalization and explained that economic globalization buffers Povertization (pauperization) and deprivation of people with disabilities. Globalization and neo-liberal policies put a value on market efficiency so that people with disabilities are excluded and discriminated from labor market or experience the lack of access to employment opportunity. The relative poverty and inequality of people with disabilities increase and neo liberal trend in policies reduced welfare. Within this changing global environment, the status of people with disabilities has also changed. Economically, disabled persons have been disadvantaged in and excluded from the competitive market system and have struggled with economic inequality.

On the contrary, the political response to globalization, which is characterized by global governance and the global network of people with disabilities, was seen as an attempt to tackle the problems that economic globalization has produced. Politically, globalization has rejected the earlier welfare state model, which provided a safety net. In its place, people with disabilities are creating their own global networks like DPI to make their voices heard. Economic globalization has created difficulties such as relative poverty, inequality, and deprivation of people with disabilities while political response of people with disabilities to globalization created a system of global governance that provides protection through the many projects and programs of international organizations.

Now people with disabilities are claiming power beyond welfare. Here, the power means getting freedom and opportunity that Amartya Sen noted as positive side of globalization. To get the power beyond welfare, there must be appropriate alternatives beyond neo-liberal social policies. Dani Rodrik warned as following, “maintaining adequate safety nets for those at the bottom of the income distribution would not break the bank” [23]. The phrase could be changed to, “The world will not go bankrupt from the expenses of setting up adequate and appropriate individual support for people with disabilities and providing appropriate social conditions so that they can live on equal terms with non-disabled people.” Also, people with disabilities have to have their own citizenship. It can be achieved by community changes and the de-commodification of labor, with the recognition that every human being is interdependent.

REFERENCES

- [1] Market fundamentalism (or free-market fundamentalism) is a term coined by George Soros, to criticize the belief that the free market is always beneficial to society. As it is a pejorative term, the people and organizations it refers to will generally reject the label. The meaning can be considered economic liberalism or laissez-faire capitalism applied logically and consistently in all fields.
- [2] Neo-liberalism represents the antithesis of Keynesian social democratic policy. It is a historically-specific reemergence of economic liberalism among economic scholars and policy-makers during the 1970s and through at least the late-1990s, and possibly into the present
- [3] Sen, A.: Why human security? Presentation paper at the International Symposium on Human Security in Tokyo, July, 2000.
- [4] Hurrell, A. and Woods, N.: Inequality, globalization, and world politics. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [5] Dicken, P.: Global Shift: The internationalization of economic activity. 2nd ed., New York: Guilford Press, 1992.
- [6] Bretherton, C. and Ponton, G.: Global Politics: an introduction. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- [7] Robertson, R.: Globalization: social theory and global culture. London: Sage, 1992.
- [8] Shaw, M.: Global Society and International Relations: sociological concepts and political perspectives. Cambridge, UK; Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 1994.
- [9] Neufeld, M.: Theorizing Globalization: Toward a Politics of Resistance – Neo-Gramesian Response to Mathias Albert, Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations, Vol. 15: 93-106, 2001.
- [10] United Nations: UN Millennium Report: Globalization and Governance. Eds. Kofi A. Annan. (Available at: <http://www.un.org/millennium/sg-report/>) 2000.
- [11] International Labor Office: Globalization, Labor and Migration: Protection is paramount, Perspectives on Labor Migration 3E, International Migration Program, Geneva: International Labor Office, 2003.

- [12] Sandmo, A.: Globalization and the Welfare State: More Inequality – Less Redistribution?. Discussion Paper at the Conference of the European Institute of Social Security, Bergen, Sep., 2001
- [13] Stienstra, D.: Disabling globalization: rethinking global political economy with a disability lens. *Global Society*, Vol.16: 109-121, 2002.
- [14] Stone, E.: Disability and development in the majority world. In: *Disability and Development: Learning from Action and Research on Disability in the Majority World*. Eds. E. Stone. Leeds: Disability Press, 1999.
- [15] Charlton, J.I.: *Nothing about us without us*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- [16] Binde, J., and Appadurai, A.: *Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.
- [17] Chossudovsky, M.: *The Globalization of Poverty*. London: Zed Books, 1997.
- [18] Sklair, L.: *Sociology of the Global System*. 2nd ed., Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- [19] Sassen, S.: *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: New Press, 1998.
- [20] The Povertization of Women: A Global Phenomenon. Nichols-Casebolt et al. *Affilia*. 1994; 9-29.
- [21] Fischer, A., Franke, K. and Rompel, M. (Eds.): *Disability and Development Policy Paper*. Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit. 2006.
- [22] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: *Transforming Disability into Ability: Policies to promote work and income security for disabled people*, 2003.
- [23] Rodrik, D.: Sense and nonsense in the globalization debate. *Foreign Policy*, Summer107: 19-37, 1997.
- [24] Holden, C. and Beresford, P.: *Globalization and Disability*. In: *Disability Studies Today*, eds. C. Barnes, M. Oliver, & L. Barton. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- [25] Cox, R.H.: The Consequences of Welfare Reform: How Conceptions of Social Rights are changing. *International Social Policy* 27: 1-14. 1998.
- [26] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: *Social expenditure Statistics of OECD Members Countries*, 2003.
- [27] Elwan, A.: *Poverty and Disability: A Survey of the Literature* Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 9932. The World Bank Group, Dec. 1999.
- [28] Department for International Development (2000), *Disability, poverty and development* (available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/disability.pdf>)
- [29] International Labor Office: *Employment of people with disabilities: The impact of legislation*. Report of a Technical Consultation in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 20-22, Geneva: International Labor Office. 2002
- [30] Metts, R.: *Disability issues, trends and recommendations for the World Bank*. 2000. (available at: http://siteresourcesqa.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/Overview/Disability_Issues_Trend_and_Recommendations_for_the_WB.pdf.)
- [31] Howard, M.: An 'interactionist' perspective on barriers and bridges to work for disabled people. Commissioned for Institute for Public Policy Research, *Disability and Work*, 2003
- [32] Oliver, M.: *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd. 1996
- [33] Bonnel, R.: *Poverty reduction strategies: Their importance for disability*. The World Bank, Disability and Development Team, 2004
- [34] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.: *Sickness, Disability and Work: Key figures and data on low employment rates of people with disability and high disability benefit recipiency rates in many OECD countries*, 2010.
- [35] Fujiura, G.: *Disablement in the Third World: Demography of living standards, health, and poverty*. Proposal submitted to NIDRR. Chicago: Department of Disability and Human Development, 2000.
- [36] See "Towards Full Social Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities" declaration of Jan. 29, 2003 at http://www.coe.int/T/E/Communication_and_Research/Press/events/2.-Parliamentary_Assembly_Sessions/2003/2003-01&uscore;Winter_session/ONG_Decl.asp.
- [37] See Ann Elwan, "Poverty and Disability: A Survey of the Literature," Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 9932, The World Bank Group, Dec. 1999.
- [38] Beresford, P. and Holden, C.: *We Have Choices: Globalization and welfare user movements*, *Disability & Society*, 15: 7, pp973-989. 2000.
- [39] Mishra, R.: *Globalization and the welfare state*. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: E. Elgar, 1999.
- [40] Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books
- [41] Fraser, N. & Gordon, L. (1997). *A Genealogy of dependency: Tracking a keyword of the US welfare state*. P.121-150, *Justice Interrupts: Critical Reflections on the Post-socialist Condition*. Edited by Nancy Fraser. NY: Routledge.

Jihye Jeon received B.A. and M.A. in Social Welfare from Yonsei University in Seoul, South Korea in 2000 and 2002 respectively. She received another M.A. in Social Policy and Planning from London School of Economics and Political Sciences, UK in 2004 and received Ph.D. in Disability Study from University of Illinois at Chicago, USA in 2014. She is currently senior researcher in Korea Disabled People's Development Institute under Ministry of Health and Welfare.