

Globalization, Migration, and Labor Market Formation — Labor's Challenge?

By Stuart Rosewarne

1. Introduction

The renewed determination of metropolitan nation-states to check the international movement of people, and especially the admission of refugees into advanced industrial economies, has drawn attention to the relevance of migration in debates on the globalization of capitalism. The movement of people has to be considered an ingredient in the process of globalization alongside global trade liberalization, transnational investment and the international circulation of money capital. Likewise, state efforts to regulate international migration have to be considered as another important institutional ingredient, alongside the reinvigorated global institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, in the making of the global political economy. These developments warrant some critical reflection if only to better understand the placing of people and, more particularly, labor in the process of globalization.

There are at least five critical issues that are worthy of consideration. Firstly, it is important to consider the place of people in the uneven development of globalizing capital and how this has underpinned the new international migrations. Secondly, there is an urgent need to reflect on the character of this migration and how it is affecting labor market formation, including the ways in which labor migration is being regulated in the making of an international wage labor force. Related to this is the question of how best to conceptualize this new momentum in the international circulation of labor. Fourthly, it is sensible to reflect on an issue that has exercised the attention of many critics of globalization by focusing on the significance of this new international migration of labor for the integrity of the nation-state. Finally, we should consider what this might mean for conceptualizing the place of labor within the accumulation process.

2. Globalization and Migration

The globalization of capitalism has been neither a uniform nor an orderly process. Development across the globe has been decidedly uneven. Globalization has been associated with the concentration of

capital in particular regions. The circulation of capital has been concentrated almost exclusively in three regions of the world, in North America, Europe and East Asia, encompassing South East Asia. This has exaggerated the character of capitalism's uneven development, and provided an impetus for international migration. The failure of the lesser developed economies to attract capital and provide employment opportunities for those denied the opportunity to provide for their material well-being has generated high levels of unemployment and underemployment. Migration then is rightly seen as one of the few avenues of hope for material survival.

Globalization is also as much the victory of capitalism over the formerly existing socialist states and their colonies, albeit something of a pyrrhic victory materially and politically. Rather than herald the much-promised advantages of development, the victory has engendered political and economic turmoil. The "liberation" of economies from the grip of state socialism has resulted in the establishment of capitalist social formations marked by clandestinity, corruption and violence in the efforts of mostly political leaders to capture capital and political power. The struggle for power and resources in the former socialist states has also spawned bitter struggles to redefine the boundaries of the nation. Of course, these developments are not restricted to the formerly existing socialist states. Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of southern Africa have followed a similar trajectory in the post-colonial era. The effect has been much the same: millions of people have been displaced, transformed into refugees who are forced to search the world for asylum from economic despair and tyranny. The magnitude of daunting, with United Nations Human Rights Commission estimates that there are some 21 million refugees worldwide, and to this number we can probably add another 14 million displaced peoples.

One of the paradoxes of globalization has been that the resurgence in migration appears to have placed people on the same footing as capital, as being no longer territorially bound. Yet nothing could be further from the truth. In contrast with the many ways in which nation-states have removed obstacles to the circulation of capital, there has not been an extension to people of the entitlements afforded capital. Notwithstanding metropolitan states being signatories to UN conventions on the rights of refugees, very few asylum seekers gain entry to the advanced industrial economies. Rather than engendering the liberation of the peoples of the world, metropolitan states have strengthened border controls to more forcefully regulate and restrict the entry of people.

Clandestine and covert methods of travel have become the necessary means through which people escape oppressive regimes and economic despair. The obstacles erected to bloc refugees' escape to the advanced industrial world have resulted in countless thousands losing their lives in their flight to asylum. For those who do reach the borders of metropolitan economies, they are forced to run the gauntlet of state resistance to the granting of asylum. Rather than freeing people, globalization has engendered a milieu in which new forms of institutionalized racism and bureaucratic abuse have emerged to demarcate the peoples of the world.

3. Migration and Labor Market Formation

One of the most distinguishing features of this new era of migration is that the regulation of migration has become defined largely in terms of the labor requirements of advanced industrial economies. With the end of the long post-WWII boom the comparatively liberal migration regimes of the advanced industrial economies came to an abrupt end. Subsequently, the metropolitan states of Europe and North America, and to a lesser extent East Asia, reformulated migration policies to focus more precisely on the definition of capital's labor needs. Migration policy has been formulated to facilitate the admission of the cadres of transnational capital, with managers and professionals enjoying ease of entry. The privilege of being sanctioned to obtain employment in the advanced world has also been extended to a range of skilled workers and most notably IT specialists. The most recent illustration of the differential barriers to access is in the U.S.'s easing of work-visa application procedures for specific types of workers. A \$1,000 payment will speed up the application process for preferred categories of skilled workers. Points systems, that value specific skills, provide the benchmark for entry into other advanced economies. We can also observe a second tier of officially-endorsed labor migration, of lesser skilled workers who states admit on a limited-term basis, mostly as seasonal workers principally to meet the demands of agricultural industries but also the labor demands for tourism and entertainment (this latter category being mostly a subterfuge for sex workers).

Setting aside the sanctioning of the deployment of migrant seasonal workers, the official policy of metropolitan states has been to severely restrict the entry of unskilled migrant labor. However, the focus of migration policy has not been entirely defined by the de jure regulations that encapsulate the publicly projected restrictive regulatory regimes. Alongside the ostensibly tighter regulatory environment hides another dimension to the pattern of labor migration. There has been a significant flow of migrant workers to the economies of the United

States, Mediterranean Europe and Asia who have gained entry by irregular and clandestine means. While states in Europe and North America in particular have invested considerable resources in constructing and fortifying barriers to entry, this has not checked the international movement of people. People smuggling and labor trafficking to circumvent border restrictions have emerged as the new money-making businesses of the global economy. In part, this has been a direct response to the new restrictive regimes. Not surprisingly, politicians continuously justify the construction of the fortress-like border boundaries as necessary to check the clandestine movement of people and the criminal activities associated with trafficking migration.

This has given rise to some striking anomalies. In the first instance, there are disproportionate levels of resources being invested in trying to keep people out of the metropolitan economies. States — most notably Britain, Germany and Austria among European states and most Asian states and Australia — are determined to keep people from entering their borders and more stringently policing asylum applications. The rights of asylum seekers are consistently being compromised, and post-World War II international commitments on the protection of refugees are being rewritten or set aside in the process. In addition, anti-discrimination and regularization programs are being administered in more circumspect ways throughout much of the advanced industrial world, to the disadvantage of refugees.

In stark contrast to this restrictive regime, there are millions of migrants who have succeeded in breaching the borders, and finding work in the United States, Mediterranean Europe and Asia. They constitute a subterranean component of metropolitan labor markets. Because they are defined as illegal, they are invariably subject to a whole range of abuses and exploitative practices by state officials and employers. Yet, while designated as illegal, states have devoted comparatively few resources to regulating the presence of these migrant workers. States have, in effect, sanctioned the emergence of subterranean labor markets conceding capital's demands to employ migrant workers.

The resurgence in the international movement of people has thus been linked to *both a tightening and a loosening of the regulatory environment*. Migration policy has been affirmed as being crucial to the state's role in labor market formation. States have sought to effect some influence over the way in which national labor markets are incorporated into a global circuit formally sanctioning the employment of some migrant workers. On the other hand, the state has condoned the effective *privatization* of some spheres of labor market formation. These spheres have thus been incorporated into a global labor circuit,

into a dynamic that is subject to globally defined economic pressures and the varying domestic demands of capital. Whilst people smuggling and labor trafficking may not have the formal imprimatur of the state, they are the products of a system that has enabled clandestinity to shape labor market formation. The development of people smuggling and labor trafficking has given an institutional foundation to the privately engineered globalization of labor markets.

4. The Regionalization and Globalization of Labor.

While the new era of migration points to the globalization of labor markets, it is also important to recognize that there has been a tendency for the flow of labor to become increasingly regionally concentrated. In many respects, labor is following the patterns of capital's globalization. The movement of labor in the Americas is concentrated around North America and the U.S. in particular. Labor circulation in Asia, especially workers from the underdeveloped economies of the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand, and increasingly Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos and Burma, as well as China, is concentrated within East and South East Asia. The collapse of the former eastern bloc economies, the political turmoil in the Balkans and Central Asia, and the underdeveloped state of many of the Mediterranean African countries, inscribes an arc of migration centered around the magnet of Europe.

Proximity plays an important part in the regionally focused migration of people to the advanced and developing industrial economies, as do cultural, linguistic, and family connections. However, notwithstanding the forces making for the regionalization of labor markets, the circulation of labor, like capital, is not bound by the regional concentration of capital. The very processes that make for regionalization also help to clear the way for a fuller globalization of labor markets. Global transport networks have eroded the significance of space. Many former colonial ties that also establish linguistic, political and cultural links cut across the regional links based on capital investment. The tension in the spatial fix of migration is amplified by the contradictory character of regulatory regimes that both seek to restrict the movement of labor whilst simultaneously permitting (or at least resulting in) the privatization of labor migration. These tensions are evident in the European Union where, despite endorsement of the Schengen Agreement by member states, the Mediterranean economies demonstrate a continuing reliance upon undocumented migrant workers. As well, the efforts to construct more restrictive borders around the EU and in neighboring states, through inter-state cooperation and coordination of policy, has had the effect of prompting the development of surreptitious and illegal means for entering Europe. In the process,

the establishment of clandestine routes of passage opens the way for people from beyond the immediate region to utilize these resources to migrate to Europe. Mexico remains the most significant origin of the U.S.'s undocumented labor force, and Mexico has emerged as a significant conduit through which people from throughout the world organize their entry into the U.S.

Pronouncements by the World Bank and the United Nations that the future development of the advanced industrial economies will be contingent upon the adoption of more liberal migration regimes point to increasing institutional pressure for a more generalized movement of people. In both instances, the institutions have contended that the advanced industrial economies will have to open their borders to migrants in order to establish population and labor market profiles that enable the pace of national capital accumulation to be sustained.

Above all, human agency also impels this tension in the spatial dimensions of the movement of people, for the desire to escape economic despair and oppressive regimes does not readily inscribe a particular geographic passage. Such passages will often be framed by established connections. New ones will be formed as emigration is established as an aspect of the life pattern of some communities. The promise of economic opportunity and freedom from political oppression is not singularly geographically defined.

5. The Role of the State in Framing Labor Circulation

Labor migration has added another dimension to the meaning of the globalization of economies. Some radical critics have contended that the international mobility of labor, in breaking migrants' association with specific national polities, further erodes the integrity of the nation-state. However, there is a need for caution in not exaggerating either the magnitude of the movement of people or the weakening of the regulatory authority of the state. Within Europe, the removal of all barriers to the inter-country mobility of citizens has not altered people's preference to remain living in their country of birth. If one sets aside the international mobility of the cadres of capital, it is people seeking refuge from persecution and economic despair who mostly dominate the resurgence in migration. They are looking at migration in terms of resettlement and do not constitute a territorially footloose community.

Moreover, more than any other group, their applications for asylum are subject to intense scrutiny by individual states, by states acting in unison, and by international agencies. Securing entry on the basis of refugee status has proved to be an ever increasingly difficult way of entering almost all of the advanced industrial economies.

Despite all the rhetoric about the flood of refugees, of “illegal” entrants of “queue jumpers,” comparatively few people are granted asylum by metropolitan states, and the introduction of quotas of the number who will be granted refugee status has established a cap that operates irrespective of the means of securing entry.

Many states have been strengthening their regulatory authority, expending substantial resources in shoring up border controls to restrict entry. For instance, the member states of the European Union, the United States and Canada, Japan, and Australia and New Zealand, have been preoccupied with building ever-more difficult barriers, legislative and physical, to block the path of potential immigrants who do not fit neatly into defined labor market requirements. Inter-state cooperation has reinforced the capacity of individual states to more effectively manage the entry of people. Moreover, the metropolitan states have also brought considerable pressure to bear upon other nation-states to establish comparable border controls, contributing to institution formation and enhancement, and in the process to the erection of buffer zones beyond their own borders.

Critics of globalization could point to the increased significance of clandestine migration to substantiate claims that state authority is being undermined by globalization in multiple ways. However, the argument fails to appreciate the extent to which the growth of clandestine migration reflects the role of states in conceding the private organization of some spheres of labor market formation. This does not signal an erosion in the authority of the state but rather one aspect of metropolitan states’ embrace of neo-liberalism. The privatization of labor markets has not been generalized but has tended to be quarantined to particular sectors and/or particular occupations. Moreover, as the periodic policing exercises demonstrate, states have not been averse to ensuring that when the political need arises, the regulatory force of the state can be brought to bear to effect greater control over the constitution of the domestic labor force.

It is also critical to point to the legal and the symbolic ways in which the authority of the state has been underpinned in the partial embrace of privatized labor markets. Considerable rhetorical energy is directed to associating clandestinity with illegality and criminality. Notwithstanding states condoning the employment of clandestine workers, when states characterize undocumented workers as “illegal,” at times as criminals, officials can readily appeal to their obligation to promote law and order to justify regulating this sphere of the labor market and expelling undocumented workers whenever it is politically necessary or opportune.

The idea that migration disturbs the integrity of the national polity has to be qualified by acknowledging the continuing importance of citizenship. Citizenship remains a crucial element in the definition of the national community and provides the formal entitlement for people's right to project a political and industrial voice. Definitions of citizenship provide the formal institutional bases for excluding the undocumented from the national political process. The 'illegal' status of the undocumented will tend to make them wary of contributing to debates on the constitution of the nation. The civil and political rights of documented im/migrant workers, including those who have obtained residency permits, remain somewhat circumscribed. The rights of refugees are being routinely limited. Some metropolitan states subject "queue jumpers" seeking asylum to detention and, even when granted asylum, impose requirement that they reside in particular locales mostly away from major urban centers and also restrict welfare entitlements. Some of these formal restrictions on civil rights are also being overwritten by the different ways in which place in the polity is framed by ethnicity and race as well as gender, and the distinguishing feature of the new migration is that has been driven by the global ethnic and racial demarcations associated with uneven development. Metropolitan state regulation of migration has been bound up with the regulation of the movement of people based on ethnic and racial distinctions. Some call this the "racialization" of certain industries, jobs, and employment.

6. Labor Migration and Capital Accumulation

Finally, we should briefly reflect on the conceptual significance of the new migration for understanding the place of labor within the accumulation process. The proximate cause of the resurgence in migration is principally the uneven development of the global economy. The emphasis signalled above is of the unevenness of capitalism's development across the global political economy, especially between the advanced industrial economies and the Third Worlds to which must now be added the former socialist economies.

However, the magnitude of, and the momentum in, the international circulation of labor have been largely shaped by the interventions of metropolitan nation-states. In regulating migration, metropolitan states have been preoccupied with reconciling the flow of people with domestic labor requirements and, more generally, the state's management of the social reproduction of labor power. We can identify at least two crucial ingredients that have framed this in the age of neo-liberalism.

The first is the way in which states have responded to uneven development within the advanced industrial economies. Uneven development has manifested itself in shortages of labor. This is not unexpected given the structural transformations that characterize capital accumulation. Shortages of skilled labor reflect the rapid development of, for instance, information technology industries and the failure to produce sufficient labor with the concrete skills to meet the demands of this expanding sector. Labor shortages are also reflective of most metropolitan states' embrace of neo-liberalism and their retreat from active management of the reproduction of labor power. The policy of leaving it to "the market" to reconcile the supply of labor with changing demand, as a substitute for public strategic investments in education and training and other state interventions in shaping the skill profile of national work forces, foreshadowed labor shortages in particular sectors of advanced industrial economies.

Secondly, states have sought to remedy metropolitan capital's labor problems not by jettisoning the neo-liberal policies, but by adapting the management of labor to satisfy capital's labor needs. Thus, through the issue of work permits to professional and skilled workers, especially in IT and in nursing, and to seasonal workers, states have invested in the globalization of labor markets to remedy the imbalance in domestic labor markets. Likewise, the deregulation of some spheres of the labor market, with states effectively permitting the privately organized recruitment and deployment of undocumented workers in some sectors, has enabled capital's needs to be met through recourse to global labor markets.

Metropolitan states have sought to reconcile the varying demands for labor with an accumulation strategy that has incorporated labor more directly into the process of globalization. This has been possible because of the ways in which the global uneven development of capitalism has engendered latent reserve armies of labor. Under the compass of neo-liberal governance, migrations policies have been organized as an essential element in labor market policy. State regulation of migration has once again become a key instrument in state endeavors to facilitate particular accumulation paths within the national economy, supporting those industries that it seeks to foster and insulating those less viable ones that cannot be physically relocated. State regulation of migration has become a policy instrument for the state's endeavors to promote accumulation across different sectors within the national economy.

Under the direction of the state, as well as relatively independently of the state, capital has been able to draw upon the global reserves of

labor as a substitute to domestic sourcing of labor. This has been crucial in shaping the pace of accumulation in a number of important respects. The migration regulatory regimes have enabled metropolitan capital and, more particularly, metropolitan states to abrogate responsibility for investing in the social reproduction of labor power. In fact, the regimes are reflective of the broader neo-liberal agenda of reducing the state's commitment to social infrastructure more generally. State policies has become much more mechanistic and functional in character. Policies have become increasingly defined in terms of the very specific object of satisfying the needs of individual capitals with respect to labor. State policies have modified restrictions on capital's access to global reserves of labor in order to allow capital to access specific labor requirements. This has been effected through fine tuning the issue of migrant worker work permits. This has been effected through the issue of temporary and/or seasonal work permits, which allow capital to employ labor only when necessary thereby avoiding the costs associated with carrying workers out of season. By condoning the privatization of particular spheres of labor markets, the state has given capital free reign to draw upon offshore labor reserves either directly or through private recruiting agencies in the search for low-paid labor. Capital's hand in this global labor market is further strengthened because without the formal sanction of the state, migrant workers have little recourse to whatever industrial protections might be afforded by the state, and capital is more or less free to determine the terms and conditions under which such workers will be employed.

The migration regimes that have been adopted by states represent one further dimension of the more general deregulation of labor markets. The regimes have also been consistent with the various ways in which states have retreated from investing in the social reproduction of labor. With advanced industrial economies able to draw upon, and more especially to cherry pick from, globally constituted reserve armies of labor, enabling capital to deploy migrant labor frees the state from its general commitment to ensuring the social reproduction of labor as well as investing in meeting the particular labor needs of capital.

The globalization of labor markets thus has tended to result in the devalorization of labor. The national norms that had hitherto determined the value of labor power and the rates of remuneration of labor become qualified by capital's capacity to draw upon the global reserve armies of labor. This may vary according to whether access to these global reserves is organized under the regulatory authority of the state or through the privately orchestrated labor markets. In the former instance, domestic pressures and industrial settlements may restrict the extent to

which labor power is devalued, and this may be reinforced by the likelihood that capital will seek to maintain or increase the productivity and intensity of regulated labor. However, this cannot be assured, as might be observed in relation to the deployment of migrant workers in nursing in many advanced industrial economies. In the second instance, the deregulation of labor markets has been orchestrated with the specific objective of reducing the cost of labor power, because the survival of those sectors that employ seasonal and clandestine migrant workers, most notably the labor-intensive areas of agriculture and the small enterprises in manufacturing and service sectors, have become reliant upon access to low-paid labor. Moreover, because capital in these sectors is less likely to invest in enhancing the productivity of labor, the viability of accumulation will be contingent upon continuing access to low-paid migrant workers. The limited duration of employment and clandestinity will restrict the capacity of these migrant workers to give voice to challenging their subordinate status, although it will not preclude this.

Given the structuring of labor markets and the possibilities for the devalorization of labor power, capital accumulation will continue to be characterized by uneven development. The importance of the national political economy for framing the determination of norms for valuing labor power and the rewarding of wage labor will be diminished. The particular ways in which labor markets have globalized will tend to fracture any coherence in the valuing of labor power across the economy. The measure of this fracturing of national labor markets will depend upon whether labor is drawn from the international labor markets or sourced from domestic supplies, and whether labor is sourced under the direction and imprimatur of the state or through private channels. The globalization of labor markets engenders national labor markets which become framed in terms of a labor segmentation that is underwritten by differential entitlements, differential employment security, differential industrial rights, and differential civil and political rights.

The globalization of labor markets has had the effect of diminishing the significance of the material and social forces that determine the value of labor power across the national political economy. Recourse to global labor markets enables the state to avoid the deleterious effects of the neo-liberal program of retreating from underwriting the social reproduction of labor power. Recourse to global reserve armies of labor also gives capital the ability to maintain wage labor's productivity whilst reducing labor's relative rate of remuneration. Capital can build on the separation of labor as a

commodity and labor as social labor. Capital can drive a wedge between the wages it pays to workers and the historical costs of reproducing labor power according to established national norms by using access to migrant labor as leverage to weaken the bargaining position of wage labor.

It also makes sense to think of the globalization of labor markets as providing comparable advantages to capital as those derived from its ability to relocate globally. The mobility of capital endows capital with the ability to benefit from global wage differentials, although as Marxist interventions in debates on unequal exchange have emphasized, the real measure of differences may have to be qualified by differences in the productivity of labor. In the case of skilled workers, the benefits that can be derived from deploying migrant labor are probably less likely to be subject to this qualification because of capital's ability to cherry pick workers from the global reserves of labor and because migrant workers will tend to be employed according to the norms and standards of the advanced industrial economy rather than the country of origin. In the case of unskilled migrant workers, capital can use the threat of the discipline of the market as well as that of the state to ensure that the intensity of labor does not fall below established national norms. The globalization of labor markets provides a potential advantage to capital that may be disproportionately greater than that derived from the international mobility of capital.

It is, however, mindful to qualify an argument that emphasizes capital having secured complete free reign in negotiating labor's place in accumulation. The globalization of labor markets is not a one-way street. Because opportunities for migration also free labor from the constraints of the nation and from the national disadvantages and lack of employment opportunities consequent upon the lack of investment capital and in the reproduction of labor, migration provides workers with an opportunity to escape the effects of underdevelopment. Migration offers the opportunity for material advancement. However, precisely because migration is not a universal entitlement, because the globalization of labor markets remains subject to the regulatory authority of the state, and especially the metropolitan states, both overtly and covertly, labor's lack of freedom also represents a constraint on capital. We have to be mindful of the fact that the globalization of labor markets has not fully liberated labor from the tyranny of space and regulatory institutions, and this delimits the capacity of capital to exercise leverage in labor markets.

The continuing role of the state in labor market formation and in managing capital accumulation is pivotal to understanding why it is

that the globalization of labor markets has been a qualified or partial process. This can be viewed in terms of what might be regarded as states simply responding to the functional requirements of capital accumulation. The state may deregulate labor markets and provide capital with the right to draw upon the global reserves of labor to meet particular labor needs. But this intervention has its limits because the state cannot completely abrogate responsibility for ensuring some investment in the social reproduction of labor to ensure some minimum level of and range in the skill profile of the nation's labor force. To do so would result in the state jettisoning a responsibility for securing the general conditions of accumulation.

As well, the deregulation of labor markets has to be regarded as part of the larger project of neo-liberalism which, while it has resulted in the state's retreat from investing in public infrastructure, including investments in education and training and social welfare, has not been extended to the deregulation of borders. There is good reason for this because to deregulate the circulation of labor would open the borders to more than just labor. Given metropolitan states' ambitions to reduce investment in social infrastructure, to broaden the immigration profile to include the young and the aging could well subject the state to financial commitments that it has been wanting to contain. Finally, there is the issue of the legitimacy of the state and the foundation of this legitimacy in the national polity. Border controls have been an integral element in the efforts of the state to promote territorial and social integrity. To remove those controls could well undermine the political cohesion upon which the authority of the state rests.

7. Conclusion

The freedom afforded capital that has given force to the process of globalization has not been extended to labor or, more generally, people. On the contrary, the pressures that have been engendered by the globalization of capitalism, has coincided with the development of a regulatory environment that has provided for the partial freeing of labor, but on terms that are largely functional to the demands of capital, and also has resulted in the imposition of a host of restrictions on people's rights to seek asylum from economic despair and oppression. In both instances, labor rights and human rights have been undermined. The global circulation of labor is but one aspect of the global pressure to deregulate labor markets and weaken the place (power) of labor in the global political economy. The restrictions on the rights of refugees signals the metropolitan states' retreat from long-standing commitments to the protection of human rights. The institutional

transformations wrought under the compass of globalization clearly represent an assault upon the integrity of humanity.

This assault on the integrity of humanity is, of course, not incontestable. There are social and political limits to just how far the state can use migration policies as a weapon in the deregulation of labor markets. Migration regimes have, in part, historically reflected the political force of organized labor in its struggle to secure some regulation over labor markets. The legitimacy of the state requires that it meet some of organized labor's demands to temper the vagaries of labor markets, and this is not inconsistent with the role of the state in securing the general conditions of accumulation. Nor does the way in which metropolitan states have sought to institutionalize the marginalization of migrant workers, and thereby institutionalize the fracturing of national labor markets, represent an inviolable obstacle to organized opposition to the neo-liberal agenda. As new forms of organizing across the world are demonstrating, the new migrant workers are organizing to fight for their industrial rights, establishing unions to represent the interests of workers who historically have never enjoyed the protection of and voice that comes with collective organization. Established labor movements more generally are also appreciating the advantage of challenging the divisions between local workers and the new migrant workers, and organizing among migrant workers to demand an end to regimes that restrict the rights of workers. They are also being joined by a host of non-government organizations to champion the rights of migrants generally and migrant workers in particular. These struggles have extended beyond the reach of nations, as well as beyond the concerns of labor to address the issue of human rights, and it is to these new forms of organizing, the new coalitions of labor and other social movements, that we must look towards if we are to break down the boundaries of globalization.