

THE SOCIAL ECONOMY

Working alternatives in a globalizing era

ROUTLEDGE

RETHINKING
Globalizations

Hasmet M. Uluorta



The Social Economy

Critically examining economic developments within the last sixty years, this book argues that a crisis in global social reproduction is altering existing understandings of work, labour and the economy.

The author of this original volume, Hasmet M. Uluorta, contends that the crisis in the global economy is triggering a potential paradigm shift from one defined under the rubric of Employment to an alternative theorized as Work. Discussing the Employment paradigm that formed the dominant mode of development after World War II through to the 1970s, the author considers the economic and political forces that resulted in its eventual decline.

Focusing on already existing practices of organizations and workers in Toronto, Canada, the book goes on to consider the shift to Work and the consequent rise in the social economy which has broken down conventional categories of work and leisure. The author concludes that the social economy presents fundamental challenges to understandings that underpinned the previous economic order.

Building on insights from a range of disciplines, *The Social Economy* will be of interest to students and scholars of international political economy, international relations, labour studies, sociology, and globalization studies.

Hasmet M. Uluorta is Visiting Assistant Professor at the Department of International Studies at the University of Miami. He is the former Associate Director of the Stanford Center on Ethics at Stanford University.

Rethinking globalizations

Edited by Barry Gills

University of Newcastle, UK

This series is designed to break new ground in the literature on globalization and its academic and popular understanding. Rather than perpetuating or simply reacting to the economic understanding of globalization, this series seeks to capture the term and broaden its meaning to encompass a wide range of issues and disciplines and convey a sense of alternative possibilities for the future.

1. Whither Globalization?

The vortex of knowledge and globalization

James H. Mittelman

2. Globalization and Global History

Edited by Barry K. Gills and William R. Thompson

3. Rethinking Civilization

Communication and terror in the global village

Majid Tehranian

4. Globalization and Contestation

The new great counter-movement

Ronaldo Munck

5. Global Activism

Ruth Reitan

6. Globalization, the City and Civil Society in Pacific Asia

Edited by Mike Douglass, K. C. Ho and Giok Ling Ooi

7. Challenging Euro-America's Politics of Identity

The return of the native

Jorge Luis Andrade Fernandes

8. The Global Politics of Globalization

'Empire' vs 'cosmopolis'

Edited by Barry K. Gills

9. The Globalization of Environmental Crisis

Edited by Jan Oosthoek and Barry K. Gills

10. Globalization as Evolutionary Process

Modeling global change

Edited by Geroje Modelski, Tessaleno Devezas and William R. Thompson

11. The Political Economy of Global Security

War, future crises and changes in global governance

Heikki Patomäki

12. Cultures of Globalization

Coherence, hybridity,
contestation

*Edited by Kevin Archer, M. Martin
Bosman, M. Mark Amen and
Ella Schmidt*

**13. Globalization and the Global
Politics of Justice**

Edited by Barry K. Gills

14. Global Economy Contested

Power and conflict across the
international division of labor

Edited by Marcus Taylor

**15. Rethinking Insecurity, War
and Violence**

Beyond savage globalization?

*Edited by Damian Grenfell and
Paul James*

16. Recognition and Redistribution

Beyond international development

*Edited by Heloise Weber and Mark
T. Berger*

17. The Social Economy

Working alternatives in a
globalizing era

Hasmet M. Uluorta

For Anne, whose aesthetics, labour and reflections
make all possible

The Social Economy

Working alternatives in a globalizing era

Hasmet M. Uluorta

First published 2009 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group,
an informa business*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2008.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s
collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

© 2009 Hasmet M. Uluorta

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or
reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic,
mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter
invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any
information storage or retrieval system, without permission in
writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN 0-203-88430-2 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 10: 0-415-77593-0 (hbk)
ISBN 10: 0-203-88430-2 (ebk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-77593-9 (hbk)
ISBN 13: 978-0-203-88430-0 (ebk)

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
 Working alternatives: an introduction	 1
<i>Contextualizing social reproduction</i>	6
<i>The crisis of social reproduction and the paradigm shift from Employment to Work</i>	9
<i>Case study: the social economy</i>	11
<i>Book organization</i>	16
<i>Afterword</i>	19
 1 The Employment paradigm	 20
<i>Engineering the Employment paradigm's regime of accumulation</i>	21
<i>Engineering the Employment paradigm's mode of régulation</i>	26
<i>The political economy of the Employment paradigm</i>	28
<i>Hailing the subject of the Employment paradigm</i>	32
<i>Afterword</i>	38
 2 The Work paradigm	 39
<i>Transformative forces in the post-Employment era: capital, neo-liberalism and the United States</i>	40
<i>Employment capitalism and the structuring of the Anglo-Saxon model</i>	46
<i>The Work paradigm</i>	50
<i>Afterword</i>	58

3	Unpacking economy	60
	<i>Conceiving labour: economy as objective manifestation</i>	61
	<i>Conceiving labour: economy as social manifestation</i>	64
	<i>Labouring for social reproduction</i>	69
	<i>Bringing it all together at home</i>	75
	<i>Afterword</i>	79
4	Unessential economy	82
	<i>From rationalism to reflexivity</i>	83
	<i>From dualism to différance</i>	88
	<i>From metanarratives to heterotopia</i>	92
	<i>Afterword</i>	96
5	Methodology and case study	98
	<i>Study objectives</i>	98
	<i>Methodology</i>	99
	<i>Social economy classification schema</i>	103
	<i>Sampling methodology</i>	105
	<i>Case study introduction: Toronto social economy organizations</i>	108
	<i>Characteristics of staff respondents</i>	116
	<i>Afterword</i>	122
6	Structuring the Work paradigm: the consumption of labour-power	123
	<i>Overall changes in work, 2000 to 2003: single-variant analysis</i>	124
	<i>Overall changes in work, 2000 to 2003: bivariate analysis</i>	131
	<i>Working futures</i>	140
	<i>Afterword</i>	143
7	Structuring the Work paradigm: (re)production of labour-power	144
	<i>Conceptualizing the Work paradigm: economies in différance</i>	144
	<i>Beyond rationalism: reflexivity and economies</i>	149
	<i>Working economies: multiactive labour-power</i>	153
	<i>Heterotopias at work</i>	156
	<i>Afterword</i>	166

8 Conclusion: towards a political economy of work	168
<i>A recap of the Employment and Work paradigms</i>	<i>169</i>
<i>Empirical findings</i>	<i>171</i>
<i>Paradigms lost</i>	<i>173</i>
<i>Appendix A: Organization Survey</i>	<i>175</i>
<i>Appendix B: Worker Survey</i>	<i>184</i>
<i>Notes</i>	<i>193</i>
<i>Bibliography</i>	<i>220</i>
<i>Index</i>	<i>237</i>

Illustrations

Tables

0.1	Critique of terms used in place of the social economy	13
0.2	Social economy characteristics	14
1.1	Features of the Employment paradigm	21
6.1	Change in paid work, 2000–3	125
6.2	Gross domestic product composition	130
7.1	Top five reasons for working in the social economy: paid workers	152
7.2	Top five reasons for working in the social economy: non-paid workers	152
8.1	From Employment to Work	172

Figures

2.1	Neo-liberal model unemployment rates	46
2.2	Regulation and employment generation	47
2.3	‘Official’ versus ‘U-6’ unemployment rates	48
2.4	Educational requirements and the composition of the Canadian paid labour market	50
3.1	Relationships between market, state, and social economies	67
3.2	Workscapes	68
4.1	Basis for employment generation in Keynesian economics	86
5.1	Primary fields of activity (CCRA) and percentage growth	111
5.2	Primary fields of activity (ICNPO)	112
5.3	Revenue sources: average contribution and frequency	114
5.4	Revenue sources: institutional composition	115
5.5	Composition of expenses	116
5.6	Age composition of workers	117
5.7	Educational attainment	119
5.8	Primary fields of organizational activity (CCRA)	120
5.9	Primary fields of organizational activity (ICNPO)	121

6.1	Changes in work generation 2000–3	124
6.2	Part-time paid work, 1975 to 2002	127
6.3	CCRA and changes in work generation 2000–3	131
6.4a	ICNPO and changes in work generation 2000–3 (paid work)	133
6.4b	ICNPO and changes in work generation 2000–3 (non-paid work)	133
6.5	Scope and changes in work generation 2000–3	134
6.6	Budget and changes in work generation 2000–3	136
6.7	Size: budgetary composition and average contribution	137
6.8	Epochs and changes in work generation 2000–3	138
6.9	Epochs: Social Services and Arts, Recreation and Leisure	140
6.10	CCRA futures	141
6.11	Epoch futures	142
7.1	Social economy as a temporary manifestation	145
7.2	Social economy exists to assist transition to market economy: age groups	146
7.3	Unemployment rate by age group, 1980–2003	147
7.4	Social economy exists due to corporate support: educational attainment	148
7.5	Wage level comparisons between the social economy and the market economy: educational attainment	150
7.6	Reasons for working in the social economy: paid work and non-paid work	152
7.7	Recognition of multiactivity: gender	154
7.8	Weekly percentage composition of multiactivity: gender	155
7.9	Distinguishing between paid work and non-paid work: gender	157
7.10	Distinguishing between paid work and non-paid work: paid work classification	158
7.11a	Work rankings (part 1)	159
7.11b	Work rankings (part 2)	160
7.12	Feel strain with multiactive engagements: work type classification	162
7.13	Weekly percentage composition of multiactivity: paid work classification	165

Acknowledgements

This book is a heterotopic affair. It was written between immigration visas, life-changes, different cities and caf  s as well as in and out of a variety of university settings. I wish to express my profound thanks to my family for their encouragement and understanding of the many challenges and sacrifices along the way. This project would not have been possible if it were not for the willingness of organizations and members of the Toronto social economy to participate. I thank them for their invaluable contribution. I remain grateful for the support I received from the Department of Political Science at York University, the Politics Department at the University of California, Santa Cruz, the Stanford Center on Ethics at Stanford University and to the International Studies Department at the University of Miami. As such this research is a result of a broad scholarly community situated across time and space but whose reflections and echoes filled my thoughts.

Dr Jan Nederveen Pieterse has been a constant source of intellectual stimulation, insisting on the acknowledgement of alternative development practices as well as the examination of the politics of alternative development. Dr Stephen Gill's insistence on and modelling of the pursuit to develop new theory without intimidation as a means to better explain current global structural reforms has been invaluable. Dr Lawrence Quill provided access and the necessary amusement for an understanding of political philosophy. Dr Barry Gills, editor of the Routledge *Rethinking Globalizations* book series, understood the significance of this project and supported its inclusion in this series.

This book would not exist however if it were not for two people: Dr Isabella Bakker and Anne Kim. As an instructor, mentor and friend Dr Bakker remained committed to this project by encouraging, prodding, editing, supporting and guiding me through to its completion. Anne Kim made everything possible with her care, scholarly engagements and skeptical belief in my theoretical conceptions. Her allowing me to monopolize conversations to discuss work, labour, multiactivity and the social economy as well as technical issues concerning web pages, databases and secure socket protocols has enriched this project beyond what I could have conceived on my own. Any misrepresentations or shortcomings with the ideas and arguments nonetheless are undoubtedly mine.

Abbreviations

BNA	British North America Act
CAD	Canadian Dollars
CCF	Cooperative Commonwealth Federation
CCRA	Canada Customs and Revenue Agency
EU	European Union
FNPW	Female Non-Paid Work
FPTPW	Female Part-Time Paid Work
FPW	Female Paid Work
FTPW	Full-Time Paid Work
HTML	Hypertext Markup Language
HTTPS	Hypertext Transfer Protocol over Secure Socket Layer
ICNPO	International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations
LETS	Local Exchange Trading Systems
NETS	New Employment Opportunities in the Third Sector
NPW	Non-Paid Work
PTPW	Part-Time Paid Work
PW	Paid Work
SSL	Secure Sockets Layer
US	United States
VSI	Voluntary Sector Initiative
WES	Workplace and Employee Survey

Working alternatives

An introduction

Nearly one-third of the labour force in the OECD is currently unemployed. Globally, official unemployment reached its highest recorded levels in 2003 at 185.9 million.¹ Besides unemployment, there is massive underemployment, a condition that many nations have identified in one way or another with catchy colloquialisms:

- overeducated and underemployed (Canada);
- the new underclass or digital divide (United States);
- the 40:30:30 society (United Kingdom);
- the two-thirds/one-third society (Germany);
- the two-speeds society, the socially excluded and socially expelled (France);
- the A-team and the B-team (Denmark).

In recent years, electoral platforms that have prioritized strategies to overcome high levels of unemployment and underemployment have resulted in success. These successes include Jean Chrétien's Liberal party in the 1993 Canadian elections; Gerhard Schröder's 1998 Social Democrats and Angela Merkel's 2005 Christian Democratic Union in Germany; Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva's 2002 Workers' Party victory in Brazil; and Nicolas Sarkozy's 2007 Union for a Popular Movement victory in France. All of these political parties spent their campaigns talking about the employment issue; none of their victories solved the problem of unemployment and underemployment.

Scholarship has also turned to an examination of employment generation. One noted constellation of scholars proposes a transition to a knowledge economy as its solution. Proponents of this notion include scholars such as Robert Reich and Richard Florida, who maintain that the knowledge economy represents an unprecedented opportunity for employment generation with a global demand for high-waged jobs. For Reich, workers in this knowledge economy are referred to as 'symbolic analysts'.² For Florida, they comprise the emergent 'creative class'.³ Regardless of what they call them, the encouragement of this form of employment, according to these scholars, is what policy-makers should focus on.

2 *Working alternatives: an introduction*

This contrasts sharply with alternative scholarship in the area of employment studies. Scholars such as Jeremy Rifkin, André Gorz, and Ulrich Beck do not believe in the salvation promised by the knowledge economy. Instead they posit that technological changes, rather than transforming employment (from industrial to knowledge work), will lead to the end of employment as it is currently understood.

According to Rifkin, the acceleration in new technologies today is triggering a crisis with no historical correlative.⁴ To illustrate his point he describes the African American experience in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, a time when technological changes in agriculture were quickly displacing traditional employment opportunities in the American south.⁵ The difference between then and now, according to Rifkin, is that new forms of employment were being generated in the industrializing north and hence compensating for the losses in the south. This is not occurring today. Technology is still able to make labour redundant but it now does so in an era when our societies have been unable to generate new compensatory forms of employment.

André Gorz makes a similar argument but with theoretical distinctions. Gorz distinguishes for example between Marxist categories of abstracted and socially necessary labour. This approach enables him, unlike Rifkin, to provide a theory as to why technological change takes place and what the implications are for workers. Nevertheless, like Rifkin, he argues against the strategy for full employment championed by liberal scholarship and mainstream policy-makers. He argues instead for a greater distribution of existing employment that would thereby free individuals to pursue more socially meaningful pursuits. According to Gorz, these pursuits equal a shift away from capitalist to non-capitalist forms of employment, a means by which society may 'reclaim work' and hence free the individual from the subjectivity constraints imposed by capitalist social relations of production. In short Gorz theorizes the emancipation of the individual from the confines of alienated labour in the market economy and hence brings the role of the subject into the debate.

The subject is also highlighted in the work of Ulrich Beck, but through the lens of what he refers to as the emergence of global risk society. According to Beck, risk is the inability of the existing institutional order to foresee and control the consequences of industrial society.⁶ In terms of employment, this global risk manifests as the 'Brazilification of the West' – the global growth of employment insecurity that occurs when precarious forms of employment (e.g., lack of full-time work, low wages, threat of worker reductions through capital flight) expand and are coupled with the rationing of social welfare provisions.⁷

According to Beck, the 'Brazilification of the West' can be detrimental for democracies. Increased risk triggers a decline in civic engagements and leads to the further hollowing out of nation-based democratic politics. However, it can also be transformative and unifying. According to Beck, risks that are

simultaneously global and democratic are providing opportunities for a new form of democratic politics. People across boundaries are recognizing that they have a common problem and potentially a common solution. Experiences are becoming validated and, in this way, risk sharing is becoming the basis for new forms of collective action.⁸

However, much like Gorz and Rifkin, the way forward for Beck is not a return to the impossibility of full employment. It is the removal of the insecurity associated with currently precarious employment practices. In other words flexibility can serve as a solution to global risk society rather than as a trigger for its intensification. To illustrate his point, Beck posits two future scenarios that he believes would reinvigorate democracy and end the present crisis in employment.⁹ The first involves the activation of paid civil labour within the national voluntary sector. The second activates this same force of paid labour but on a transnational basis. Both involve the displacement, but not the replacement, of the market economy by the voluntary sector.

The common denominator for both liberal and alternative theorists of the employment crisis is the assumption that the current crisis is an opportunity for alternative global employment futures. For Florida and Reich this opportunity lies within the knowledge economy and its proliferation of 'cultural creatives' and 'symbolic analysts'. Policy-makers and political elites have generally accepted this supply-side framing of the future of employment. However I would argue that it is, at best, utopian and, at worst, an ineffectual and therefore ultimately detrimental basis for policy formation. It is not that these new forms of employment are not being generated – they are – but in what numbers and to what extent? Can the knowledge economy really solve the current global crisis in employment? Scholars and policy-makers who support the liberal notion of a transition to a knowledge economy continue to base their solutions on a painfully simple and familiar question: how is it possible to generate employment? In this sense their focus remains converged on employment generation in the capitalist market economy and to a lesser extent within the state economy, and their solutions will only support and underwrite the current hegemonic capitalist market development that defines employment as paid work and nothing more.¹⁰

Alternative theorists, on the other hand, collectively call for a complete re-theorization of employment itself culminating in a demand for the better distribution of existing paid work (e.g., reduced working times) and for an increase in paid work in the voluntary sector. While I agree with these alternative re-theorizations of employment I believe that they still lack a full theorization of *alternative global working futures*. Specifically they do not theorize the distinctions between employment and labour and, as a result, fail to abandon the binary distinction between paid work (employment) and non-paid work in the market, state, and social economies. Their acceptance of this arbitrary distinction is significant because it also implies a tacit acceptance of the distinction between a salary or wage and a 'shadow wage',¹¹ 'guaranteed income'¹² or 'civic money'.¹³

4 *Working alternatives: an introduction*

More troubling though is that they remain in the realm of futurist literature by failing to adequately reflect on existing work practices. For example, alternative work theorizations silo labour expended in the market and voluntary sector in terms of either/or. But individuals do not work in either the market economy or the social economy. As discussed in Chapters 6–8, many individuals work across economies, expending their labour in both the market and social economies. This reality moves beyond the either/or theorization exemplified by Rifkin, Gorz and Beck. Boundaries become fuzzy; the work done in and through economies becomes blurred. In short, existing work practices do not conform to either/or. Rather they conform more readily to both/and. Also Rifkin, Gorz and Beck's articulations assume that work exists out there, whether 'out there' is the market economy or the social economy. Missing is the work done within the household or other sites of labour production and consumption. As feminist scholarship points out the household is also a site of work. According to political economists Isabella Bakker and Stephen Gill, the basis of the market economy and all production is in fact reliant upon the work done within the household.¹⁴

Linked to this critique is the lack of agency that all of these conceptualizations present. Reich, Florida, Rifkin, Gorz and Beck all posit agency with capital. Like an all-powerful force, global capital swoops in to deterritorialize individuals, communities and nations. As passive objects we only know the power of capital as it manifests outside social and democratic control. Reich and Florida present a future without options – individuals and states must simply conform to the 'reality' of a knowledge economy or suffer at the hands of a vengeful deity. Rifkin, similarly, presents a future devoid of politics. For him, the future is one brought about by and limited to technological developments.

Gorz, unlike Rifkin, prioritizes the necessary struggle for the recovery of human subjectivity that post-Fordist capitalist accumulation denies. Yet his sympathetic discussion of the 'programmed society' posited by Alain Touraine presents a striking challenge to his own aim of reclaiming work and subjectivity.¹⁵ Lost within this articulation is a focus on existing working alternatives and more broadly the political contestations and struggles that provide shape to this globalizing era.

Beck is the only theorist who truly foregrounds politics in his work by suggesting that the shift to global risk society presents an opening to a renewed politics that extends beyond legislatures and parliaments. In this conceptualization politics is activated in spheres that were previously ignored, such as the household. In a sense Beck echoes the feminist assertion that 'the personal is political'. Yet the precariousness of labour, the emergence of world risk society, and the resulting strategies to overcome this new human condition go beyond Beck's assertion of an emergent politics. Rather they point to an embedding of labour within the social through what I refer to as an already present consciousness of *being-in-the-world-with-others*.

This analysis of an emergent consciousness focuses explicitly on the agency of those who are already engaged in alternative working futures. Derived from the Heideggerian conceptualization of *dasein*, *being-in-the-world-with-others* refers to a state of being in which the individual is always already fully engaged in the social.¹⁶ This challenges the atomistic disembedding of neo-liberal globalization and the individualism of global risk society by arguing that, in an era of intensifying globalization, individuals are constantly hybridizing with their perpetual others. In the face of employment insecurity and global risk society, it is this new consciousness rather than the end of solidarity that exemplifies already existing alternative working futures.

The critical analysis of working futures provided by Rifkin, Gorz and Beck cannot be discounted. Yet their alternative analyses of work are incomplete. They do not sufficiently address the distinctions between work, employment, and labour. They do not account for the household and the time spent performing other activities. Also, an alternative analysis of work does not require a utopian vision of a possible future. Analysis can and must focus on already existing practices and conceptions of working alternatives.

This book therefore provides a corrective to the utopian conceptualizations that characterize the theorizations put forward by Rifkin, Gorz and Beck. The utopian label arises from their assertion that a possible future can exist that combines both paid and voluntary work. An examination of already existing practices reveals that this future already exists, but not in the way envisioned. Existing examples reveal new practices and, potentially more important, new understandings of 'work'. The theorization of work and the individuals who engage in it cannot proceed in such discrete terms that describe some as working in the voluntary sector while others remain in the market economy. Instead, by taking existing working practices as a starting point, it becomes clear that individuals work across economies and within various activities within those economies. Stemming from the socially necessary work done in the household and continuing through to the voluntary, market and state economies, work therefore must be conceived as multiple and hybrid rather than singular and fixed.

In short, within the political economy of the everyday, practices already exist that challenge the hegemonic conceptions of work and economy. These practices reveal that the current crisis in employment is not necessarily that of numbers (number of jobs), technology, or paid/unpaid dialectics. Rather it is a crisis of a deeper fundamental nature – a crisis of social reproduction. 'The crisis,' Gramsci writes, referring to the capitalist crises of the 1930s, 'consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born'.¹⁷ The resolution of the current crisis therefore cannot be found by fine-tuning the existing paradigm with the supply of 'cultural creatives' or the siphoning off of the excess of humanity to the voluntary sector.¹⁸ The existing paradigm is constitutive of a crisis of social reproduction and it is only through this lens that a more thorough re-theorization of work is made possible.

Contextualizing social reproduction

The concept of social reproduction has been taken up most notably by political economists in the feminist tradition such as Isabella Bakker, Pat Armstrong and Hugh Armstrong, and Meg Luxton, and sociologists such as Pierre Bourdieu.¹⁹ However, social reproduction remains a highly contested term. Feminist political economists define social reproduction as:

both biological reproduction of the species ... and ongoing reproduction of the commodity labour power. In today's world involving social reproduction involves institutions, processes and social relations associated with the *creation and maintenance of communities* – and upon which, ultimately, all production and exchange rests. [original emphasis]²⁰

Central to a feminist understanding of social reproduction is the existence of a gendered division of labour that subordinates the reproductive work done in the household to work that is performed in the market and state economies. This bifurcation of work into paid/non-paid, public/private and productive/unproductive is arbitrary. As Meg Luxton and June Corman write, 'working-class households are those dependent on both the wages earned by one or more household members and the domestic labour that converts the wages into usable goods and services for household subsistence'.²¹ In other words, social reproduction is based on the necessary symbiosis of both waged and unwaged labour. However, it is only waged labour that is valued as productive.

Scholars, such as Bakker, build on this theorization of social reproduction by unpacking the placement and association of gender in the economy. They utilize case studies to indicate that current global structural reforms are undermining the existing foundations of social reproduction (e.g., women's non-paid work, the welfare state, the environment) thereby constituting a crisis. As Bakker suggests, gender is becoming more muted and amplified as a result of the current global structural reforms.

These global structural reforms are driven by the hegemonic processes of what Stephen Gill refers to as disciplinary neo-liberalism.²² Gill identifies three ways in which the social is subordinated to capital within disciplinary neo-liberalism:

- 1 **Politically.** Adherents of this model seek the submission of the state, society and labour to its utopian vision of 'free enterprise'. In terms of the state, this has meant the cutting of public expenditures, deregulation and the ideological positioning of the state as deficient (e.g., efficient allocation of capital). Society, in turn, has been made largely irrelevant as notions of the public or community good are effaced by the political project of privatization. Labour has also been impacted by the removal

of the historic compromise struck after World War II, exposing it to the unmediated power of capital.

- 2 **Economically.** This involves the introduction of neo-classical economics, which prioritizes the market economy as an objective manifestation. Disciplinary neo-liberalism is pragmatic and unequal in terms of the application and exposure to market forces. Anything that detracts from ensuring 'efficient market exchanges' (e.g., trade unions, unenforceable property laws) would by definition have to be eliminated.
- 3 **Historically and Spatially.** Gill situates disciplinary neo-liberalism within this era of intensifying globalization. This is signified by the use of 'neo' to indicate a new kind of liberalism. Global in scope, it is underpinned by the structural power of transnational capital and the United States.

Within disciplinary neo-liberalism, the feminization of labour extends beyond that of the gendered division of labour to the gendering of labour. This can be seen in the form of de-unionization, low-paid service sector employment, and the rise of part-time employment. This re-definition of gender is significant in that it clearly moves discussion away from gender roles to that of social construction and world orders in relation to production. It is a gendered 'harmonizing down' as the position of men deteriorates and the pressure on women to 'step up' increases. The crisis of social reproduction, therefore, becomes more readily an outcome of both the gendered division of labour (with value placed on paid work) and the feminization of work in the current global political economy. As such, emphasis within this literature is placed on the (re)production of the productive subject.

Janine Brodie adds to this literature on the crisis of social reproduction by linking it to subjectivity.²³ As she suggests, current restructuring is not merely an economic exercise with deeply gendered outcomes but is also constructive of a new subject or citizen. Brodie argues:

[r]eprivatization discourse is increasingly framed in terms of a new definition of citizenship which denies that the citizen can claim universal social rights from the state. The new common good is one which promotes efficiency and competition. In turn, the good citizen is one who recognizes the limits and liabilities of state intervention and, instead, works longer and harder in order to become self-reliant.²⁴

Brodie's argument embeds the production of subjectivity within the political contestation that exists between social forces. In doing so, she draws specific attention to the role played by ideology in the construction of subjectivity.

Pierre Bourdieu also utilizes ideology in his theorization of social reproduction.²⁵ Bourdieu's project, nevertheless, is dissimilar from that of feminist political economists in that his focus is on the structuring of social being. That is, Bourdieu conceptualizes social reproduction as the consistent ideational production of society rather than the contradictory material production of

commodity labour. Social reproduction therefore is the tendency for fields (i.e., institutions), such as education, to reproduce existing social hierarchies through their ability to differentially reward those who accept their legitimacy. These fields are what Bourdieu refers to as the structured habitus or personal environment. The habitus is connected to the individual on both a conscious and subconscious level. As Bourdieu argues, '[t]he agent engaged in practice knows the world . . . too well, bound up with it; he inhabits it like a garment . . . he feels at home in the world because the world is also in him, in the form of the habitus'.²⁶

The conceptualization of the habitus in relation to social reproduction is both the strength and limitation of Bourdieu's theorization. By conceiving the habitus as structured beyond economics, Bourdieu brings forward a varied and uneven field of cultural, economic, social and symbolic capital.²⁷ It is their uneven distribution and valuation that is said to reproduce the existing society. In reference to symbolic capital, for example, Bourdieu writes, 'the realistic, even resigned, or fatalistic, dispositions which lead members of the dominated classes to put up with objective conditions that would be judged intolerable or revolting by agents otherwise disposed . . . help to reproduce the conditions of oppression'.²⁸ Subordination therefore becomes a sort of rational coping strategy while at the same time reproducing the same social hierarchies.

Yet in this conceptualization Bourdieu produces a form of economic determinism not in the sense of base-superstructure dichotomies but by assuming that individual motivation is due to a neo-classical economic motivation (self-interest) and an anthropological conception (status). While the inclusion of status is a welcome development, economic motivations cannot be reduced to either of these classifications. Is engagement in non-paid work within the voluntary sector due to self-interest? Is there status to be gained by these sorts of engagements? The answer is undoubtedly yes, but only in some instances and for some individuals. Equally important are motivations stemming from a sense of community, responsibility, solidarity, hope, care and dependence, which is better understood as forming the consciousness of *being-in-the-world-with-others*.

This is precisely the point raised by political economy scholars who highlight the differentiated motivations for female non-paid work within the household. Yet their arguments often remain insufficient due to their emphasis on the household. With the burgeoning growth of non-governmental organizations, community groups, informal care networks and the like, the household is but one space within the larger social economy. These divergent motivations, however, are not inconsequential. They undermine the architecture of the existing institutional order that is predicated on the utopics of market economics. As such, they provide the material basis for social transformation.

For Bourdieu there is little chance of social transformation due to the arbitrary nature of social norms. Bourdieu provides an overly deterministic

view of the potential for social transformation when he writes of the habitus as 'an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted, the habitus engenders *all the thoughts, all the perceptions, and all the actions* consistent with those conditions *and no others*' (emphasis added).²⁹ Yet beyond indicating that it is elite-driven, this theorization cannot adequately indicate why cultural, economic, social and symbolic capital is structured to favour the elite minority over the majority. Are elite rule and dominant culture synonymous? Is the social economy also an equally important site for the creation of various forms of capital? Is it possible that the capital produced in the social economy may differ from that produced and controlled by the state or market economies? This theorization posits that transformation, if possible, is only achieved uni-directionally by adopting rather than altering or decentering the sources of social, cultural and economic capital.

Therefore, for Bourdieu, this inability to change the constitution of the various forms of capital leads to social reproduction – that is, reproduction of the status quo. Bourdieu is not interested in how institutions are themselves structured. Rather, he places significance on how institutions structure the social. In this sense social reproduction forms a seamless and virtuous circle. Political economy scholars, however, conceptualize social reproduction as a contingent process predicated on the specificities of a mode of *régulation* and regime of accumulation.³⁰ Subject to politics, social reproduction therefore is not assured and instead is open to contestation with the potential for transformation through social compromise and revolution.

The discussion in this book begins from this opening to contestation. This is an entirely different problematic from that defined by Bourdieu, and more readily identifiable yet differentiated from the project initiated by feminist political economy scholars. In contradistinction to Bourdieu, this discussion centres on alternatives since this project already assumes a crisis in social reproduction. It is due to this crisis that new and alternative development strategies are manifesting in the form of material practices and ideational re-orientations in the social economy. The starting point of this book therefore is the middle; it is an examination of the social economy as it is situated between what I refer to as the Employment paradigm and an emergent Work paradigm.

The crisis of social reproduction and the paradigm shift from Employment to Work

One of the central arguments of this book is that a paradigm shift is underway from Employment to Work. By employment I mean, 'an activity carried out: for someone else; in return for a wage; according to forms and time schedules laid down by the person paying the wage; and for a purpose not chosen by the worker'.³¹ Employment is therefore an external imposition onto the self and easily located (i.e., factory floor, office). Employment within the

same occupation, however, may have a differential impact on the self as the social relations of production may be varied. Nevertheless, the normalization of employment and the resultant social relations of production are a manufactured outcome of capitalist hegemony and constitutive of the Employment paradigm.

Work, conversely, is *what we do*. It is premised on a broader conceptualization of productivity, as production is conceived of as directed not solely for production and consumption but also for social reproduction. As such, work is not easily located on the factory floor or office but is instead dispersed throughout a multiplicity of sites within the social, state and market economies. In this sense there is no shortage of work to be done. Inclusive of the work done in the market economy and state economy, the Work paradigm expands labour and the ensuing social relations of production to include housework, environmental reclamation, elderly care, childcare, self work, neighbourhood revitalization and so on.

The paradigm of Employment is in Gramscian terms the 'old' paradigm: a period of time and a system of thought that associated labour with formal full-time employment, and subjectivity with that found in the employment-as-identity nexus. The new, on the other hand, may well be an emerging paradigm of Work that challenges the assumptions that demarcate labour with formal, full-time employment. As such, the new also addresses other forms of labour-power manifestations that are commonly overlooked and purposely negated by academics, policymakers and other stakeholders. Specifically, the focus of this work is on the production and reproduction of labour-power in its full manifestation as both paid and non-paid work.

These manifestations of labour-power do not fit within the current definitions of the wage-labourer. They are not part of the market or state economies. In many respects, they are not viewed as real. However, they are of equal social, cultural and economic significance particularly due to the way in which they contribute to social reproduction.

According to Karl Marx, all production is premised on labour-power, which he defines as 'the aggregate of those mental and physical capabilities existing in a human being, which he exercises whenever he produces a use-value of any description'.³² In this sense, labour-power is imbued with agency; unlike dead labour it is variable. While Marx focused explicitly on the market economy, his definition is also amenable to the social economy. Applying his definition of labour-power to the social economy radicalizes both the term and the sector. Marx states, '[l]abour itself, in its immediate being, in its living existence, cannot be directly conceived as a commodity, but only labour-power, of which labour itself is the temporary manifestation'.³³ Labour-power, as a social relation, is therefore subject to politics. By focusing on labour, social output, irrespective of whether it takes place in the market or social economies, cannot be abstracted. In other words, the growth of the social economy cannot be attributed to technological innovation or increased free time (i.e., leisure). Rather, we learn that the growth

of the social economy is due to its combination of both paid work and non-paid work.

The expenditure of labour-power within the social economy along with a popular engagement in multiactive work indicates a shift from Employment to the broader conceptualization of Work. This emergence of a new paradigm necessitates a rephrasing of the question asked earlier in this chapter. It is no longer, 'How is it possible to generate employment?', but 'How is it possible to ensure the (re)production of labour-power?' It is this expenditure that distinguishes labour from other commodities. It is the *capacity* to labour that forms the basis of the emerging Work paradigm.

Workers are currently alienated from their *capacity* to labour as well as a broad range of non-alienating activities. This is the central contradiction of the post-Employment era, to which it has no clear solution. The post-Employment era still places overwhelming emphasis on the market economy at the expense of the state and social economies. In doing so, it fails to consider how it is possible for workers to have the *capacity* to labour. Where does this *capacity* come from? How is it maintained?

In this book, I argue that the capacity to labour is located in the individual worker; it is derived not from the market but from the social. Foregrounding the social, in turn, contests the current hegemonic development model of disciplinary neo-liberalism. Starting from the capacity to labour, however, reveals that indeed another world is possible as it forms a counterpoint to the political, economic and spatial basis of disciplinary neo-liberalism. It is this situation in-between – that is, in-crisis – that I refer to as the post-employment era. Positioned after the possibility of the Employment paradigm it also precedes the institutionalization of the Work paradigm.

Case study: the social economy

The dramatic global growth of the social economy is significant as a site of this potential transition. In this book, I examine the work done in and through the social economy, focusing specifically on Canada and the Canadian experience within the global political economy.

The social economy does not have a single unifying definition. In fact the size, scope, temporality, purposes and impacts of the social economy are currently subject to considerable debate. Therefore, before proceeding it is important to delineate what I mean by this term. In broad terms, the social economy label is a reference point for a wide variety of activities that are carried out by diverse constellations of networks. These networks are both permanent and fleeting, signifying both social and economic impacts, but they are consistent in two respects: they work outside the market economy and state economy and for the purpose of ensuring social reproduction.

Common in Francophone locales, such as France, Belgium and Québec, the term 'social economy' is still relatively unfamiliar in Anglophone communities.³⁴ For example, within the pan-Canadian context (outside Québec),