UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
University of Birmingham Research at Birmingham

Global gender justice

Jaggar, Alison

License:
None: All rights reserved

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Jaggar, A 2020, Global gender justice. in T Brooks (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Justice.* Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, Oxford. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-oxford-handbook-of-global-justice-9780198714354>

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

General rights
Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

•Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
•Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
•User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of ‘fair dealing’ under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
•Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy
While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 20. Apr. 2024

Alison M. Jaggar

Global gender justice

This article overviews some of the rapidly expanding philosophical work on global gender justice. In the space available, it is not possible to provide a comprehensive survey so I offer a sampling of issues and themes, none explored in depth. I aim to show that gender concerns are integral to many, perhaps all, aspects of global justice and that reflection on gender justice is encouraging fresh approaches to some important philosophical questions.

1. Starting points

1.1. What is justice?

Justice exists when social relationships are in moral balance. Plato thought of justice as a character trait but this article takes it to be a desirable feature of the structures, institutions, and practices which provide the frameworks for systematic social relationships. Social relationships hold paradigmatically among human beings but may also hold among various kinds of collectivities and, arguably, even with animals. Philosophers concerned with justice ask how our collective life may best be arranged so as to produce a proper balance among the entitlements and obligations of all legitimate claimants. Philosophers perennially debate not only what should count as proper balance but also who/what are legitimate claimants of justice, what they may claim, and what are the spheres and circumstances in which these claims hold. For this reason, justice is called an “essentially contested” concept.

People’s lives in every society are organized by structures, institutions and practices which regulate divisions of labor, family relations, access to resources, and processes for dealing wtih conflict. Social structures create menus of available options for action and assign the respective benefits and costs of making various decisions. Unlike philosophers concerned with personal ethics, philosophers concerned with justice focus less on assessing specific decisions made by particular agents or entities and more on assessing the structure of the frameworks that open or close various options for those agents. When social structures are unjust, they provide systematically imbalanced sets of life options and prospects for the members of different social groups, enabling some to enjoy undeserved advantages and privileges while arbitrarily disadvantaging others and rendering them disproportionately vulnerable to ills such as violence, impoverishment, and political marginalization.

Gender is one dimension along which systematic injustice often occurs. Feminist social and political is dedicated to identifying injustices along this dimension and envisioning more gender just social arrangements. Most feminist work has focused on relational and distributive justice, studying what would constitute just relationships among genders and fair distributions of social benefits and burdens, entitlements, responsibilities and opportunities. However, feminist philosophers have also contributed to the literatures on retributive justice, which deals with how wrongdoing should be punished, reparative justice, which investigates how to compensate or repair past wrongs, and transitional justice, which considers how best to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses.

1.2. What is gender?

Today, public discourse and official documents tend to use "sex" and "gender" interchangeably. However, sex is best understood as a biological classification, though not a simple one,[1] and gender as a complex set of social norms and expectations about the proper behavior of human individuals according to the biological sex they are assigned. People assigned to the male or female sexes are expected to behave in accordance with the respective gender norms prevailing in their societies. In most societies, more or less rigid gender norms shape most aspects of most peoples' lives, enabling and constraining their work opportunities and responsibilities and conditioning their access to resources. Gendered norms also regulate people's modes of self-presentation, dress, deportment, sexuality, and styles of speech.

Gender norms are often enforced coercively, so people who do not conform to prevailing standards of sex and/or gender may be subject to interventions intended to force compliance. Such interventions include involuntary sex assignment surgeries, performed on intersex infants or children, and severe social sanctions for those whose behavior, including sexual behavior, violates gender norms. People who entirely reject their gender identities and even their initial sex assignments are often sanctioned with special severity because transgender and transsexual people challenge widespread and deep-rooted beliefs that sex and even gender refer to natural kinds and that both are dichotomous.

Gender norms vary across societies, so different norms of masculinity and femininity characterize different social contexts. For example, farming, building, or trading may be regarded in one society as work for women and in another as work for men. Although multiple norms of masculinity and femininity prescribe different behavior for sexed individuals in various social contexts, transnational gender norms are also emerging and some of these will be discussed in this article.

Gender everywhere is interwoven with other categories of difference and inequality because people typically live within multiple systems of social power. In modern societies, no one is merely a man or a woman; in addition, we belong to specific nationalities, classes, religions, age cohorts, etc. and our gender identities are always shaped by these other social divisions. [2] The

[1] Human sex is not dichotomous: Fausto-Sterling (2000) reports that individuals born as mixtures of male and female exist as one of five natural human variants and she criticizes the arbitrariness and coercion that often characterize social processes of sex assignment. Humans' physical sex characteristics are shaped by social factors at both phenotypical and genotypical levels.

[2] For example, masculine privilege is usually substantial but masculinity can also carry considerable costs for people who are disadvantaged on other dimensions. In the United States, men of African descent are far more likely than any other demographic group to be incarcerated and/or to die by violence. Making sense of the recently publicized though longstanding phenomenon of unarmed young African American men being killed by police officers in the US requires understanding gender intersectionally. It is salient that the victims are black but also that they are masculine; it is equally salient that their killers are usually, though not always, both white and masculine. African American women also suffer gendered and racialized street harassment from the police but they are often taken to be sex workers and not killed by the police at such a high rate as African American men.

permeation of gender by other social categories and the consequent proliferation of gender identities is often called intersectionality. Both masculinities and femininities are intersectional.

Gender norms are not static but evolve in response to many factors including direct efforts to change them. Feminist activists strive to transform institutions and practices that they believe embody unjust gender norms and produce systematically unjust relationships.

2. What is global gender justice?

2.1. The global as a domain of justice

If justice is a proper balance in social relationships, then questions about justice can arise only when entities are in some sort of social relation with each other. From the seventeenth to the mid-twentieth centuries, most Western philosophers agreed that the moral demands of justice held only among humans who shared a common way of life and they typically identified the boundaries of this moral community with the frontiers of the sovereign state. Because no governance institutions existed to regulate relations among states, philosophers thought that the international sphere could not be a site of justice and instead regarded it as a potential battleground in which each state must be perpetually prepared for war against any or all of the others.

After WWII, several institutions of global governance were established and philosophers began revising their long-standing assumption about the spatial domain of justice. The 1945 establishment of the United Nations provided a framework for international co-operation and the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights expressed a cosmopolitan concern for the rights of all human beings everywhere. The Nuremberg and Tokyo war crimes tribunals, as well as later tribunals, were designed to demonstrate that these rights must be respected universally. In 2002, the International Criminal Court was founded as a permanent international tribunal to prosecute individuals for genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. During the same period, the global economy became more tightly integrated and organized through the establishment of international financial institutions, notably the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization, designed to regulate global trade, was established in 1995. All these developments encouraged philosophers to begin recognizing the global arena as a domain of justice. However, philosophical controversy continues over which entities are properly considered claimants of justice in this domain, what type of claims may to be negotiated, and what principles of justice are appropriate.

2.2. Women in Nonwestern cultures

Scattered reflections on sex equality can be traced far back in the history of Western philosophy but philosophical thinking about this topic increased dramatically in the early 1970s. Influenced by the second wave feminist slogan “The personal is political,” feminist philosophers challenged traditional understandings of the domain of justice, just as global justice theorists were beginning to do. However, whereas global justice theorists argued that the domain of justice extended beyond the frontiers of the state, feminist philosophers argued for recognizing claims of justice in the close quarters of so-called personal life, including sexual, procreative, and family relations. They pointed out that these areas of life were structured by gendered power imbalances and argued that justice questions should be raised about many issues hitherto neglected by

academic philosophy, including domestic violence, unpaid domestic work, abortion, and many issues involving sexuality.

In the 1990s, a few philosophers began raising concerns about gender justice at the global level. Two prominent liberal feminists, Susan Okin and Martha Nussbaum, were troubled by various Nonwestern practices which they perceived as unjust to women. They sought philosophical justification for challenging those practices and were disturbed by what they saw as the relativism of postcolonial feminists who resisted simply condemning the practices. In Okin's and Nussbaum's view, the central philosophical issues of global gender justice were moral universalism versus cultural relativism and the possibility of "external" as opposed to "internal" social criticism (Okin 1994; Nussbaum 1992, 2000). Okin's and Nussbaum's work was extremely valuable in raising questions about some gendered aspects of global justice but they framed some of the issues in ways that were unduly narrow and misleading.

2.3. Expanding understandings of global gender justice

Some of the limitations of Okin's and Nussbaum's work on global gender justice resulted from their using the term "culture" in a particular sense employed in the 1990s by many Anglophone political philosophers. In this usage, culture was taken to refer primarily to religion, sexuality and family life as opposed to politics and economics.[3] It was the same sphere of personal life that the feminist philosophers of the 1970s had emphasized. Okin wrote, "the sphere of personal, sexual, and reproductive life provides a central focus of most cultures (Okin 1999:12). When culture is interpreted in this sense, has special significance for women, as Okin noted, because these are areas of life to which women are often relegated.

Okin's and Nussbaum's attention to matters of religion, family and sexuality was certainly legitimate but the heavy emphasis they gave to those areas tended to divert attention from the ways in which gender is also embedded in the basic political and economic structures of most societies. Not only are women a large and increasing proportion of the paid workforce in both the formal and informal economic sectors of most societies but even women's unpaid work at home produces crucial economic goods and services, such as food and health care. In addition, focusing on cultural issues, construed as somewhat distinct from economic and political structures, tends to suggest that achieving gender justice is more about changing beliefs and attitudes than it is about reforming basic structures. Thus, taking gender injustice to be primarily cultural, in the sense used by political philosophers of the 1990s, minimizes its extent and depth.

A further problem with Okin's and Nussbaum's conception of culture was its assumption that clear contrasts could be drawn among cultures. Uma Narayan argues that drawing such contrasts requires culturally essentialist generalizations, which offer totalizing characterizations of whole cultures treated as static, internally homogenous and externally sealed (Narayan 1998). More empirically adequate understandings recognize that cultures are internally contested and constantly evolving, often in response to external influences; for example, gender norms in many Asian, African, and Latin American societies were forcibly altered by colonization and fading

[3] The word "culture" was mostly used in this way in the philosophical debate about "multiculturalism." For example, Nancy Fraser contrasts concerns about cultural recognition with concerns about economic redistribution (Fraser 1997).

cultural traditions sometimes gained new life as symbols of resistance to colonialism.[4] In focusing on gender injustice in Nonwestern cultures, Okin and Nussbaum tended to treat those cultures as self-contained, rather than seeing them as interacting with larger global contexts.

Additional limitations of Okin's and Nussbaum's work included its implicit assumptions that West is Best for women and that they were personally able to assess "other" cultures impartially (Jaggar 2005). Okin and Nussbaum did not address the possibility that their own judgments might be biased by their specific global locations, partial perspectives, cultural values, and even adaptive preferences. Finally, by expressing concern only for women, they ignored gender injustice to men and boys.

Since the turn of the millennium, philosophical work on global gender justice has expanded and become more self-reflective. Through examining the gendered dimensions of issues such as war, global governance, political freedom, nationalism, migration, indebtedness, poverty, mental health, climate change, and more, feminist philosophers are revealing that gender is integral to virtually all aspects of global justice, not limited to a few marginal issues. As they study the ways in which local practices interact with global structures, they have recognized that many unjust practices are than self-contained local matters. Moreover, they are giving more attention to the gendered forces which shape and constrain men's as well as women's lives in the changing global order. Currently, philosophers working on global gender justice investigate how gendered norms and practices often cross across national borders and seek to identify emerging transnational gendered collectivities and identities. Finally, many philosophers working on global gender justice are reflecting on the ways in which their own philosophical perspectives might be shaped by their particular locations in the global order and exploring epistemological and methodological issues regarding situated assessments of global justice.

3. Some normative issues of global gender justice

3.1. Some structural features of the current global order

Although women's and men's situations vary widely among and within different regions of the world, many gender parallels exist. The World Bank's *2012 World Development Report: Gender Equality and Development* provides a recent comprehensive overview (World Bank 2011). The *Report* finds that advances toward gender equality have been made on several fronts. Gender gaps in primary education have closed in almost all countries and in many countries girls now outnumber boys in secondary schools and young women outnumber young men in universities. Nutrition and life expectancy have improved in general and for women in particular—though unevenly (World Bank 2011:xx). Women's labor force participation has risen, progress has been made towards women's formal rights, and in many countries fertility rates have declined rapidly (World Bank 2011:xi). Nevertheless, women worldwide tend to have less access to resources than men of the same ethnicity, class, and even family and to be more vulnerable to overwork, sexual violence, and political marginalization.

[4] In Kenya, "clitoridectomy became a political issue between the Kikuyu and Kenya's white settlers and missionaries, as well as a symbol of the struggle between African nationalists and British colonial power" (Brown 1991:262).

Philosophers concerned with the gender dimensions of global justice have identified several structural features of the current global order which are facially gender neutral but profoundly influence gender relations worldwide. Below I list some of those features, whose relevance to issues of gender justice will emerge in subsequent sections.

1. The lingering effects of past colonization mean that countries becoming independent in the middle of the twentieth century were disadvantaged as they entered the new global order. Today, many of these countries still function in this order primarily as sources of raw materials and unskilled or semi-skilled labor. This radically affects the life prospects for women and men in those countries, though typically in different ways.
2. In order to meet their basic material needs, increasing numbers of people depend on an expanded and integrated global market. Dependence on this market has transformed the working lives of many women who continue to produce most of the world's food and clothing but do so now in context of global supply chains (Balakrishnan 2002). Expansion of the global market has not only transformed local economies; it has also rendered them more vulnerable to exogenous shocks.
3. Since 1970, when the period of formal colonization was ending, the economic gap has widened between what is now called Global North and Global South, giving the global North disproportionate influence in setting the rules of international trade.[5] These rules have often been criticized not only for general unfairness to poor countries but also specifically for placing disproportionately heavy burdens on the women of those countries.
4. Following the international debt crisis of 1970s, many nations in the global South were subjected to strict conditions for debt servicing and further borrowing. These conditions are often referred to as "structural adjustment" policies. They were guided by neo-liberal political philosophy and characterized by reduction of trade tariffs, hostility to government regulation, private exploitation of hitherto public assets, and austerity in social services. Austerity weighed particularly heavily on women in countries subjected to structural adjustment, because their socially assigned responsibilities for family welfare made them especially dependent on social services (Jaggar 2002).
5. Shocks to the global economy, such as the oil crisis of the 1970s, which raised indebtedness among less developed countries, and the 2008 financial crisis, which intensified structural unemployment, have increased inequality both within countries and among them. These inequalities have gender dimensions.
6. Global wealth inequality motivates millions of people to migrate internationally despite increasingly draconian restrictions on immigration into wealthy countries. Gender structured labor markets and definitions of family mean that contemporary migration is deeply gendered.
7. Radically improved global communications, especially access to the internet, have resulted in the transnational spread of ideas. Western ideas have disproportionate influence because much of the material is in English and produced in West. They include gender ideologies characterized by distinctive conceptions of what it is for men and women to be successful, happy, and sexual desirable.

[5] More recently, the economic rise of China and emergence of middle-income countries, such as Brazil and India, have blurred the sharp North/South division.

8. Conflicts over resources and proxy wars have drastic consequences for all affected populations but these consequences differ systematically for groups differentiated by class, gender and age (Jaggar 2014b). They include the breakdown of social order, forced conscription of boys and young men, and rape and sexual torture, whose victims include boys and men but are mostly girls and women.

These structural features of the current global order are reshaping gender relations and raising many questions of gender justice.

3.2. Feminization of the global labor force

In many countries of the global South, women's traditional subsistence agriculture, local market food production, and small-scale textile and garment production have been undermined by the expansion of export agriculture and a flood of cheap mass-produced imports, often required by structural adjustment programs. Today, women not only produce much of the world's food and clothing in global supply chains; they also perform most jobs such as electronic assembly, often in the increasing numbers of export-processing zones scattered across the global South. These zones typically escape local taxation and local laws governing labor relations, equal pay, occupational safety and health (United Nations 1999; Beneria 2003:79). Women have been called the new global proletariat. In addition, women often do paid piecework at home, combining it with the care of children and/or older people. Home-based work is notoriously low-paid and lacking in labor protections and children and older people are often enlisted to help (Khattak 2002).

Women's increased entry into the global paid labor force has occurred just as that labor force has become more "flexible." Over the past half century, much manufacturing industry has moved to the global South and many formerly well-paying blue-collar jobs in the global North have been replaced by lower-paid, irregular jobs in service industries. There has been a worldwide increase in informal employment, which lacks social protection, and the distinction between formal and informal employment has blurred (Beneria 2003:96, 110). Following the financial crisis of 2008, widespread unemployment spread to many countries in Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, the United States. Would-be workers confronting this dire situation have been named the "precariat." They are said to constitute a new class which is able to access only intermittent and casual work, enjoys no predictability or security, and is sometimes receptive to extremist ideologies (Standing 2011).

The global labor force is now feminized in several senses. Most obviously, women now comprise a larger proportion of the paid labor force than ever before (World Bank 2011). In addition, a larger proportion of the available jobs are regarded as "women's work." Finally, labor market conditions for many men have deteriorated, becoming more like the precarious labor market conditions that typically characterized many 'women's jobs' (Standing 1999; Elson 2002:94). The feminization of the global labor force raises many questions of global gender justice.

One extremely complicated cluster of questions concerns the justice of the emerging gendered divisions of global labor. It is well known that paid work provides women with new opportunities for economic independence and for escaping abusive family situations, yet these opportunities often come at the cost of economic insecurity, long hours, high pressure, and

sexual harassment. Changing transnational arrangements bring gendered costs as well as benefits for many males too. In some ways, "boys and young men (are) at a relative disadvantage" (World Bank 2011:9). In many countries girls now outnumber boys in secondary schools and young women outnumber young men in universities (World Bank 2011:ix or xx). Cultural definitions of masculinity in terms of underperformance in schooling and education may diminish men's future employment and earnings opportunities and boys may also use risk behavior and sexual experience to prove themselves "real" men (World Bank 2011:173). Increased competition for historically male jobs and downward pressure on wages means that many men find it difficult to marry and establish families and the World Bank reports that "excess mortality" of men occurs in some countries. Worldwide, men tend to have higher suicide rates than women and also higher rates of premature death due to violence, accidents, coronary heart disease, and drug and alcohol abuse (Moeller-Leimkuhler 2003). It is hard to assess the justice of these gendered benefits and costs, including time costs (Jaggar 2013). Over the past thirty years, it is possible that the life prospects of the least-advantaged groups of both women and men have worsened relative to other groups because income inequality has risen and the relative share of income going to wages has decreased in comparison with the share going to profits (Razawi 2011:9).

In studying the justice of the changing gender organization of the global economy, a crucial task is to develop categories capable of identifying which groups are legitimate claimants of justice. Much of the earlier philosophical discussion on global justice was framed as a dispute between the moral claims of nationalism and cosmopolitanism but the ungendered categories of "citizen" and "foreigner," on the one hand, and "human being," on the other, obscure gendered divisions and collectivities that stretch across national boundaries. Gendered but otherwise universalistic terms like "women" and "men" are also too coarse-grained for many circumstances because they conceal multiple divisions of ethnicity, race, and nation. To capture whatever gendered groupings are morally significant in contemporary divisions of global labor, we need more finely tuned and empirically grounded categories (Kang 2014).

3.3. Migration for gendered employment

Today many people seek employment abroad. One out of every 33 persons in the world is a migrant and an increasing proportion is composed of economic migrants rather than political refugees (International Organization for Migration 2012). Labor migration reflects transnationally continuous ideas about the gender division of labor. The International Organization for Migration says,

> Despite the fact that women increasingly migrate autonomously as the main income providers for the family, the labour markets in receiving countries remain sex-segregated. Thus, only certain sectors are open to the employment of women, including migrant women, including the so-called "traditional" female occupations such as domestic work, entertainment, nursing, care-giving, etc. (IOM 2012)

In this section, I will sketch a few of the global justice issues associated with women's large scale migration for domestic service and sex work.

The sex industry is said to be the largest and most profitable industry in the world, although reliable statistics are unavailable because much of the industry is illegal. The industry includes street prostitution, brothels, 'massage parlors', stripping, erotic dancing, sex tourism, phone sex,

and arguably "mail order brides." Much sex work remains local in scale but large scale migration for work in the sex and entertainment industries also occurs and a multi-billion dollar pornography industry exists. The domestic service industry also has global as well as local dimensions. Millions of women cross borders and oceans to seek employment in wealthy countries as maids and nannies in private homes (Parreňas 2001). Some of these migrants are legal but many are undocumented. Both the sex and domestic service industries are highly gender structured but in different ways. In both industries, the majority of the workers are women or girls, although many men and boys provide sexual services too. However, there is a gender difference between those who purchase the respective services: in the domestic service industry, most employers are relatively well-off women but those who buy sexual services include all classes of men. Men also constitute most, though certainly not all, of those transporting sex-workers and establishing the infrastructure for the trade.

Both the supply of and the demand for feminized workers in the transnational sex and domestic service industries are influenced by global factors. On the supply side, women who need income have always been motivated to enter sex work or domestic service when employment options are limited but usually they have performed these jobs in local contexts. However, several structural features of the current global order encourage them to migrate transnationally to do similar work. The most obviously motivating feature is wealth inequality among countries. Many families and less developed countries rely heavily on the remittances from migrant domestic workers abroad. Some less developed countries have official policies encouraging migration; for example, Philippine women are encouraged by government policy to migrate to the US, the Middle East and Japan as "maids," which have been said to be the Philippines' most important export product (Lutz 2002:92). Similarly many families in less developed countries depend on remittances from sex work and increasing numbers of poor countries depend on the tourism industry, which is invariably accompanied by entertainment and sex-work. Indeed, the IMF and the World Bank have encouraged many poor countries to view tourism as a development strategy, and have received loans for this purpose. Sassen writes: "At some point it becomes clear that the sex trade itself can become a development strategy in areas with high unemployment and poverty and where governments are desperate for revenue and foreign currency" (Sassen 2002:270). Women across the world have long used "marrying up" as a strategy for social mobility but the privileging of heterosexual marriage in international immigration law enables the transnational mail-order bride industry to function.

Transnational factors influence not only the supply of women migrants but also the demand for their services. In wealthy countries, the demand for maids is fuelled by the gendered division of family labor, which throws the main burden of household work on women. This longstanding division of labor is slow to change: the 2012 World Development Report asserts that men worldwide resist assuming domestic responsibilities (World Bank 2011:218). Another factor contributing to the demand for maids is the decline of real wages in wealthy countries, so that women as well as men must often work for pay. Moreover, inadequate public provision for children and elders in some wealthy countries means that private arrangements often have to be made for the care of those who cannot care for themselves. However, care work is widely regarded as a specifically feminine type of labor so it is usually available only to women.

Gender ideology shapes the transnational sex trade as well as the transnational maid trade. It creates the social meanings of the services provided and determines how gendered individuals can participate. Gendered norms of sexual desirability are spread across the world by global media in entertainment, advertising, and pornography. They often eroticize gendered power inequalities, which are then further complicated by eroticizing inequalities of age, race, class, and nation. Exposure to these ubiquitous images molds the sexuality of both girls and boys, influencing their senses of their own and others' desirability and normalizing the idea of women servicing men. They prepare girls and boys to participate in the global sex-market as workers and as consumers respectively. Similarly, global media promote heterosexual marriage as an institution that will guarantee happiness, social status, sexual satisfaction, and economic security. Both women and men seek trophy spouses but women seek husbands who are good providers while men seek wives who are attractive and deferential (Hughes 2000, 2004). [6]

The global trade in sexual and domestic services brings up some of the same issues of gender justice raised by the general feminization of the global labor force. They include the balance of costs and benefits to various gendered groups as well as more general issues of decent work and fair wages. However, additional questions are raised by the facts that workers in these industries are migrants who often suffer exceptionally poor working conditions and that the work they do has more deeply gendered meanings.

Conditions for migrant sex-workers vary widely. Some are self-employed and mix occasional sex-work with other paid occupations, while others find themselves trapped in situations of extreme abuse. In some countries, the vulnerability of migrant sex workers is increased by laws forbidding foreign women to engage in sex work, fostering their dependence on criminal gangs. Migrant domestic workers are also extremely vulnerable, especially those without work visas and/or living in their employers' homes. Male migrant workers are vulnerable too but they gain some protection by working in teams within a framework recognized by other employees, so that their relations with their employers are contractual (Altman and Cornell 2012:299). By contrast, relationship between women domestic workers and their employers is often based on trust and so involves a higher degree of personal vulnerability. Employers may take advantage of this vulnerability to force domestic servants to work long hours, to withhold pay, to subject them to violence and sexual abuse, and sometimes to hold them in conditions close to slavery (Anderson 2000 esp. ch. 8; Zarembka 2002). Mail-order brides are also often subjected to violence (Narayan 1995).

Despite frequently poor conditions for many who work in the global sex and domestic service trades, these industries would not flourish unless many people were benefiting. The global sex industry reportedly provides immense profits, though these accrue disproportionately to those

---

[6] "In both urban and rural settings around the world, in both poor and rich communities, the social norms for what makes a good wife are remarkably similar…Above all, the good wife adeptly handles her domestic responsibilities and is caring and understanding toward others… Being a good wife also systematically involves respecting one's husband—being faithful, supportive, respectful, and submissive." By contrast, "Across diverse contexts, what defines a good husband, over and above all, is the ability to provide." (World Bank 2011:172 Box 4.5).

(mainly men) who organize sex-work rather than to those (mainly women) who perform the services directly. Nevertheless, sex work also provides some high-priced escorts and call-girls with financial rewards that far surpass anything they could hope to earn in other fields and for many ordinary women sex-work creates welcome opportunities for extra income in a new country and (in the case of mail order brides) for a new family. The global domestic work industry props up gender-structured marriage in receiving countries but it can undermine oppressive forms of marriage in sending countries, since the savings accumulated by some migrant domestic workers may win them more respect in their communities of origin and enable them to renegotiate their family and work options (Huh 2008). The work may even contribute to "undoing gender" (Beneria 2008).

A different aspect of gender justice is raised by the specific character of sex and care work. Both of these provide services that are usually regarded as personal and intimate in the sense that much of their quality and meaning is thought to be lost when they are performed in an impersonal assembly-line manner. Although these services are not intrinsically dirty or degrading, it is often thought demeaning to perform them for pay. It may be particularly demeaning for men to provide such services which are widely regarded as women's work. A growing philosophical literature discusses the commodification of sexual and intimate care services and how this may be related to the subordination of feminized populations. Moral concern has also been raised about injustice to migrant care workers' family members who remain behind in sending countries, deprived of particular care relations (Parreňas 2002; Kittay 2014). Arlie Hochschild has spoken of a global "heart transplant" (Hochschild 2005).

Finally, the unfavorable work conditions experienced by many women migrants in the transnational sex and domestic service industries have brought into question the agency of these workers. Such questions become especially salient once it is realized that there is nothing natural about women providing sex and domestic services. Women are not naturally suited for domestic work; when they can, they often hire others to do it. Nor do women naturally "pleasure" men for money; indeed, they may buy sexual services when they are in a position to do so. Questions about the agency of service workers in these industries are often framed in terms of trafficking, which refers to the coerced movement of people across state borders.[7] The question of agency raises issues which are difficult to resolve both empirically and conceptually. Empirical information about how women enter these industries and why they stay is often unavailable and the notion of choice is conceptually contested. All choices are made in contexts of limited knowledge, rationality and options, and it is a matter of judgement as to when these contexts become so constraining as to create offers that cannot be refused. Some women take up sex work as a way of earning a little extra money, while others are deceived, coerced, or seeking to satisfy addictions. Some women enter sex-work voluntarily, as they move from rural to urban areas,

[7] Almost 21 million people are victims of forced labour–11.4 million women and girls and 9.5 million men and boys. Forced labour takes different forms, including debt bondage, trafficking and other forms of modern slavery. The victims are the most vulnerable – women and girls forced into prostitution, migrants trapped in debt bondage, and sweatshop or farm workers kept there by clearly illegal tactics and paid little or nothing. Of those exploited by individuals or enterprises, 4.5 million are victims of forced sexual exploitation. Migrant workers and indigenous people are particularly vulnerable to forced labour (ILO 2015).

while others are pressed into sex-work by their parents or tricked by being told that a different job awaits them. In addition, exit from sex-work is often extremely difficult so that participation in the sex industry creates long-term gendered vulnerabilities. The language of "trafficking," which conjures up passive victims, fits some cases better than others. Many migrant workers in the sex and domestic service industries may be said to have chosen their employment autonomously as the best options available within a global context of gender structured constraints.[8]

3.4. Two more examples undeveloped here

International travel for procreation. This involves individuals or couples from wealthy countries travelling to poorer countries to buy procreative goods (gametes) or gestational (often called "surrogacy") services. Since at least the 1980s, philosophers have been discussing whether or not the commercial exchange of body parts and reproductive services is intrinsically objectionable but increasing travel across borders to buy procreative goods and services has raised questions about whether, even if such market exchanges are not morally problematic in principle, they may be so in practice. One set of problems concerns the sellers' vulnerability or weak agency; the other concerns the desperation of the buyers (Anderson 1990; Satz 2010). Both of these have gendered aspects. The supply of procreative goods and services is generated by scarcity of alternative sources of income for women in many poor countries, by frequent lack of regulation, and even by national policies designed to make commercial gestational services a profitable export industry. India is a leader in commercial gestational services because labor is cheap, doctors are highly qualified, English is spoken, adoptions are closed, and the government has worked aggressively to establish an infrastructure for medical tourism (Bailey 2011:3). The demand for commercial procreative services is increased by the fact that many Western women postpone having children until their careers are well established, by which time conception is more difficult. However, assisted procreative services in the West are often difficult to obtain because of regulatory limitations, age restrictions, sexual preference, waiting times and high cost. For these reasons, women from Western countries frequently travel abroad where they can purchase faster or cheaper services and/or undergo genetic or gender selection (Donchin 2010:327).

Gender justice and the environment. A long established philosophical literature addresses issues of environment and gender justice and some of it takes a global perspective. Feminist philosophers have discussed supposed parallels between women and non-human nature and the disparately gendered consequences of toxins in weaponry, pesticides and foods, and toxic dumping in poor communities (Plumwood 1993; Mies and Shiva 1993). A more recent focus has been the gendered implications of climate change (Terry 2009). For example, a new UN study explores how drought in India has gender-differentiated consequences for agricultural wages and work (UNDP 2014).

---

[8] For example, in the republics of the former Soviet Union, where the implementation of market policies led to unemployment rates as high as 70 percent and 80 percent among women (Sassen 2002:268), many women enter sex work and dream of marriage to a foreign man, who will provide protection and economic security.

4. Some cross-cutting theoretical issues

4.1. Measuring well-being and gender equity

In discussing global gender disparities, I have relied on readers' intuitive recognition that many of these are politically problematic. However, different societies may accept different standards. Many proposed metrics exist for assessing wellbeing and gender equity and more are constantly being developed. This short discussion sketches three representative metrics, focusing less on their substantive content than on the methodology used in developing and applying them.

Human rights provide one important transnational standard of political morality. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) aspired to universal cosmopolitan ideals that provide the moral basis for much international law. The UDHR and related body of human rights law include commitments to both sex and race equality. However, feminist critics argued that early human rights documents utilized an understanding of rights which presupposed a fairly rigid public/private distinction (Okin 1998). On this model, rights protected individuals against abuses within the public realm of the state but also protected the so-called private realm of family, religion, and culture from external interference, even though this realm was the site of much gender discrimination and abuse of women. In the 1980s and 1990s, a global feminist movement rallied around the slogan, "Women's rights are human rights." One notable success of this movement was its influence on the 1993 *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action,* which included a formal declaration of women's rights as human rights and violence against women as a human rights violation (United Nations 1993). In 1995, the Fourth World Conference on Women produced the *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action,* which brought culture and religion under critical moral scrutiny and identified many gender-specific practices as rights violations (UN 1995).[9] The movement for women's rights as human rights has made vital contributions to exposing gender specific rights violations rationalized by appeals to religion and culture traditions but some scholars and activists have argued that the Beijing documents utilize interpretations of women's rights that are culturally biased and lend themselves to being deployed in an oppressive and disrespectful way against some communities, particularly in Africa (Nnaemeka 2005). Critics argue that there is no culturally neutral interpretation of women's human rights; they must be interpreted in specific contexts rather than imposed from the top down (Tobin 2009).

The capabilities offer a second global standard proposed for assessing wellbeing and gender equity. The concept was developed originally by Amartya Sen, who defined capabilities as socially available opportunities for valuable functioning (Sen 1984).[10] Sen has resisted offering a substantive list of capabilities but Nussbaum has developed an explicit list which purports to provide a universal standard for assessing local ways of life. Nussbaum's intention is to provide a concrete alternative to cultural relativism (Nussbaum 2000). She also asserts that the list contributes to a theory of justice by identifying the primary goods available for just distribution and setting a threshold that must be reached by all citizens before any society can be considered

---

[9] This document was revised in 2005 and again in 2010 (UN 2010).

[10] In the 1990s, the idea was adopted by numerous international agencies and nongovernmental organizations, including the United Nations Development Program, whose Human Development Index used a capability metric developed in collaboration with Sen.

just (Nussbaum 2000: 12, 75, 86). The general idea of capabilities has been very influential but so far there exists no generally accepted methodology for establishing a comprehensive list. Nussbaum's own justifications for her list face problems of authority and legitimacy (Robeyns 20015; Jaggar 2006).

Many other existing standards propose to measure human well-being and gender equity on a global scale. The last to be mentioned here is the Individual Deprivation Measure (IDM) (Wisor *et al,* 2014). The team that produced the IDM aimed initially to develop a metric capable of revealing whether or in what ways global poverty might be gendered.[11] They also wanted their metric to minimize cultural narrowness by including values held by many poor people, women and men.[12] Finally, recognizing that human wellbeing, poverty, and gender equity are value-laden concepts, the team sought to make explicit the values and reasoning incorporated into the metric. The most striking feature of the IDM is the consciously feminist methodology used in developing it. The research was participatory and multi-disciplinary and gender analysis was central.[13] In addition, the team provided an explicit explanation of their reasoning in selecting the indicators they included. The IDM is certainly not an all-purpose metric but its participatory and gender-sensitive methodology offers a model to be taken very seriously in developing future metrics of well-being and gender equity.

4.2. Causally explaining global gender disparities

Inequality is not necessarily unjust. Disparities may result from factors that are unpredictable or unavoidable or they may even be deserved. Systematic injustice occurs when groups are linked by structural relations of domination or when distributive disparities are morally arbitrary and produced by social structures whose outcomes are foreseeable and preventable. Investigating the nature and causes of gender disparities is important both for revealing global gender injustices and for assigning political responsibility for addressing them.

[11] Existing metrics were suspected of being gender-biased because they took households as their units of assessment, thereby obscuring intra-household disparities, and also because they used indicators of poverty that seemed to fit better with men's than women's lives.

[12] The team was aware that people in some societies understand wealth and poverty not in terms of money but rather in terms of items such as land or cows or social relationships.

[13] Researchers asked poor people in six poor countries what poverty meant to them. They worked with people situated differently, investigating how their social locations influenced their understandings of poverty. Although it used ethnographic methods, the research project was not anthropological in the sense of simply investigating what poor people in various societies believe poverty to be; instead it drew on poor people's ideas to inform the metrics used by academics and experts. In an effort to determine whether and to what extent women and men might systematically disagree about the constituents of poverty, the researchers interviewed not ungendered "poor people" but rather poor women and poor men. They asked explicit questions about aspects of poverty found by other researchers to be especially important to women, such as free time, sexual autonomy, and family planning. They employed female researchers to interview women and usually interviewed people in gender-separated groups, hoping this would encourage women participants to speak more freely. In addition, they took individuals rather than households as their units of assessment.

Because some patterns of gender inequality are extremely widespread, many Western philosophers have argued that women are invariably subordinated as a result of inherent sex differences. If this is true, then some gender disparities may not be unjust because they are natural or unalterable. Feminists have debunked many versions of the "naturalness" claim but new varieties constantly recur, often invoking evolution. Such causal claims typically rely on mistaken understandings of sex as contextually invariant, on speculative "just so" stories about evolution, and on simplistic views about biological determinism (Prinz 2012; Jordan-Young 2010). They all miss the more general philosophical point that it is social contexts which mainly determine whether, when, and how particular physical or other abilities are advantageous or disadvantageous. For philosophers concerned with gender justice, it is important to assess how social arrangements advantage some gendered groups while disadvantaging others and to explore how these arrangements could be redesigned to be more gender just.

A second inadequate explanation of global gender disparities is that they result primarily from bad decisions made by poor women out of ignorance, false consciousness, or adaptive preferences. The emphasis placed by some Western philosophers on poor women's supposedly bad decisions has often been condescending and even victim blaming, rationalizing Westerners' taking up the missionary role of "educating" or "raising the consciousness" of women in developing countries (Jaggar 2005; Khader 2013). It also directs philosophers' attention away from the proper focus of gender justice, which is less to evaluate individual choices and more to assess the social structures that construct relations of equality or domination and assign costs and benefits to various social options. Women's decisions to participate in painful, exhausting or demeaning practices may be rational insofar as they represent the best bargains that those involved are able to strike in situations where their options are highly constrained or even no-win.

Systematic gender domination and disadvantage do not depend exclusively on singular causes, such as sexual biology, cultural norms, individual choices, or social structures; instead, they result from the ways in which these factors interact in particular contexts. I have proposed that structures and policies that are both national and transnational create interlocking cycles of gendered vulnerability which often place feminized populations in especially weak bargaining situations (Jaggar 2014a).[14] The idea of transnational cycles of gendered vulnerability is an explanatory schema or methodological approach. To explain particular gender disparities, the schema must be filled in by empirical descriptions of ways in which gendered norms and practices interact in specific contexts to enable and constrain people's possibilities for action.

---

[14] My work builds on Okin's idea that the division of labor in heterosexual Western marriage created a gendered cycle of vulnerability for women. She argued that "a cycle of power relations and decisions pervades both family and workplace, each reinforcing the inequalities between the sexes that already exist within the other" (Okin 1989:4). Iris Marion Young utilized Okin's explanatory model to analyze the situation of women in some less-developed countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. She asserted that the division of family labor, which assigns women primary responsibility for care of the household, "operates as a strong and enforced norm among many newly urbanized women (and) produces and reproduces a (specifically gendered) vulnerability to domination and exploitation in wage employment" (Young 2009:230).

Interactions among national and transnational structures are further complicated by factors such as ethnicity, religion, and class, which may mitigate or multiply the disadvantages of particular gendered groups. The idea of transnational cycles of gendered vulnerability is a conceptual tool for use in figuring out which global gender disparities are unjust, who is causally responsible for those disparities, and how they might be addressed through structural changes.

The idea of transnational cycles of gendered vulnerability allows us to understand why gender disparities often resemble each other across the world without resorting to accounts that are either biologically determinist or victim-blaming. It acknowledges the causal relevance of sexed bodies but considers those bodies in various social contexts, conceptualizing them in a way that is not reductionist or deterministic. It also recognizes the causal influence of conditions that are both local and global without reducing one to the other. Finally, the idea of transnational cycles of gendered vulnerability does not "disappear" individual consciousness and choice but instead shows how women's and men's choices are shaped and limited by gendered ideologies and structural constraints.

4.3. Political responsibility for global gender injustice

Who or what is responsible for global gender injustice? Because global gender injustices come in many varieties and scales, no single account of responsibility can fit them all. This section outlines three feminist accounts of political responsibility in order to illustrate the wide range of possible approaches. The three accounts differ on several dimensions: they focus on different aspects of global gender inequities, explain them in different terms, and offer different accounts of the moral basis of political responsibility.

One view is global feminism, a perspective that descends from the radical feminism of the Western second-wave. The radical feminists wished to establish that women were a group subjected to a distinct form of oppression and their earliest writings postulated a worldwide women's culture, existing "beneath the surface" of all national, ethnic and racial cultures and colonized by these "male" cultures (Burris 1973).[15] Global feminism emphasizes physical violence against women and forced sexual and reproductive labor. It attributed these abuses to "patriarchy," a broad concept covering most if not all systems of male dominance. From this, it seems to follow that responsibility in the sense of culpability for these injustices belongs to male perpetrators and others complicit with patriarchy. This presumably includes most men and many women. However, global feminists exhort all women everywhere to combat patriarchy on the moral basis of global sisterhood (Morgan 1984). Tes call has something in common with the cosmopolitan/humanitarian spirit of Peter Singer's early work, insofar as it asks otherwise uninvolved individuals to help others on a moral basis of solidarity (Singer 1972). Gendered solidarity continues to be invoked by many women's NGOs which appeal to better-off women to help worse-off women everywhere.

Postcolonial feminism differs from global feminism on several counts. At the descriptive level, it resists assimilating diverse practices from many continents and time periods to universal

---

[15] For example, Mary Daly asserted that women worldwide were subjected to male violence, through such practices as witch burning, *sati*, footbinding, and "female genital mutilation" (Daly 1978:109-12).

misogyny or woman-hating. At the explanatory level, postcolonial feminists reject the idea of an ahistorical and universalistic patriarchy. They see gender injustices as caused by many factors, past as well as present, local as well as global, but they emphasize the causal preeminence of colonialism and neo-colonialism (Volpp 2000). Accordingly, postcolonial feminists do not place responsibility exclusively on local perpetrators; they also blame functionaries and beneficiaries of colonialism, neocolonialism and "development." They contend that even Western feminisms have often been implicated in imperial projects and charge that Western feminist criticisms of Nonwestern cultural traditions are often forms of "imperial feminism" or "feminist orientalism," patronizing continuations of the "colonialist stance" of former eras (Carby 1982; Amos and Parmar 1984; Mohanty 1991; Narayan 1998; Jaggar 2005). Although postcolonial feminism is distinct in its specific arguments, it has something in common with the work of philosophers like Thomas Pogge (2008) or Richard Miller (2010), who argue that citizens of wealthy countries are culpably liable for suffering in the global South and therefore face moral obligations of justice as well humanity to redress this suffering.

Iris Young has proposed a third account of political responsibility which contrasts with both of the above approaches. She calls this the social connection model (Young 2007). Young is concerned primarily with injustices emerging from social processes that extend widely across regions of the world. Her paradigm example is garment sweatshops, which are links in complex transnational chains that produce, distribute and market clothing. On Young's analysis, the sufferings of sweatshop workers are produced by densely interlocking social structures reinforced by the decisions of innumerable agents on multiple levels. Young explicitly rejects universalistic humanitarian models of political responsibility because she does not find it morally plausible that all moral agents have exactly same duties to all other agents; presumably she would reject global sisterhood on similar grounds (Young 2007:161). Young also argues that model of individual liability or culpability is unsuitable for attributing political responsibility for these types of structural injustices because causal connections are hard to trace and many agents involved cannot be regarded as culpable because they lack *mens rea* or realistic alternatives. As an alternative to both the above accounts of responsibility for global injustice, Young locates the moral basis of her model in people's social connections with others who share participation in structures of cooperation and competition. Young offers several contrasts between hers and the liability model: the social connection model does not isolate perpetrators; it focuses less on individual actions than on the background conditions of their decisions; it is more forward looking than backward looking; its responsibility is essentially shared; and it can be discharged only through working together collectively action.

Critics of Young's social connection model of responsibility have suggested that it may let individual perpetrators too easily off the moral hook. I cannot consider here how far these various conceptions of responsibility should be regarded as alternatives or complements to each other.

4.4. Repairing gender injustices

In this space, it is not possible to trace the contributions made by feminist philosophers to the literatures on reparative and transitional justice. Many have given special attention to gendered violence, including genocidal rape and sexual torture in conflict zones. The causes of this violence are sometimes exclusively local but many conflicts result from interventions by larger

players seeking access to resources in the global South (Pogge 2008; Jaggar 2014b). Feminist philosophers tend to advocate material restitution and compensation where these are appropriate but they also recognize that much of the damage to lives and dignity is irreparable; people cannot be brought back to life nor their suffering and humiliation erased. Indeed, framing the issue exclusively in material terms can diminish the seriousness or gravity of the harm done (Walker 2015). In such circumstances, symbolic reparations such as properly worded apologies or reinventing traditional cleansing rituals may fulfil important restorative functions (Miller 2009).

5. How can we identify global gender justice?

How to identify global gender justice is a matter of political epistemology. One time-honored methodological approach is ideal theory, which begins by imagining an ideal or "well-ordered" society (Rawls 1971). Ingrid Robeyns has referred to this as the "Paradise Island" method (Robeyns 2008). Several feminist philosophers have employed versions of ideal theory; for example, Susan Okin followed second wave androgyny theorists in advocating the abolition of gender and Martha Nussbaum has generated a universal list of capabilities (Okin 1989; Nussbaum 2000). In recent years, however, many feminist philosophers have become critical of ideal theory because idealized models are likely to disregard aspects of the real world that are crucially relevant to assessing the justice of existing institutions and the practical feasibility of proposed alternatives (Anderson 2010).

A second approach to identifying global gender justice has been offered by the tradition of care ethics. Since the 1980s, this has been developed as a feminine or feminist approach to morality. Sometimes care ethics is presented as a contrast with the "justice" approach but sometimes it is seen as complementary to justice or an alternative way of thinking about it. Different philosophers have used "care" to refer to different things, including a distinct emotional attitude, a type of personal caretaking labor, a moral methodology, and an epistemic virtue. Philosophers who advocate a care approach to global gender justice include Virginia Held (2006) and Fiona Robinson (2011).

Many feminist philosophers recommend a methodological approach to global justice that they call non-ideal or "critical" theory. In non-ideal theory, normative ideals do not function as unquestioned standards of assessment but rather as hypotheses to be tested in experience; for example, the British abolition of slavery is seen as initiating a worldwide experiment in free labor (Anderson 2014.) Non-ideal theory starts "from a diagnosis of injustices in our actual world, rather than from a picture of an ideal world" (Anderson 2010:3). However, even diagnosing injustices is far from simple in a world where the moral resources available are extremely diverse and where people are profoundly unequal in terms of epistemic credibility. Some feminist philosophers are seeking ways to address the global epistemic injustices that hamper cross-cultural expression and uptake of multiple points of view (Jaggar/Tobin 2013; Tobin/Jaggar 2013). Better understandings of global gender justice can emerge only from discussions that are epistemically more gender just.

References

Altman, Meryl and Kerry Pannell. 2012. "Policy Gaps and Theory Gaps: Women and Migrant Domestic Labor." *Feminist Economics*, vol. 18, issue 2, pages 291-315

Amos, Valerie and Pratibha Parmar. 1984. "Challenging Imperial Feminism," *Feminist Review* 17:3-19.

Anderson, Bridget. 2000. *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour,* London and New York: Zed Books.

Anderson, Elizabeth. 1990. "Is Women's Labor a Commodity?" *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 19: 71-92.

Anderson, Elizabeth. 2010. *The Imperative of Integration,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, Elizabeth. 2014. *Social Movements, Experiments in Living, and Moral Progress: Case Studies from Britain's Abolition of Slavery,* Lawrence, KS: Department of Philosophy, University of Kansas.

Bailey, Alison. 2011. "Reconceiving Surrogacy: Toward a Reproductive Justice Account of Indian Surrogacy." *Hypatia*. Volume 26, Issue 4, (Fall) pages 715–741.

Balakrishnan, Radhika. 2002. *The Hidden Assembly Line: Gender Dynamics of Subcontracted Work in a Global Economy,* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 35-62.

Beneria, Lourdes. 2003. *Gender, Development, and Globalization: Economics as if All People Mattered,* New York and London: Routledge

Beneria, Lourdes. 2008. "Globalization, Gender and the Transformation of Women's Roles," *Revista Catalana de Geografia,*

Brown, Dallas L. 1991. "Christian Missionaries, Western Feminists, and the Kikuyu Clitoridectomy Controversy," in Brett Williams, ed., *The Politics of Culture,* Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 243-272.

Burris, Barbara. 1973. "The Fourth World Manifesto," in *Radical Feminism,* edited by Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine and Anita Rapone, New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Book Co.

Carby, Hazel. 1982. "White Woman Listen! Black Feminism and the Boundaries of Sisterhood." *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in Seventies Britain* by Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. London: Hutchinson, 212-235.

Daly, Mary. 1978. *Gyn/Ecology: the Metaethics of Radical Feminism,* Boston: Beacon Press

Donchin, Anne. 2010. "Reproductive Tourism and the Quest for Global Gender Justice," *Bioethics* 24: 7, 323–332

Elson, Diane. 2002. "Gender Justice, Human Rights, Economics," in *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights,* edited by Maxine Molyneux and Shahra Razavi, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality,* New York: Basic Books.

Fraser, Nancy. 1997. "From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Postsocialist' Age," in *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition,"* New York and London: Routledge.

Held, Virginia. 2006. *The Ethics of Care*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie. 2002. "Love and Gold," in Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds, *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy,* New York: Henry Holt.

Hughes, Donna M. 2000. "The 'Natasha' Trade: The Transnational Shadow Market of Trafficking in Women," *Journal of International Affairs*, 53(2):625-651.
Hughes, Donna M. 2004 "The Role of 'Marriage Agencies in the Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking of Women from the Former Soviet Union, *International Review of Victimology,* 11:49-71.
Huh, Ra-Keum. 2008. "The Politics of Meaning: Care Work and Migrant Women," *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3):37-60.
International Labour Organization. 2015. *Forced labour, human trafficking and slavery,* http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/lang--en/index.htm (accessed 16 February, 2015).
International Organization for Migration. 2012. "Facts & Figures: Global Estimates and Trends" http://www.iom.int/cms/en/sites/iom/home/about-migration/facts--figures-1.html (Accessed 28 May 2013).
Jaggar, Alison M. 2002. "A Feminist Critique of the Alleged Southern Debt," *Hypatia*, 17:4 (fall) 119-142.
Jaggar, Alison M. 2005. "'Saving Amina?' Global Justice for Women and Intercultural Dialogue," *Ethics and International Affairs* 19:3, (fall), 85-105.
Jaggar, Alison M. 2006. "Reasoning About Well-Being: Nussbaum's Methods of Justifying the Capabilities," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 14, no. 4: 301–322.
Jaggar, Alison M. and Theresa Tobin. 2013. "Situating Moral Justification: Rethinking the Mission of Moral Epistemology," *Metaphilosophy,* Vol. 44, No. 4 (July) 383-408.
Jaggar, Alison M. 2014a. "Transnational Cycles of Vulnerability: A Prologue to a Theory of Global Gender Justice." *Gender and Global Justice,* edited by Alison M. Jaggar, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. ch.1.
Jaggar, Alison M. 2014b. "'Are my hands clean?' Responsibility for global gender disparities" in *Poverty, Agency, and Human Rights,* edited by Diana Meyers, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 170-194.
Jordan-Young, Rebecca. 2010. *Brain Storm: The Flaws in the Science of Sex Differences.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.
Kang, Hye-Ryoung. 2014. "Transnational Women's Collectivities and Global Justice." *Gender and Global Justice,* edited by Alison M. Jaggar, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. ch.2.
Khader, Serene J. 2013. "Identifying adaptive preferences in practice: lessons from postcolonial feminisms," *Journal of Global Ethics,* 9:3, 311-327.
Khattack, Saba Gul. 2002. "Subcontracted Work and Gender Relations: The Case of Pakistan," in Radhika Balakrishnan, ed., *The Hidden Assembly Line: Gender Dynamics of Subcontracted Work in a Global Economy,* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 35-62.
Kittay, Eva. 2014. "The Moral Harm of Migrant Carework: Realizing a Global Right to Care." *Gender and Global Justice,* edited by Alison M. Jaggar, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. ch. 3.
Lutz 2002. "At Your Service Madam! The Globalization of Domestic Service," *Feminist Review* 70:89-103.
Malik, Shiv. 2012. "Lost generation costing Europe €153bn a year, research finds," *The Guardian Weekly,* 26.10.12, p.3.
Mies, Maria and Vandana Shiva, 1993, *Ecofeminism*, London: Zed Books.
Miller, Richard. 2010. *Globalizing Justice: The Ethics of Poverty and Power,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Sarah Clark. 2009. "Atrocity, Harm, and Resistance: A Situated Understanding of Genocidal Rape," in *Evil, Political Violence, and Forgiveness: Essays in Honor of Claudia Card,* edited by Andrea Veltman and Kathryn J. Norlock: Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Moeller-Leimkuhler, Anna Maria. 2003. "The Gender Gap in Suicide and Premature Death: Or, Why are Men so Vulnerable? *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience,* Vol. 252 (1):1-8.

Mohanty, Chandra. 1991. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourse," in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism,* edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres, Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press, 51-80.

Morgan, Robin, Ed. 1984. *Sisterhood is Global*, Garden City, NY:Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Narayan, Uma. 1995. "'Male-Order' Brides: Immigrant Women, Domestic Violence, and Immigration Law," *Hypatia* 10(1):101-119.

Narayan, Uma. 1998. "Essence of Culture and a Sense of History: A Feminist Critique of Cultural Essentialism." *Hypatia*, Spring 13:2, 86-106.

Nnaemeka, Obioma. 2005. "African Women, Colonial Discourses, and Imperialist Interventions: Female Circumcision as Impetus." In Nnaemeka, Obioma (ed), *Female Circumcision and the Politics of Knowledge.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1992. Human Functioning and Social Justice: In Defense of Aristotelian Essentialism," *Political Theory* 20, 202-246.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2000. *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okin, Susan Moller. 1989. *Justice, Gender and the Family,* New York: Basic Books.

Okin, Susan Moller. 1994. "Gender Inequality and Cultural Differences," *Political Theory,* 22:1 (February).

Okin, Susan Moller. 1998. "Feminism, Women's Human Rights, and Cultural Differences. *Hypatia*, 13:2 (Spring).

Okin, Susan Moller (with respondents). 1999. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Eds. Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard, and Martha C. Nussbaum, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Parreňas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work,* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Parreňas, Rhacel Salazar. 2002. "The Care Crisis in the Philippines: Children and Transnational Families in the New Global Economy," in Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds, *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy,* New York: Henry Holt.

Pogge, Thomas. 2002/2008. *World Poverty and Human Rights,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Plumwood, Val. 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature,* New York: Routledge.

Prinz, Jesse. 2012. "Why Are Men So Violent?" *Psychology Today,* http://www.psychologytoday.com accessed 10 February, 2012.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Razavi, Shahra. 2011. "*World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development, An Opportunity both Welcome and Missed (An Extended Commentary)*," New York: UNRISD.

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2005. "Selecting Capabilities for Quality of Life Measurement," *Social Indicators Research,* 74:191-215.

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2008. "Ideal Theory in Theory and Practice," *Social Theory and Practice* 34, no. 3: 341-362.

Robinson, Fiona, 2011. *The Ethics of Care: A Feminist Approach to Human Security*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Sassen, Saskia. 2002. "Women's Burden: Counter-Geographies of Globalization and the Feminization of Survival," *Nordic Journal of International Law* 71:255-274.
Satz, Debra. 2010. *Why Some Things Should Not Be for Sale: The Moral Limits of Markets*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sen, Amartya. 1984. *Resources, Values and Development.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Standing, Guy. 1999. "Global Feminization through Flexible Labor: A Theme Revisited," *World Development* 27:3, 583-602.
Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class,* London and New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
Terry, Geraldine. 2009. *Climate Change and Gender Justice*, Rugby, UK: Practical Action Publishing.
Tobin, Theresa W. 2009. "Using Rights to Counter 'Gender-Specific' Wrongs," *Human Rights Review* 10:521-530.
Tobin, Theresa W. and Alison M. Jaggar. 2013. "Naturalizing Moral Justification: Rethinking the Method of Moral Epistemology," *Metaphilosophy,* Vol. 44, No. 4 (July) 409-439.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2014. "Blame it on the Rain?: Gender differentiated impacts of drought on agricultural wage and work in India," http://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/poverty/RBAP-PR-2014-Blame-It-on-the-Rain.pdf (Accessed 30 Jan, 2015)
United Nations. 1993. *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.* http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/Vienna.aspx (accessed 13 Feb, 2015)
United Nations Women. 1995. *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women: Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action.* http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/ (Accessed 30 Jan, 2015).
United Nations. 1999. *1999 World Survey on the Role of Women in Development: Globalization, Gender and Work,* New York: United Nations
United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. 2010. *Report on the Fifty-Fourth Session.* http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/305/76/PDF/N1030576.pdf. (Accessed 30 Jan, 2015)
Volpp, Leti. 2000. "Blaming Culture for Bad Behavior, *Yale Journal of Law and Humanities* 12, pp. 89–116.
Walker, Margaret Urban. 2015. "Making Reparations Possible: Theorizing Reparative Justice," in *Theorizing Transitional Justice*, edited by Claudio Corradetti, Nir Eisikovits, and Jack Rotondi, Farnham, UK: Ashgate Press.
Wisor, Scott, Sharon Bessell, Fatima Castillo, Joanne Crawford, Kieran Donaghue, Janet Hunt, Alison Jaggar, Amy Liu, and Thomas Pogge. 2014. *The Individual Deprivation Measure: A Gender Sensitive Approach to Poverty Measurement.* http://www.iwda.org.au/research/individual-deprivation-measure/ (Accessed 1 February, 2015.)
World Bank. 2011. *World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development,* Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Young, Iris M. 2007. “Responsibility, Social Connection, and Global Labor Justice,” *Global Challenges: War, Self-Determination and Responsibility for Justice,* Cambridge: Polity Press, 159-186.

Young, Iris M. 2009. “The Gendered Cycle of Vulnerability in the Less Developed World,” in *Toward a Humanist Justice: The Philosophy of Susan Moller Okin,* edited by Rob Reich and Debra Satz, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zarembka, Joy M. 2002. “America’s Dirty Work: Migrant Maids and Modern Day Slavery,” in *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* edited by Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild, New York: Holt.