

Globalization of the Community of Solidarity – The Feasibility of Basic Social Security in Poor and Emerging Countries

FRIEDRICH BUTTLER

Basic Social Security for All

Some might think that this heading needs a question mark. Is it not the case that, in the global financial and economic crisis, basic social security for everyone, throughout the world, is a utopian dream for which the resources simply do not exist? Who is supposed to pay for it? Could anything be more absurd than to stymie the urgently needed global economic upswing with such costs?

In fact, the heading needs an exclamation mark! The global crisis has revealed the underside of globalization, namely the increasing inequality of incomes and opportunities within and between countries throughout the world. Social security, however, is a basic human right, besides being everywhere an effective supply-side productive force and a source of spending that bolsters demand in the national economy.

What might be the causes and who the possible agents of socio-political change? History teaches us that the needs of workers and their families in the Industrial Revolution and political confrontations, such as the East–West conflict after World War Two, gave considerable impetus to the development of social security. The prosperous European Union, in contrast, has a problem with developing a common social agenda, in particular after Eastern enlargement to encompass the transition countries. The world community, similarly, has discovered the issue only in the last few years.

Social security is a late-born child of the Industrial Revolution and developed the forms now familiar in the industrialized countries in particular after World War Two. Protection against the contingencies of life, for example, involving illness, loss of livelihood, income, housing, and old-age poverty, emerged earlier on, to some extent, on an individual basis or in smaller social organizations, chiefly the family – in other words, by way of private provision or group-oriented solidarity. It is entirely consistent with this if associations of sovereign states, such as the

European Union, agree on solutions involving, for example, the transferability of social protection standards attained in one member state to another and, under the socio-economic conditions of the twenty-first century, it would likewise be consistent if this was expanded even further to encompass a global responsibility on the part of the international community for social justice and, thereby, social security for all.

A 2009 UN initiative (Initiative VI: »A Social Protection Floor«) provoked by the global financial and economic crisis generalizes and globalizes the claim to basic social security: »A social protection floor is important to all countries, at all times. It is even more important now that the global economic and financial crisis threatens to roll back decades of investment in favor of health and human development« (UN 2009: 40). However, the declared objective of halving absolute poverty across the globe by 2015 has been postponed indefinitely.

Nevertheless, with this in view the agendas developed in the industrialized countries, in principle, do constitute reference points – to be sure, taking due account of the differing economic potential of national economies, different starting points with regard to social security, and striking differences in terms of national political priorities. The UN initiative throws down the gauntlet for basic social security for all as point of departure, but certainly not the terminus of the further development of social security systems. The principle of universalism should be applied, as far as possible, to the relevant risks and to all inhabitants of all states. In keeping with the historical experience of highly developed national economies, a high degree of reciprocity between economic development and social security is assumed. In other words, increasing national economic potential provides the means for financing more comprehensive social security and improving benefits. At the same time, the positive function of improved social participation for national economic productivity is emphasized, provided that the orientation and administration of social security systems are based on criteria of good governance. The complementary connection between economic development and social security, therefore, comes to the fore not in terms of the economic imperative of »first of all« and »afterwards.« Basic social security for all is, independent of the level of economic development, the right instrument to help reduce absolute and relative poverty, both significantly and sustainably.

Social Dimension of Globalization

The World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, in its 2004 report (ILO 2004), backed the idea of basic social security for all, against the background of growing social inequality in the world, as well as the circumstance that no less than 80 percent of the world's population have no adequate social security. Without such basic security the positive results of global economic growth and unhindered international exchange will not filter through to the poorest countries and the poorest strata in each country.

In its World Development Report 2006, the World Bank rejected, on empirical grounds, the optimistic notion that »the rising tide lifts all boats« or, in other words, that the diffusion of economic growth has also improved the participation opportunities of the lowest income strata, based on an analysis of the effects of market opening to the developing and emerging countries. It referred above all to increasing inequality in East, South, and Southeast Asia, including China, India, and Russia. It also cited studies of the emerging countries which show that economic growth in countries with high income inequality and Gini coefficients of around 0.6, such as Brazil and South Africa, does nothing to alleviate poverty. That has been confirmed by an investigation of the poorest regions in China. Furthermore, GNP growth rates, which are high in comparison to the industrialized countries, do not reach the poorest income groups. It has been calculated for the Sub-Saharan region that the average GNP growth rates that would be needed to attain the Millennium goal of »reducing poverty by half by 2015« would be 28 times higher than previously attained (ILO 2009: 4f).

While the connection between social security and poverty reduction is empirically evident, this is not the case for the connection between national economic growth and free trade, on the one hand, and poverty reduction, on the other. Growth does improve the potential for financing social security, but it is not sufficient to maintain access for the lowest income groups to essential social services and a minimum income in case of typical personal risks arising from the contingencies of life. With regard to the ratio between government expenditure and gross domestic product and the share of expenditure on such basic needs as health care, education, and minimum security against absolute poverty in the budgets of many low income and emerging countries, even the assertion that growth is a necessary condition for financing basic social security would

be false. Even in the expenditure of poorer countries there is scope for redistribution. Numerous ways of restructuring public expenditure, even in poor and emerging countries, will occur to anyone cognizant of the connection between social justice and peace.

The UN initiative for basic social security for all characterizes the current global situation as follows (UN 2009: 40):

- ▶ 80 percent of the world population does not have adequate social protection;
- ▶ cash benefit coverage is largely concentrated on workers and their families in the formal economy and migrant workers have little access;
- ▶ most people in the informal economy, in which women are disproportionately represented, have only rudimentary access to social security;
- ▶ many of the world's 1.3 billion poor do not have financial access to needed health services;
- ▶ around 150 million people suffer a financial catastrophe every year and 100 million fall below the poverty line simply because of the need to use, and pay for, health services;
- ▶ despite the expansion of treatment for AIDS sufferers, around 60 percent of those affected are still not being reached;
- ▶ 776 million adults, two-thirds of them women, lack basic literacy skills;
- ▶ 75 million children do not attend school, while the quality of education remains poor, resulting in low learning achievements in many developing countries;
- ▶ there are shortages of teachers and health workers.

It should be clearly understood that it is not the results, but the defects of globalization so far, which call into question its efficacy for the great majority of people. If the global financial and economic crisis were to lead to an attitude of »everyone for himself« – that is, a reversion to national and regional protectionism and cut-backs in international development cooperation – then these deficiencies would only increase and contribute across the globe to intensify conflicts resulting from social inequalities.

The widely accepted response of the ILO »World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization« is that, given the positive development potential of globalization, it would be worth trying to protect it from its self-destruction at the hands of unfettered liberalism, tied in

with the abandonment of adequate social protection. But how far will the consensus go? Will it be sufficient, as the historical experience of the end of the nineteenth century teaches us, at least to avoid destructive social conflicts or, beyond that, as in the OECD countries after World War Two, will it be possible for global systems of social security to emerge, with extended coverage for all?

Even within the framework of the social dialog between the groups cooperating in the ILO – governments and employers' and employees' representatives – this remains an open question. The three social partners, not to mention various national representations within the government group, have developed decidedly different responses. With regard to basic social security, however, agreement could be reached, on condition that the established minimum is not set up as a universal norm, thereby becoming a benchmark for a race to the bottom for already more developed social systems. Emerging and poor countries have, in the past, criticized minimum standards as non-tariff trade barriers. Care is therefore needed. Certainly, such criticisms are invalid where they serve merely to cover up human rights abuses, including the infringement of basic social rights.

Different Development Paths

Social protection is path dependent and requires a long-term perspective and careful actuarial projections. That is key to its sustainability. Apart from radical political change, in which the urgency and frequently also the willingness to take a new direction are obvious, path dependence also means that changes in agendas and instruments tend to take place gradually. In any case, changes require great care within the framework of democratic consensus-building and the lesson of the last few decades is that social partner participation can exert a considerable influence on the outcome.

The development of social protection systems in the Western industrialized countries after World War Two must also be interpreted in connection with the East–West conflict. With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of COMECON (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance), a new landscape revealed itself. Esping-Andersen (1990), with his work on the »three worlds of welfare capitalism,« has contributed admirably to getting the debate under way on the different development paths

of social policy systems in the industrialized countries. Indeed, various typical country groups, which share similar high levels of development, exhibit quite different development paths with regard to their social policy agendas. The various approaches have been assigned, on a regional basis, to the Scandinavian, the Central European, the Anglo-Saxon, and the Southern European countries, and their social policy orientations designated as largely conservative, market liberal, or social democratic in inspiration.

To be sure, this remains a Western European–North Atlantic debate in origin and its concept of universalism is, correspondingly, limited to the industrialized countries. This is not to say that political actors in the relevant countries have not, at the same time, developed – at least to some extent – more global perspectives with regard to development cooperation; nevertheless, we can say that, so far, a universalist social policy concept with a global perspective is lacking.

To the extent that it laid down internationally accepted principles, ILO Convention No. 102 on social security (1952) established a standard. However, it is fairly lightweight with regard to practical aims. Furthermore, so far it has been ratified by only 44 member states, 31 of them in Europe, seven in Latin America, and five in Asia. That says a great deal about its continuing lack of acceptance in peripheral, emerging, and transition countries. Even so, an agreement can serve to provide some sort of orientation, even if it has not been ratified (cf. for a review of Convention No. 102 and other ILO social standards ILO 2008a).

In order to give new impetus to application of the principles of the Convention, the International Labor Conference 2003 backed a global campaign for social protection for all. It is important to note that, in many people's opinion, global developments call for the replacement of the Convention by something more extensive in order to take account of the social dimension of globalization. However, at present, a workable majority for the development of such a new international legal instrument is not in evidence. A German–Dutch initiative called on the ILO to report on the results of the campaign so far. One such result is the document (»for debate and guidance«) issued by the ILO's Governing Body in November 2008 (GB 303/ESP/3).

Nevertheless, significant impulses for the reorganization of social protection systems in a number of transition countries arose from the approaches characteristic of the three – in population terms, small – »worlds of welfare capitalism.« The main points of departure here were

the relatively high – in relation to GNP – standards of social protection in the socialist economies and the dramatic decline in economic performance ushered in by the collapse of COMECON in many of the now independent states and the Russian Republic. In the 1990s, the OECD, the World Bank, and the IMF, in view of the unsustainability of the existing social protection systems, encouraged the transition countries to adopt approaches to social protection which reflected rather the Anglo-American variant of welfare capitalism than the Scandinavian or the continental European.

The debate concerned, in particular, the organization of pension systems – including old-age, survivor, and invalidity benefits – which, with a few exceptions, accounted for the lion's share of social protection expenditure (cf. *Delivering Decent Work in Europe and Central Asia*, ILO 2009, the section entitled »Social Protection«). The World Bank and kindred spirits were at that time pushing funded systems and privatization, while other approaches favored rather the development and replenishment of solidaristic »pay-as-you-go« systems. It is important to remember, of course, that, ultimately, the sole means of financing pensions, health insurance, and other services are the regular revenues of the domestic economy. As a consequence, the belief that it is possible to elude this matter of fact by means of funded systems would be a serious error. The devaluation of capital stocks due to the global financial crisis provides grim confirmation of this.

The European Commission (Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008 – EU Indicators: 30) summarizes recent reform tendencies to the effect that a closer link between contributions and benefits, combined with the prolongation of working lives, would have a positive impact on the adequacy and sustainability of pensions. Increasing personal contributions and activation have become decisive elements of reform agendas not only with regard to pension insurance.

Social transfer programs in industrialized – including transition – countries go a long way towards reducing poverty. For the EU as a whole, the European Commission (op. cit.: 49) has set out a reduction in poverty risk of around 40 percent. The effects on income inequality in this respect are significantly higher in the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands, with Gini coefficients between 0.22 and 0.26, than in Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with Gini coefficients above 0.3 (ILO 2009). In the eight transition countries in the EU-25, Gini coefficients ranged from 0.19 in the Czech Republic to 0.28 in Poland

before 1990. By 2001, they had increased to, for example, 0.27 in the Czech Republic and 0.39 in Hungary, a clear sign of the increasingly urgent need for action (Buttler/Schoof/Walwei 2006: 112). As a result, income inequality between EU member states is greater today than that between the EU-27, on the one hand, and the United States, Korea or Thailand, on the other. The question arises, in view of these diverging developments in the EU-27, of whether more common ground should be sought with regard to the member states' social agendas. The bogey term of »harmonization« is pointedly avoided in this connection, with the emphasis rather on more convergence, backed by the open method of coordination within the framework of the EU, the aim being to draw on the added value generated by European cooperation in the areas of labor market and social policy, without undermining subsidiarity.

Within the framework of the Lisbon Strategy and the renewed Social Agenda, flexicurity is now the big idea under the aegis of which labor market policy strategies and social protection systems, together with the promotion of lifelong learning and the further development of labor law, are to be pooled. The aim is to link labor market flexibility and social security in terms of the economic structural change necessary for development. The European Commission (2007) is pushing common principles of flexicurity and the European social partners (2007) have called on the member states to implement appropriate packages of measures. Country studies relating to the establishment of more common ground in European social policies have been conducted, for example, under the Finnish EU Presidency (Kvist and Saari 2007) and by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Golinowska et al. 2008), with particular reference to the transition countries in comparison to the countries exemplifying Esping-Andersen's »three worlds.« (For an annotated summary of the relevant policy documents, see Buttler 2008.)

Similar considerations find expression in the Russian government's seven anti-crisis priorities, recently drawn up, with social support topping the list: »The Government will support citizens and families that were the hardest hit by the global economic crisis. This implies greater social support for the public, broader coverage of quality social and medical services, and better supply of medicines, especially vital ones. Special attention will be paid to preserving the labor potential. The Government will step up its efforts to curb unemployment by adopting programs for retraining those who are likely to lose their jobs« (<http://www.government.ru>).

Undoubtedly, the call for more convergence in European social policy is controversial. On the one hand, it is argued, with justification, that even the development of the common market could not manage without common health and social policy institutions, as a consequence of which the European member states have relinquished a certain amount of sovereignty (in the words of Kvist and Saari [2007: 264], »have been transformed into semi-sovereign welfare states«). On the other hand, precisely this, together with its possible continuation, have become the target of Eurosceptic objections. The German Constitutional Court, with its judgment of June 30, 2009 on the Lisbon Treaty, has given a new lease of life to a debate which possibly it did not anticipate. »The Constitutional Court lives and takes its decisions in fear that it will have to submit to the European Court of Justice,« commented the French political scientist (though of German origin) Alfred Grosser (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, July 11/12, 2009).

The road to greater convergence in terms of member state social policy has not been blocked by the judgment, even in Germany, but the pursuit of political majorities for that purpose has not exactly been made easier. The reduction of the European Union to the Single Market would not only be a retrograde step with regard to the development of the treaties launched by the far-sighted Jean Monnet and Konrad Adenauer, but also serve to discourage other supranational initiatives aimed at economic and social policy cooperation, such as the Asian–European initiative ASEM (Asia–Europe Meeting).

Change of Perspective: Minimum Social Protection in Poor and Emerging Countries

Although ILO Convention 102 still stands – *faute de mieux* – as the flagship agreement with regard to international social policy, its shortcomings due to the lack of basic social security for all seem so serious from today's standpoint that new ways are being sought to globalize social protection. The call for a »social protection floor,« a »basic benefit package for all,« should also be understood in this context. Building on certain minimum standards, later on social systems can be developed, in accordance with the specific level of development of individual countries, in the direction of more comprehensive social protection. In parallel with this, services which have already reached a certain level should

not be adapted downwards (Setting Social Security Standards in a Global Society, ILO 2008a). Having said that, it would be wrong to conclude from this that the modernization of standards in the interests of good governance should be halted.

The concept of basic social security for all is derived from the Declaration of Human Rights of 1948: »Everybody has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance.« »Social security is a basic human right,« is the conclusion drawn from this by the International Labor Conference 2001.

So far, no internationally recognized definition of the »social protection floor« has been developed. However, the UN Crisis Initiative 2009 proposes two key elements for this purpose: (i) first, geographical and financial access to water and sanitation, adequate nourishment, health, and education, and (ii) provision of essential social transfers, in cash and in kind, to the poor and vulnerable.

With regard to transfer payments within the framework of the Initiative, the ILO envisages minimum guarantees or standards, with the following components:

- ▶ universal access to essential health services;
- ▶ income or subsistence security for children through child benefits;
- ▶ income support combined with employment guarantees through public works programs for the working-age poor who cannot earn sufficient income on the labor market, including benefits for mothers during and just after pregnancy;
- ▶ income security by means of tax-financed pensions for the old, the disabled and those who have lost the main breadwinner in a family.

In addition, such minimum guarantees should ensure the social protection of particularly vulnerable groups, such as migrant workers and persons suffering from HIV/AIDS. Particular attention should be paid to enhancing the social status and rights of women in families, in the community, and in society in general.

Use of the notion of »guarantee« provides considerable room to maneuver. For the time being, it remains an open question how the relevant benefits will be provided, not to mention whether they will be financed

through taxation or also contributions, whether they will be linked to particular modes of behavior or means-tested, and how the target groups will be defined. »The decisive point is that all citizens have access to essential health services and means of securing a minimum level of income. Different countries will push forward different combinations of needs based, insurance based and universal non-contributory systems of social protection. Fiscal space, institutional strength and levels of poverty and vulnerability should drive the decision-making process regarding how to construct the basic social floor and which benefits to introduce as a matter of priority« (UN 2009: 47).

The emphasis on this »creative leeway« is in line with experiences with international social policy and development cooperation, in particular with regard to the need for differentiation in accordance with the situation on the ground, the requirement of self-determination, the possible disincentive effects of unconditional programs and the free-rider effects of untargeted schemes, the conditions under which means-testing might be appropriate, and the importance of which financial instruments are selected and how they are combined.

With regard to the important issue of informal labor, which, if anything, increases in times of crisis, and the shadow economy, the question arises of the social inclusion of those affected. If the incentives which lead people into the informal labor market or encourage them to remain there are not to be increased, this issue cannot be adequately addressed without first examining the options and laying down appropriate legal paths for passing from informal employment into formal employment on the basis of the circumstances prevailing in a particular country. In Turkey, for example, the government and the social partners, prompted by a common interest, have successfully implemented a program for this purpose in a number of provinces.

Needless to say, this is scarcely a panacea. Crucial components of basic social security are not conditional on the existence of a formal employment relationship and should be regarded in terms of the human right to social protection. The question of the inclusion of persons involved in informal employment and how benefits for them could be financed arises in particular with regard to – at least partly – contribution-based benefits.

The UN Initiative proposes that the problem be addressed through consideration of the following alternatives: »create or expand coverage for income support for families with children and for the elderly based

on need, vulnerability or universal entitlements, subsidize any existing state health insurance schemes so that people that become unemployed or leave the formal labour market do not lose protection, define a set of basic health care guarantees for the vulnerable that have no insurance based system and finance it from general taxes, increase service support in the education systems (targeted or universal, especially within preschool, primary and lower high school) with a strong investment in food services and health preventive services« (loc. cit., p. 47, footnote 13).

Is all this merely wishful thinking or are good practical examples already in existence? There are now progress reports on over 30 developing and emerging countries worldwide in which, over the last ten years, social transfer programs have been launched with the abovementioned components of basic social security. As might be expected with regard to the further development strides taken by the emerging countries, there are comprehensive programs in Mexico (»Oportunidades«), Brazil (»Bolsa Familia«), and South Africa, with a focus on cash benefits for children, the disabled, and old people, as well as India, with a program aimed at guaranteeing 100 days' employment annually.

The UN Initiative (UN 2009: 48) refers to a total of 70 programs with between 150 and 200 million beneficiaries. »Some of these schemes are conditional on certain behaviours, such as school attendance, the utilization of preventive health services, or accepting public work. Others are provided to entire subgroups of the population (such as recipients of old-age pensions in Bolivia, Namibia, and Nepal). In a number of cases, transfers are combined with social services, sometimes including basic social work and child protection support ... (such as the programme Chile Solidario). In other cases, especially in the poorest countries, a combination of cash and food transfers is often provided as part of school feeding programmes, nutritional interventions, cash transfers for the elderly, and cash and food-for-work schemes. In Ethiopia, the UN World Food Programme supports about half of the total beneficiaries under the Productive Safety Net Programme, the largest social protection scheme in Africa« (UN 2009).

The ILO is currently finalizing a meta-study analyzing about 80 individual studies on programs of this kind. This will also make it possible to draw conclusions with regard to best practice.

Can Low-Income Countries Afford Minimum Social Protection?

In order to answer this, careful actuarial studies are required on individual countries. The ILO has carried out model costings for 12 countries in Africa and Asia (ILO 2008b). The following four components of basic social security were considered separately in different variants with regard to their estimated cost at the time of their envisaged introduction in 2010 and in terms of their development through 2020 up to 2030: universal basic old age and disability pensions, basic benefits for a maximum of two children per family, universal access to essential health care, social assistance combined with 100-day employment guarantee programs. To summarize, this makes it possible to ascertain the costs of an overall package or of combinations of individual components.

The model costings specify, to this end, assumptions with regard to the expected costs of health care, the level of cash transfers, and the expected number of beneficiaries based on population statistics or laid down hypothetically. Of key importance for the results of the calculation are the income targets which are taken as percentages of national per capita income (for example, 30 percent for old-age and invalidity pensions, 15 percent for basic child benefits) or hypothetical benefit ceilings, set at a maximum of 1 or 0.5 US dollar (on the basis of purchasing power parity). The aim is to determine the required total benefit level as a proportion of GNP.

For an overall basic social protection package, in 2010, benefits in the range of 3.7 to 10.8 percent of GNP would result, depending on the starting points of individual countries. That is well above what these countries are currently spending on social security, which is rarely more than 3 percent for health care and 1 percent for everything else.

If the countries in question were to increase the proportion of social expenditure to one-fifth of public expenditure, however, their own contribution to a social protection package could increase to between 2.4 and 5.8 percent of GNP. Some countries – such as India, Guinea, and Vietnam – would then be in a position as early as 2010 to provide 100-percent financing, while others – such as Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, and Nepal – would, for the time being, only be able to manage 50 percent. In between lies an intermediate group, consisting of Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Senegal. In comparison to the proportions of social policy expenditure in the national budgets of industrialized countries this does

not appear to be too high. However, these model costings might overestimate poor countries potential contributions, where a considerable gap between GNP and its components forming the actual tax base exists. This issue is subject to further ILO considerations.

Alternative scenarios can be calculated in accordance with which countries do not attempt to realize all components at the same time or, to begin with, provide for lower benefit levels per person. Even the introduction of universal basic social security in old age, together with child benefits, would, according to analyses for Tanzania, reduce the number of households affected by poverty in which old people live with children by up to 46 percent (ILO 2008b).

The model costings come to the following conclusion: »A basic social protection package is demonstrably affordable (...). But this is on condition that the package is implemented through the joint efforts of the low-income countries themselves (...) and of the international donor community« (ILO 2008b: 18). The contribution of the international community could, for example, consist in expanding the fiscal framework for building up social security in the poorest countries by means of debt relief and a specific focus on technical assistance. The subsidiarity principle, which operates at all levels of social policy, should also be applied at international level. This is confirmed by experiences from international development cooperation on avoiding disincentives, boosting empowerment, and ensuring sustainability.

Conclusions

The concept of basic social security for all must, first, be viewed in the context of the target of halving absolute poverty worldwide. The context is self-evident. Social security can make a sustainable contribution to reducing both relative and absolute poverty.

The same – secondly – does not apply to economic growth and the alleviation of poverty, however. The notion that »the rising tide lifts all boats« is just not supported by the facts. In order to make the potentially positive development effects of globalization sustainable it must, by all means, be complemented by a social dimension.

The »three worlds of welfare capitalism,« thirdly, had paradigmatic significance for various transformation processes after the break-up of the Soviet Union. From a global standpoint, they turn out to have a

strong European/North Atlantic orientation and therefore, in comparison to the global population, constitute small worlds. A switch to a global perspective is therefore necessary.

Fourthly, the concept of basic social security (»social floor«) in poor and emerging countries has therefore been introduced. Model costings of their financial feasibility carried out by the ILO, have been presented.

Finally, if the millennium goal of halving poverty worldwide is to have any realistic chance, if not by 2015, at least shortly thereafter, then a global solidaristic effort will be required. It would only be fitting if, in the context of globalization, the scope of the community of solidarity needed for basic social security was also globalized and, at the same time, the capacities of families, groups, communities, and national economies were increased, in order to enable them to contribute to the highest extent possible. Social and economic development are inseparable.

References

- Buttler, F., U. Schoof, and U. Walwei (2006): »The European Social Model and Eastern Enlargement,« in: *Zeitschrift für Arbeitsmarktforschung*, 1/2006: 97ff.
- Buttler, F. (2008): *Sharing Knowledge and Perspectives for Work in Europe – Main Issues*. Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Commission of the European Communities (2007): *Towards Common Principles of Flexicurity*, Communication COM 2007/359.
- Commission of the European Communities (2008): *Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008, EU Indicators*. Commission Staff Working Document.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990): *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton University Press.
- ETUC, BusinessEurope, UEAPME and CEEP (2007): *Key Challenges Facing European Labour Markets: A Joint Analysis of European Social Partners*. Brussels, October. Available at: ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_dialogue/docs/cross_key_challenges.pdf.
- Golinowska, S., P. Hengstenberg, and M. Zukowski (eds) (2008): *Diversity and Commonality in European Social Policies*. Bonn/Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Grosser, A. (2009): »Deutschland auf dem Sonderweg,« in: *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (July 11/12). Available at: <http://www.government.ru/content/>(accessed 8.9.2009).
- ILO (2004): *A Fair Globalization – Creating Opportunities for All*. Report of the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization. Geneva.
- ILO (2008a): *Setting Social Security Standards in a Global Society*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 2.

- ILO (2008b): *Can Low-income Countries Afford Basic Social Security?* Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 3.
- ILO Governing Body (2008c): »Social Security Standards and the ILO Campaign for the Extension of Social Security,« GB.303/ESP/3.
- ILO (2009): *Delivering Decent Work in Europe and Central Asia*, Vol. 1, Part 2, Chapter on Social Protection.
- ILO (2009): *Social Security for All, Investing in Social Justice and Economic Development*, Social Security Policy Briefings, Paper 7.
- Kvist, J., and J. Saari (2007) (eds): *The Europeanization of Social Protection*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- UN (2009): Global Financial and Economic Crisis, UN System Joint Crisis Initiatives, Initiative VI: A Social Protection Floor.
- World Bank (2006): *World Development Report*.