Introduction: The Problem of Globalization

Living as a first-world citizen in a globalizing world presents a great moral challenge. Many people are aware that the wealthiest 20 percent of the world's population consume 76.6 percent of the world's resources, while the world's poorest 20 percent are left with 1.5 percent.[1] However, fewer people are aware that while basic education for everyone in the world would cost six billion dollars, US Americans spend eight billion dollars annually on cosmetics; that while water and sanitation for everyone in the world would cost nine billion dollars, Europeans annually spend eleven billion dollars on ice cream; that while providing reproductive health care for all women in the world would cost twelve billion dollars, together US Americans and Europeans currently spend that much annually on perfumes; that while basic health and nutrition for everyone in the world would only cost thirteen billion dollars, Europeans and US Americans spend seventeen billion dollars annually on pet food.[2] These facts offer a glimpse into the different social realities of life in the global North and the global South.

Certainly there is nothing morally questionable about eating ice cream, wearing perfume, or having a pet. Yet these statistics do portray a troubling moral crisis in our world. How is it possible that so few have so much, when so many have so little? Obviously, the money currently being spent on personal consumption reflected in these figures cannot simply be shifted to cover expenditures like basic education or water and sanitation for the world's population. Our global economic system and its disparities are not that simple. There is something more deeply amiss in our world that we must try to comprehend.

The underlying moral problem that these statistics reveal is twofold. First, these statistics demonstrate a behavioral problem on the part of people living in the first world that manifests itself as relative indulgence and overconsumption by the world's elite in the face of human suffering around the world.[3] Second, these massive inequalities between life in the first world and life in the two-thirds world reveal an underlying structural problem in our global society: that the contemporary structures of the global economy—including neoclassical economic theory, international financial institutions, global trade agreements,

and the actions of transnational business corporations—are designed by people in the first world in ways that disproportionately benefit those of us living in the first world. The wealthy elite, namely the people who live in the first world and their elite compatriots in developing countries (who are often educated in the first world), are the architects of the global economic and political structures that shape the face of globalization and global economic policy. While it is essential for individual first-world consumers to recognize our complicity in perpetuating this global system of increasing inequality, it is also vital that we recognize the systemic root of the problems that are reflected in these statistics. These two factors—personal complicity and behavior alongside structural analysis and accountability—are the foundations for changing the direction of our global future.

An ethic of solidarity is both a model for first-world Christians for how to live faithfully in the midst of a globalizing world (personal complicity and behavior) as well as a framework for a new way of imagining our political economy and our social networks and interactions (structural analysis and accountability).[4] An ethic of solidarity is a transformative ethic, rooted in the principles of sustainability and social justice, that requires first-world citizens to work simultaneously on transforming personal habits and lifestyles as well as global economic and political structures that perpetuate inequality and injustice. The starting point for this project is the problem of social injustice that is generated by the dominant form of globalization in our world and the economic ideology that undergirds it.[5] In these pages, I will explore the richness, depth, and challenge that a theology of solidarity offers as the foundation for economic and social relationships as opposed to the guiding principles of individualism, profit, and wealth accumulation that currently drive the economic structures of human society.

My work as a Christian social ethicist is best defined as feminist liberation ethics, a strand of thought rooted in the tradition of social Christianity that takes the problem of social injustice as its starting point.[6] The tradition of Christian social ethics is the branch of ethical inquiry that understands its task as "the relentless advocacy of ethical positions on matters of public policy based on Christian theological criteria."[7] By its nature, Christian social ethics is public theology that engages in critical social analysis with an eye toward developing normative moral criteria to help shape human behavior and social policy. Critical feminist theologies also shape the methodological perspective of this study in several significant ways, including the emphasis on examining interstructured oppression, privileging standpoint theory and the importance

of social location, and the emphasis on developing relationships across lines of difference that is foundational to the ethic of solidarity developed here.

Assessing the Morality of Economic Globalization

Economies and markets are social structures created by human beings. They are the means by which people order and structure the basic activities of human existence. The economies, markets, and social systems that humans create are moral structures that reflect particular values expressing particular understandings of what it means to be human and what it means to live a good life. As such, it is important to interrogate the moral codes and priorities that are embedded in economic systems to ensure that these systems reflect the values that societies hold most dear. The current economic order, which is commonly referred to as "neoliberal globalization," is a complex idea that deserves some analysis.

The term "globalization" is currently used in a wide variety of ways. Generally speaking, it refers to economic, social, political, and cultural processes that serve to break down traditional barriers that have separated peoples, nations, and cultures from one another. To the extent that globalization refers to interaction between cultures, trade partnerships and agreements, migration, and technology transfer, it is hardly a new phenomenon. Just as surely as tribal and cultural identity can be traced to the evolution of *homo sapiens* as a species, the interaction, intermarriage, and trading relationships between different clans and tribes represent the earliest patterns of commerce and social interaction between groups that defined themselves as somehow different from one another. These behaviors and interactions mark the history of human civilization over the millennia. Sometimes cultural interaction has progressed peacefully and functioned in mutually beneficial ways; at other times nations have acted as aggressors against their neighbors or against those peoples and cultures that they perceived to be inferior.

The political and economic shifts that accompanied the end of the Second World War led to the rise of a new geopolitical landscape that included two major changes. The first change was the solidification of the Western and Eastern political "blocs" that came to be known respectively as the "first" and the "second" world. The second change was a growing concern with the economic development of newly independent nations in Africa, Latin America, and to a lesser extent, Asia. The working assumption of the Western countries, or the first world, was that these former colonies needed to develop their assets and resources in ways that would make them more prosperous. The general consensus was that the best way for them to succeed was to emulate the

industrial development model that had propelled the first world to economic success. These countries were referred to as "underdeveloped" or "developing." They also came to be known as the "third world," and more recently, the "two-thirds world" or the "Global South."

The most significant changes that have shaped the global economy and the context of globalization in which we now live took shape in the 1980s. At that time, a new set of economic policies were promoted by leading politicians in Britain and the United States that have come to be characterized by the label "neoliberal."[8] These policies brought business and political leaders together in the task of developing a more integrated global economy. The guiding principle behind these policies was that economic growth and the health of the economy were best achieved by creating political environments that allowed "market mechanisms" to function freely without government interference. Also referred to by the names "supply-side economics," "Washington Consensus," "laissez-faire," and the "free market," these economic approaches relied heavily on deregulation, privatization, and increasing international trade, and were heavily promoted by the administrations of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan.

With the disintegration of the former Soviet Bloc countries in the last decades of the twentieth century, economists and politicians heralded the triumph of capitalism and sought to extend neoliberal policies around the world in an effort to create a single, unified global market that functioned with a common set of economic principles and assumptions. While various engines of the global economy, like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO), had already moved toward neoliberal policies in the early 1980s, by the end of the decade these dominant international financial institutions promoted neoliberal ideas as the foundational economic assumptions of their models of development. The economic power that these institutions wielded, through economic policies and critically important credit ratings of developing countries' economies, allowed them to pressure many developing countries to conform to Western economic assumptions about growth and trade. These assumptions often discounted the particular circumstances, histories, and cultural specificities of individual countries and their economies.[9] The structural adjustment policies that accompanied the neoliberal model functioned to eviscerate social spending on education, health, unemployment, and other social services in countries where many people were unable to compensate for this loss of government services. These cutbacks had significant impacts on literacy rates, prenatal care, infant

mortality, and the general health and well being of many people living in or near poverty.[10]

As a nation, the United States is deeply invested in the promotion and continuation of the neoliberal model of globalization. From our fourteen-trillion-dollar debt to the military-industrial complex that accounts for 45 percent of our national budget, US Americans have structured our economy in ways that are beholden to a neoliberal economic agenda. The allure of an ideology that recognizes the capitalist, consumerist, and individualist way of life as the pinnacle of civilization, and a capitalist market economy as superior to all others, has structured our lives and our minds in particular ways. Unfortunately, privilege and wealth are too often accompanied by a complacency that blinds us to our own weaknesses. As a country, we have become a people that are largely ignorant of the economic institutions of globalization like the IMF, World Bank, and the WTO. Many people in the United States do not know what these institutions do or how they function, but ignorance does not reduce the moral culpability of US Americans for the actions of their government working through these institutions. The very presence of the World Bank and IMF in Washington, DC tells volumes about the influence and control that the United States has in shaping their policy directives.[11]

In this book, the term "economic globalization" is used to refer specifically to the form of globalization that is driven by neoliberal economic theories and activities promoted by US economists, business people, and public officials. While many US Americans have benefited handsomely from neoliberal globalization through wealth gained from financial investment and transactions to inexpensive food, clothes, and electronics, the neoliberal global order has also had a negative impact on the lives of many people living in this country. The growing gap between the rich and the poor that has increased dramatically since the 1990s, the realities of outsourcing and free trade that have contributed to the continued loss of working-class industrial jobs, the subprime lending crisis, and the shifting of the tax burden from the wealthy to the working poor are all consequences of a rise of neoliberal culture that is increasingly shaping the political-economic landscape in the US.[12] These negative consequences of economic globalization help make it easier for US Americans to see the ways in which the neoliberal agenda that has been exploiting the developing world for decades has also been slowly undermining the capacity of people across the economic spectrum to create a "good life" here at home.

Neoliberal globalization is a particular ideology, or belief system, that offers humankind one pathway for organizing economic behavior and transactions. It is not, however, the only model of how international and domestic economic

arrangements could be ordered. When viewed from the perspective of the poor and disenfranchised, the morality of neoliberal globalization is far from benign. In fact, the current form of neoliberal globalization mimics the patterns of colonialism and exploitation that dominated international affairs for the last several hundred years. While it purports to be the only way to end poverty, it often functions to impoverish people, communities, and cultures through the implementation of free-market solutions and theories that build up the wealth and power of the world's most powerful economic and political players.[13] Unfortunately, the univocal focus on free-market solutions to poverty draws on Western, neoclassical economic assumptions about human behavior, desire, values, and social reality that do not necessarily correspond to the social reality of the twenty-first century. By focusing almost exclusively on promoting macroeconomic policies to generate economic growth through free-trade zones, growing crops for export, and pushing integration of developing world economies into the global economy, the capitalist approach to addressing poverty fails to allow proponents of neoliberalism to pay adequate attention to the complex factors that contribute to poverty or to the unique forms that poverty takes in different cultural contexts.

Neoliberal policies have certainly functioned to create wealth. The moral question, though, is, "Who has this wealth benefited?" From a Christian ethical perspective, drawing on the deep traditions of justice and care of neighbor as the ethical cornerstones of reflection, a more trenchant moral question is, "What effect do these policies have on the poor and the most marginalized people in society?" Valuing the perspectives of the poor and marginalized allows for engagement in a process of critical social analysis that highlights the processes of globalization from a different perspective than the dominant vision of privilege that accompanies much discourse on globalization in the first world. The current economic crisis offers an opportunity to open up a whole new discussion on political economy that has the potential to move beyond the twentieth-century debates over individualism vs. collectivism. Despite the globally integrated and interconnected world of the twenty-first century, no single master narrative of economic transactions, development, or prosperity is possible or even advantageous in a world that is as diverse and economically uneven as the present world. In considering the moral underpinnings of globalization and economic exchange, it is necessary to examine what values undergird different visions and interpretations of globalization and to expose the ways in which all forms of globalization are not morally equivalent.

The current model of neoliberal globalization is not the only way to shape globalization processes in our world. Global warming and climate change are

teaching us that economic integration is too narrow a lens through which to think about the relationships of a global community. Because we share a single ecological space, the habits and practices of people in different parts of the world are leading us toward a new consciousness in which we are forced to recognize the radical interdependence that we share as life forms in a finite space. This new consciousness marks a radical shift between the social and economic worlds of eighteenth-century Europe, where capitalism developed, and the realities of life in the twenty-first century.

Adam Smith and David Ricardo, two of the "fathers" of modern economic theory, did not live in an industrial world with airplanes, high-speed tanker travel, the Internet, and a looming climate change crisis. Their theories of self-interest and comparative advantage belong to a different social and political world that simply does not translate adequately into our own. The philosophical revelations of the Enlightenment that individuality and human rights ought to be the foundation of human society were significant milestones in human development in the 1700s, and these ideas have led to enormous strides forward for the civil rights of minorities and women in many contexts. It is true that all peoples or governments around the world do not necessarily share these assumptions that are taken for granted by Western democracies. For this reason, it is essential to retain an affirmation of the importance of individual self-worth and dignity as important foundational aspects of understanding human nature. At the same time, an overemphasis on individual rights has eclipsed our understanding of the common good. In some cases, where Western values have heavily influenced economic policy, an emphasis on the rights of individuals (for profit or private ownership) has forced communities in the developing world to conform to Western norms of individualism at the expense of their ability to recognize and affirm the value of interdependence. What is at stake for the health and well-being of people and the planet is the ability of Western nations and their leaders to hold the values of individual rights and private property alongside the values of interdependence and sustainability in ways that will shape the practice of globalization in new directions. As a moral philosopher, Smith rooted his economic theories in a moral framework that assumed compassion; he would hardly recognize the economic theory of today that claims to stand outside of morality.[14]

By contrast, a theology of solidarity is firmly rooted in the values of mutuality, justice, and sustainability. Solidarity is a meaningful response for first-world Christians to the environmental degradation, economic disparity, and unjust form of globalization that plague our world today. It requires recognition of the disparity between the dominant, self-centered norms of

economic globalization that currently shape economic discourse and practice in our society and the need for moral norms that guide economic interactions in ways that promote the common good. In a world that values and promotes unmitigated consumerism and wealth creation, practicing an ethic of solidarity requires first-world citizens to think and act in countercultural ways.

A Tale of Two Fires

The heart of the moral question that first-world citizens must answer in facing neoliberal globalization is this: to what extent will one participate in a system that benefits some at the expense of others? Furthermore, to what extent are one's own daily habits and practices complicit in the exploitation of other human beings and the planet? These are the questions that shape the present inquiry. A comparison of two industrial fires can help to frame the problem.

In May of 1993, in what has been called "the worst industrial fire in the history of capitalism,"[15] hundreds of low-wage factory workers were trapped inside a burning toy factory on the outskirts of Bangkok, Thailand. Official reports listed the dead at 188 and the injured at 469. Survivors reported that the main doors were locked and windows had been blocked to prevent pilfering. Stuffing and animal fibers used to make the toys had littered the factory. Furthermore, while Thai law requires that the fire-escape stairways of such a large factory be sixteen to thirty-three feet wide, this factory's were a mere four-and-a-half feet wide, and cheap construction allowed steel girders and stairways to crumple easily in the heat.

While the tragic fire at the Kader Industrial Toy Company happened in Thailand, a deeper examination of the circumstances reveals a bit of the complex web of global economic integration and some of the moral problems associated with it. The Kader factory had contracts with Toys R Us, Fisher-Price, Hasbro, Tyco, Arco, Kenner, Gund and J. C. Penney for whom they manufactured Bugs Bunny, Bart Simpson, and Sesame Street toys destined for export to US American consumers. This factory was one of many that have sprung up in the developing world in recent decades, often accompanied by low wages and poor working conditions and made more attractive for investors due to lax environmental laws and government oversight. The Kader fire is a prime example; shoddy construction, failure to follow legal safety codes, dangerous inattention to the storage of flammable materials, and carelessness regarding fire safety procedures all contributed to the fire—and were well within the arena of human control.

Before this tragedy, the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire of 1911 in New York City had ranked as the worst industrial fire in history. The Triangle

fire became legendary and ushered in a new era of regulatory protection for US American workers. In fact, the outrage of citizens over the fire was so pronounced that hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers showed up for the funeral procession of the six unidentified victims in a driving rain.[16] The New York state legislature set up an investigative committee that led to the modernization of the state's labor laws. It is certainly true that working conditions had been poor in factories throughout the nineteenth century as the era of industrialization firmly took root in the United States and Europe. However, labor organizers, concerned citizens, and Christians active in the social gospel movement all collaborated to rectify working conditions and bring about statutory reform that protected workers from exploitation and abuse.[17]

In sharp contrast to the moral indignation that followed the Triangle fire, the Bangkok fire was barely noticed by those outside of Thailand, primarily eliciting moral indifference from the world's elite. Today, similar tragedies continue to be commonplace in the low-wage factories, processing plants, and agriculture jobs that fuel the growth of the global economy by providing consumers with inexpensive goods and services and investors with remarkable profits.

The preventable nature of the fire at Kader combined with the fact that it was a factory producing goods for export to the United States (and other Western consumers) raises complicated questions about moral responsibility. Most US American consumers have bought a toy from one of these companies in their lifetime, and most of those people probably gave no thought to where the toy came from. The fact is, first-world consumers make too many purchases every day to stop and think about where each product originated: who grew our food, whose hands assembled our electronics, whose lives were risked in the manufacture of our toys.

Martin Luther King Jr. believed that the greatest tragedy of his era was the "appalling silence of the good people."[18] Unfortunately, the current era is also marked by much silence on the part of many "good people." While some people who are made aware of egregious human rights violations respond with moral outrage, too many of the good people who remain silent fail to see their own connection to the crises of our world. Others lack a vision of how to respond, even if they are motivated by a desire to help. There are, of course, many people in the first world who respond with outrage to exposés in the daily media. This kind of consumer response can be useful in addressing the immediate problem of child labor, unpaid wages, or unsafe working conditions in a particular factory or manufacturing line (remember the Kathie Lee Gifford and Nike scandals related to sweatshop labor?). But campaigns like these only address

the presenting problems and lack a deeper understanding of the complexity of issues of free trade, global economics, and social injustice. Without such understanding, these actions and campaigns are not likely to contribute to long-term solutions. An ethic of solidarity offers a vision of how to respond to the crises that face the human community by developing relationships of mutuality and justice and learning how to see social problems in new ways that allow for the development of new models and structures for economic exchange that promote the common good.

Foundations for an Ethic of Solidarity

Solidarity is the building of relationships between people across lines of difference with the explicit or implicit intention of working together for social change. Relationships of solidarity are rooted in the mutual recognition of the human dignity that everyone possesses and that Christians understand as a reflection of the *imago Dei*. While these relationships may be transitory or long-lasting, they are substantive and represent a long-term commitment to the shared principle of a just social order that cares for both people and the planet. There are three key points that are foundational for first-world people who wish to develop an ethic of solidarity:

1) Understanding social location and personal privilege

2) Building relationships with people across lines of difference

3) Engaging in structural change

First, our social location in the world is an important factor in how we understand and interpret the world. The term "social location" refers to that set of identity-forming circumstances, like race, gender, ethnicity, culture, sexual orientation, and class that affect and influence one's experience of the world. Social location, life experience, education, training, faith commitments, and theological influences all work together to shape people's worldview, and all of these factors significantly shape the *doing* of theology and ethics in our world. How we understand and think about God, the sacred, and what it means to live faithfully in the world are all shaped by who we are. Given the hegemonic role that first-world countries have played in shaping the engines of globalization, and given our current political and economic power in the world, understanding the privileges that accrue to first-world people vis-à-vis the people who have been socially, politically, and economically marginalized

by current globalization practices will be an essential aspect of this inquiry. Examining a social problem by asking questions about how the privileges of race, class, and gender shape the social reality is one aspect of engaging in critical social theory, which is an essential foundation of Christian social ethics.[19]

Second, developing relationships with people across lines of difference is essential to promoting consciousness-raising and sustaining long-term social change. Philosopher Kwame Appiah argues that experiences of cultural difference do more to open our minds to difference than reading or learning about difference.[20] For most readers of this book, immediate and personal contact with social injustice comes in the form of encountering people who are oppressed. If these encounters lead to more long-term relationships and partnerships between individuals or communities of people, they can be an essential aspect of an ethic of solidarity. Developing significant personal relationships with real people offers the possibility of changing the way we understand the world. These relationships can help us think about the world through the eyes of others. "The poor" are no longer statistics on a page, but living, breathing people with stories, families, hopes, and dreams.

While crossing the many barriers of ethnicity, class, race, education, and nationality that separate people from one another may not necessarily make them friends, what it can do is to help Christians understand Jesus' gospel call to love their neighbor in a new way. Jesus does not tell people that they must make their neighbor into a friend, but rather his admonition is to recognize the common humanity that binds people together and to affirm that all people deserve to be treated with love, compassion, and equality. While experiential education and practices of immersion run the risk of voyeurism and exploitation of marginalized people, if these experiences are planned with the participation of local participants and as part of a larger examination of social and structural injustice, they can be an important factor in working toward social transformation.[21]

Third, successful long-term social change requires addressing the structural root of social problems and injustice. Sociologist Robert Wuthnow reports that two-thirds of the members of religious communities say their congregation is involved in operating a soup kitchen or food program.[22] Likewise, often when people see others on the street who are hungry and homeless, an immediate and compassionate response is to reach out to them and feed and shelter them. However, in today's world many of the people who are poor, marginalized, or abused by the economic and environmental excesses of neoliberal globalization do not need charity—what they need is justice. While there is certainly a place

for the work of charity, an ethic of solidarity focuses on the essential work of social justice as a necessary factor in changing the direction of our world toward a more just and peaceful community.

For many people, religious communities and belief systems serve as the primary source for moral education, including beliefs about human nature, right and wrong, and justice and injustice. While there are certainly people who derive their moral sensibilities from other locations (e.g., philosophy, humanism), the role of religion in shaping the moral sensibilities of the world's people is still formidable. In addressing issues of conflict and social injustice in the world, it is important to recognize the significant role that religion plays in shaping people's worldviews and moral ideals. Embracing religious traditions and communities as significant partners in the work of conflict transformation and social justice is an essential element of working toward positive social change in our world.

The task of discerning how Christians are to live faithfully in the world is the fundamental concern of Christian ethics. While timeless principles like love and justice are recognized as transcending any particular time period (and any particular religious tradition), how followers are to live out these principles is not always immediately evident. Knowing how to "do justice" requires people to identify and challenge the injustices that are prevalent in society. Beverly Harrison has described the intellectual work of theology as one of "reappropriating all our social relations, including our relations to God, so that shared action toward genuine human and cosmic fulfillment occurs."[23]

Engaging in this kind of theological work requires people to reclaim control of their social relations and recreate the structures of society in ways that are consistent with the biblical lessons of how to live a just and faithful life. This is where Christian social ethics begins, with an understanding that the call of Micah and the prophets to a life of justice, love, and humility before God is also the call to follow Christ in the world. By its very nature, Christian social ethics is public theology that engages in critical social analysis with an eye toward developing normative moral criteria to help shape human behavior and social policy. From this perspective, the task of Christian ethics becomes one of social transformation and social change.

Conclusion

It is clear that the planet is not able to sustain a global population that desires to live as first-world citizens currently live. Even more importantly, there is little evidence that first-world lifestyles that revolve around money, consumer goods, and entertainment have improved the happiness of first-world people.

Certainly, it is true that developments over the last hundred years like antibiotics, vaccines, and access to clean water have reduced infant mortality and generally increased the health and well-being of many people living in the developed world. Likewise, labor-saving devices like refrigerators, washing machines, and running water have certainly transformed women's lives and family life in general, easing the daily workload in the home. None of the advances that have been made in medicine, science, and technological innovation should be minimized, nor should the pre-industrial past be romanticized. However, a number of significant lifestyle shifts that have accompanied industrialization have increased humanity's environmental footprint with questionable contributions to the overall well-being of our lives as a community of citizens or a community of nations. Changes that have transformed the lives of those in the first world in recent decades must be examined not just on a personal level but also on a social level. What impact do these changes have on families and communities of people living halfway around the world, and on future generations?

A different world is possible. A different form of globalization and a world order marked by social justice and sustainability are possible. The economic crisis that has heralded the beginning of the twenty-first century requires new social narratives, new ways of being in the world, and a new ethic that offers us a pathway toward achieving this goal. An ethic of solidarity offers just such a pathway.

Notes

1. The World Bank, *World Development Indicators, 2008* (Washington DC: Development Data Group, 2008).

2. United Nations Development Programme, "Chapter 1," in *The Human Development Report*, 1998, http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1998.

3. Thomas Princen, "Consumption and its Externalities: Where Economy Meets Ecology," in *Confronting Consumption*, ed. Thomas Princen, Michael Maniates, and Ken Conca (Boston: MIT Press, 2002), 23–42. Princen defines overconsumption as the aggregate effect of consumptive behavior of individuals that actually functions to undermine a species's life-support system. While Princen's interest is primarily in the aggregate environmental effects of individual consumer behavior, his concept is instructive here as a way of understanding how individual consumer behavior that seems reasonable and appropriate has an aggregate negative effect on the well-being of the human species as a whole.

4. Certainly, there are many people in the United States and other first-world countries who struggle against economic injustice and poverty on a daily basis. I do not intend to imply that *all* people living in the first world are wealthy. Nevertheless, many of the economic advantages of neoliberal economic globalization impact the relative quality of life of people living in or near poverty in the first world vis-à-vis their neighbors in the global south. While there are many fine works that address the important issues of poverty in the United States and the first world, this

book is intended to ask particular questions about the ethical and moral status and responsibility of people with privilege who are complicit in or benefit from the current form of neoliberal globalization that dominates the global political economy. Furthermore, since the book is written from a US American perspective of privilege, it often uses examples from that context. Given the fact that some of the challenges of lifestyle, environmental impact, complicity of supporting dominant forms of globalization and struggles to work toward structural change are shared more widely by people who live in the first world, I often speak more broadly for what an ethic of solidarity might mean for "first-world Christians" or "first-world people." Readers can decide for themselves whether they are implicated in the analysis presented.

5. In my first book (*In Search of the Good Life: The Ethics of Globalization* [New York: Continuum, 2004]), I offered a detailed ethical analysis of four different models of globalization (neoliberal, development, earthist and postcolonial) as a way of helping people understand that how we globalize the world is a choice that people are making and that different models of globalization embody different moral visions of "the good life." This book assumes much of the critique of the different models of globalization presented in that book and develops an ethic of solidarity as a normative Christian ethical response to the inadequacies of the dominant forms of globalization prevalent in the contemporary world.

6. Gary Dorrien offers a historical analysis of social Christianity in his book *Soul in Society: The Making and Renewal of Social Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995). For discussion of feminist ethics see Lois K. Daly, ed., *Feminist Theological Ethics: A Reader*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994, esp. chs. 1–2.

7. Joseph C. Hough Jr., "Christian Social Ethics as Advocacy," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 5, no. 1 (1977): 123. June O'Connor's essay, "On Doing Religious Ethics," in *Women's Consciousness, Women's Conscience*, ed. Barbara Hilkert Andolsen, Christine E. Gudorf, and Mary D. Pellauer (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985), is also a good introduction to the tasks of religious ethics. She describes these tasks as not only the decisions and actions that one takes in response to moral questions, but also attention to the interpretive framework or worldview that shapes one's decisions and actions and the epistemological perspective that shapes one's worldview.

8. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

9. Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002).

10. Pamela Sparr, ed., *Mortgaging Women's Lives: Feminist Critiques of Structural Adjustment* (London: Zed Books, 1994).

11. For more detailed information about the history and actions of the World Bank and IMF, see Catherine Caufield, *Masters of Illusion: The World Bank and Poverty of Nations* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1996) and Bruce Rich, *Mortgaging the Earth: The World Bank, Environmental Impoverishment, and the Crisis of Development* (Boston: Beacon, 1994).

12. Patricia Ventura, *Neoliberal Culture: Living with American Neoliberalism* (London: Ashgate, 2012).

13. Jeffrey D. Sachs's book, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time* (New York: Penguin, 2005), proposes an economic "ladder" that poor countries can use to climb out of poverty.

14. For a more detailed discussion of Smith's moral framework for *Wealth of Nations*, see Rebecca Todd Peters, "Economic Justice Requires More than the Kindness of Strangers," in *Global Neighbors: Christian Faith and Moral Obligation in Today's Economy*, ed. Douglas A. Hicks and Mark Valeri (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 89–108.

15. Information regarding the Kader fire is from William Greider's report of the incident found in William Greider, *One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997), 339–346.

16. Joseph Berger, "100 Years Later, the Roll of the Dead in a Factory Fire Is Complete," *New York Times*, February 20, 2011, A13.

17. The 1908 Social Creed of the Churches that was adopted with the formation of the Federal Council of Churches was a public statement of the goals of the social gospel movement that focused on establishing a 40-hour workweek, abolishing child labor, and establishing a minimum wage, among other things.

18. Martin Luther King Jr., "Address at the Fourth Annual Institute on Nonviolence and Social Change at Bethel Baptist Church, December 3, 1959," in *The Papers of Martin Luther King, Jr, Volume 5: Threshold of a New Decade, January 1959–December 1960*, ed. Clayborne Carson (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005), 333–343.

19. Broadly speaking, critical social theory is a branch of intellectual inquiry that draws on a variety of disciplines, including history, social science, and philosophy, with the intention of critiquing and transforming society. See Max Horkheimer, "Traditional and Critical Theory," in *Critical Theory: Selected Essays,* trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Continuum, 2002).

20. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006).

21. For several decades, the task of liberation theology has been to encourage people living in situations of oppression and injustice place their own experience within a larger structural analysis that enables them to see the origins of the problem and help them envision concrete solutions that empower them to create social change. Since Paulo Freire's groundbreaking work in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, justice educators have focused on experiential education, or teaching people by involving them in the work and practice of social change. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos (New York: Continuum, 2000).

22. Robert Wuthnow, "Beyond Quiet Influence? Possibilities for the Protestant Mainline," in *Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*, ed. Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 389.

23. Beverly Wildung Harrison, "Theological Reflection in the Struggle for Liberation," in *Making the Connections*, ed. Carol Robb (Boston: Beacon, 1985), 245.