Wong, H. & Baig, R. B. (2019). Anti racist social work: The Hong Kong context. In G. Singh & S. Masocha (Eds.). *Anti-Racist social work*. London: Red Globe Press.

Chapter 12: Anti racist social work: The Hong Kong context

Associate Professor Hung Wong (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) and

Assistant Professor Raees Begum Baig (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

Introduction

With the change of sovereignty from the Britain to China in 1997, race relations in Hong Kong has changed significantly. Afraid that their right of abode granted by the British colonial government would be ceased after 1997 due to uncertain political situation, many South Asians migrated to Hong Kong right before 1997. Together with the increase in the number of foreign domestic workers, non-ethnic Chinese population roused from 251,200 in 1991 to 343,950 in 2001. However, the Basic Law, which is the new constitution of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR), has put non-ethnic Chinese in an inferior social position as it has emphasised the importance of Chinese language and Chinese nationality in the government system (Xiao, 2001).

With all these racial changes, vivid individual and institutional racial discriminations were found in Hong Kong which caused the local civil society organizations to call for anti-racial discrimination legislation and policy implementation on racial equality (Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor, 1998). To progress with anti-racial discrimination work and to abide with the obligation under the ratified International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Race Discrimination Ordinance (RDO) was eventually passed in 2008 with intensive lobbying and advocacy effort of civil organizations.

Although the RDO was passed, the largest limitation was on the role of government in promoting racial equality as there is no specific clause regulating the government to exercise positive duty in promoting racial equality. The minimalist approach on legislating against racial discrimination was said to be very much adhered to the government's neo-liberalistic administrative ideology.

Subsequent social work practices and services on race relations and integration reflect key elements of neoliberalism, including the strong focus on employment and minimalistic government involvement. Looking through the lens of social work and service on anti-racism, this chapter give a critical analysis on how the idea and practices of anti-racist social work practices have been executed in Hong Kong under neoliberalism and what would be the future direction in regards to the changing racial dynamic in Hong Kong.

Social work in Hong Kong under neo-liberalism

Early since the 1960s, the Hong Kong government has claimed to adopt *laissez-faire* policy in its administration. The then Financial Secretary Sir Philip Haddon-Cave in 1980 viewed that 'positive non-interventionism involves taking the view that it is normally futile and damaging to the growth rate of an economy, particularly an open economy, for the Government to attempt to plan the allocation of resources available to the private sector and to frustrate the operation of market forces'. To him, that did not mean the government should not be intervening, but the Government weighs up carefully the arguments for and against an act of intervention … and … comes to a positive decision as to where the balance of advantages lies' (HKSAR Chief Executive, 2006).

Social welfare under such ideology would usually perceive to be minimalistic; the government would provide state welfare beyond minimum intervention only when such welfare policy could be perceived to be beneficial to economic development (Wong, 2008). Welfare policy, especially those related to financial assistance, exercised a strong sense of neo-liberal anti-redistribution position.

Being the believer of trickle-down theory of development, the government embedded strongly the belief that economic growth would lead to better livelihood of the population across all policy areas. Such belief subsequently led to welfare retrenchment and reduction on social service expenditure in the wake of economic crisis in order to boost the city's economy (Tang, 2000).

Hong Kong experienced a sharp increase in unemployment rate during economic downturn, from 2.2% in mid-1997 to 6.2% in early 1999. In order to help out the unemployed, the government's the expenditure on social assistance has risen 4 times within 5 years. The increase in welfare spending not only induced a widespread of public fear on creating a culture of dependency and made people lost motivation to work; it also triggered the Chinese government's (Tang, 2000). In response to these economic and political threats, the Hong Kong government tighten the eligibility of welfare application and also imposed job-search requirements on welfare recipients.

In light of globalization, Hong Kong joint WTO in 1995 and signed the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) which was believed to subsequently cause the Hong Kong government to reform its public service management (Lam and Tse, 2013). These changes included the implementation of the Enhanced Productivity Programme under the HKSAR Social Welfare Department which the funding for subsidised organizations has been lowered by 10%; the Lump Sum Grant funding system which emphasised on cost-effectiveness in service performance; outsourcing and privatization of social services (Lam and Tse, 2013; Lam and Blyth, 2014).

Although the government of the previous term claimed "positive non-intervention" was no longer a suitable approach for Hong Kong and the government pledged to be more

interventionist; the direction on social welfare and social services has not changed (Lam, 2015). Neo-liberalism is still strongly embedded; characterising with minimal state intervention, associating welfare with economic growth, increasing private sector involvement, and services under market regulation.

Development of race agenda in Hong Kong and the implication on social work

Since the 1960s, various international human rights treaties have been applicable in Hong Kong. As Hong Kong was the then British colony, the United Kingdom has ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) and extended it to Hong Kong in March 1969. The British Government further ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Social, Economic and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) in 1976 and also extended their application to Hong Kong at the same time.

Although these international human rights treaties have long been applicable in Hong Kong, it was not until the 1980s that the Hong Kong public knew about their application as the Hong Kong government did not make the information known to public (Brynes and Chan, 1993). The decolonization process which led to the negotiation on the Sino-British Joint Declaration in the 1980s has alerted the public about these human rights protection mechanisms, politicians and the members of the civil society urged the government to strengthen human rights protection in Hong Kong. The intense human rights discussions prior 1997 have subsequently led to the enactment of the Bill of Rights Ordinance in 1991 and various anti-discrimination legislations (including the Sex Discrimination Ordinance, the Disability Discrimination Ordinance and the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance), and also the establishment of the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) to enforce the anti-discrimination legislations. The idea of legislating against racial discrimination gained momentum shortly after the change of sovereignty.

Hong Kong has long been a migrant society with people moving mainly from the Mainland China and a small proportion from the other parts of the world. Non-Chinese migrants mainly came to Hong Kong after it was ceded to the British; among them, the most significant groups were the British, Indians and other South Asians, and Southeast Asians. When Hong Kong was ceded to Britain, the British came to rule Hong Kong and worked as civil servants (Bickley, 2005). Together with the British, Indians were brought to Hong Kong to work for the police force and the military (White, 1994; Plüss, 2005). After World War II, there was a huge shortage in manpower of the British Army. The British Government developed the Gurkha division in 1947 (Gregorian, 2002). Due to their close relationship with the British government, non-Chinese population in the colonial days was of higher social status than the local Chinese population and highly segregated from the local Chinese population.

The demographic pattern started to change in the 1990s. Because of the growing economy, the number of middle class families increased drastically. These families started to hire foreign

domestic workers (FDWs) mostly from the Philippines and the Indonesia, who live with the families under the live-in policy. At the same time, the number of South Asian rose significantly. Children of South Asians working for the British colonial government were granted with the right of abode, feared that their right would lapse after the change of sovereignty, many of them rushed back to Hong Kong for and have remained since (Baig, 2012).

The change of sovereignty caused the non-Chinese no longer eligible to work for the new HKSAR government. Gurkha army needed to evacuate from the army camps, and the requirement for Chinese nationality and Chinese language imposed on civil servant recruitment barred non-Chinese to join the HKSAR government. The new migrants did not live together in those ethnic areas traditionally formed; rather, they were spread across the territory, especially when more migrants are living in public housings. According to the statistics, the percentage of domestic household with ethnic minorities other than live-in FDWs live in public housing increase from 10.5% in 2001 to 15.1% in 2006 (Census and Statistic Department, 2007). This leads to an increase in contacts between the general public and the ethnic minorities, especially with Filipinos, Indonesians, Pakistanis, Nepalese and Indians. Because of the rising number of ethnic minorities and the residential integration, the government and the public became concerned about race relations and racial discrimination.

Table 1: Population of Non-Chinese in Hong Kong, 1961 – 2006

	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001	2006
Total Population	3,129,648	3,936,630	4,986,560	5,674,114	6,708,389	6,864,346
British	--	29,004	25,703	16,000	18,909	11,420
European and American	--	9,446	11,463	--	19,302	--
South Asian[1] (Indian) (Pakistani) (Nepalese)[2]	--	8,727 (6,134) (2,593) --	11,867	-- (18,000) (9,000) (313)	-- (18,543) (11,017) (12,564)	-- (20,444) (11,111) (15,950)
Southeast Asian (Filipino) (Indonesian)	--	--	28,637	-- (72,000)	193,050 (142,556) (50,494)	200,293 (112,453) (87,840)
Others	--	17,706 (include Southeast Asian)	23,236	--	--	--

[1] With India and Pakistan declared independence from British Empire in 1947, statistics were collected separately in accordance to the place of origin as Republic of India and Islamic Republic of Pakistan.
[2] The number of Nepalese is not the actual figure of all ethnic Nepalese in Hong Kong as an unknown number of Nepalese residents have acquired British, or other, nationality.

Total Non-Chinese Population (% of total population)	49,747 (1.59%)	64,883 (1.65%)	100,906 (2.02%)	251,200 (4.43%)	343,950 (5.1%)	342,198 (5.0%)

Sources: Census and Statistic Department, HKSAR Government

Due to the lower education and job attainment of the new migrants, many of them have experienced difficulties in living in Hong Kong. Human rights advocates found that racial discrimination against non-white was serious (Ng, 1999). The new migrants have experienced difficulties mainly in employment, education, housing and health service (Baig, 2012). Police tended to have more bias towards ethnic minorities, and ordinary people are also less friendly to a dark-skinned person than a white man (Ng, 1999). The large influx of migrants and their children has also caused a shortage in school places. Vivid cases of racial discrimination on public and institutional levels were found. Throughout the three years after the establishment, EOC has received 64 complaints alleging racism (Schloss, 2000). Unfortunately it was unable to handle those cases as the EOC was only mandated to tackle the three existing discrimination ordinances but lacked the power to act against racial discrimination as there was no law.

The increasing concerns on the non-Chinese communities have caused the government to put forward new initiatives to maintain racial harmony and facilitate the communication between the concern groups and the government. The Race Relations Unit (RRU) and the Committee on the Promotion of Racial Harmony (CPRH) were established in 2002-2003 to enhance race-related services, and the Ethnic Minorities Forum (EMF) was also formed in 2003 to allow members of the non-governmental organizations, including representatives from the ethnic minority communities and the social service organisations, to attend and discuss race relations issues. Responding to the increase concerns on the problems faced by ethnic minorities, it was hoped that the establishments could help the government understand the problems more precisely and to render appropriate services to help ethnic minorities to integrate into the society.

With more public support, the government finally agreed to proceed with the legislation and a consultation paper was released in September 2004. Alongside with the proposed protection provisions, the consultation paper stated the race relations policy of the government:

(a) Eliminate and combat all forms of racial discrimination;

(b) Promote racial equality and communal harmony; and

(c) Encourage ethnic minorities settled in Hong Kong to integrate into the wider community, while retaining their cultural identity. This entails -

• providing practical assistance to members of the ethnic minorities to facilitate their settlement in Hong Kong and their integration into the wider community;

• Addressing the problem of racial discrimination; and

• Promoting equal opportunities for all ethnic groups.

With sufficient votes gained in the Legislative Council, the Race Discrimination Bill was passed in July 2008. The further enactment of the RDO confirmed the duty of the government and the NGOs on their welfare and service provisions to maintain racial equality and to promote racial and social integration of the wider community.

Legislating against racial discrimination and the impact on social work

The engagement of social work in anti-racist practices has grown after the change of sovereignty in 1997, and the legislation process has intensified social work anti-racist practices in diverse forms of intervention, from interpersonal interventions to policymaking.

Varies across organisations, social service organisations started ethnic minority services around 2000, in districts where there were higher ethnic minority concentrations, such as Yau Ma Tei, Sham Shui Po and Tsuen Wan (Baig, 2012).

At the beginning, due to limited understanding towards ethnic minorities and without specific funding resources available, these organisations provided some tangible services, such as language classes and recreational activities, but they tended to be piecemeal and disorganised. With more social workers voiced out the need for service support, funding schemes have developed particularly for the promotion of equal opportunities and ethnic minority services, such as the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund and the Equal Opportunities (Race and Sexual Orientation) Funding Scheme. Services became more sophisticated and more diversified in meeting the needs of ethnic minorities.

Participation of social workers in race debates

In light of the need for better collaboration on services for ethnic minorities, the Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS) has started to work on ethnic minority issues in 2003. A network was formed to facilitate communication among the social service organizations. These meetings provided platforms for the representatives to share their skills and concerns over services and resources, and HKCSS facilitated in resources development, skills training and also lining up with relevant government departments.

At the same time, the government has also established the Ethnic Minorities Forum (EMF) and the first meeting was held on 30 July 2003. A number of organisations attended the meeting, including both representatives from the ethnic minority communities and the social service organisations. The Ethnic Minorities Forum was developed to be regular platform between the government and the organizations working on ethnic minority issues to discuss agendas mainly on education, employment and social services.

Social workers played a key role in advocating for anti-racial discrimination legislation. Soon after the government started the anti-racial discrimination legislation consultation exercise, more than 20 organizations, including human rights groups, social services organisations, ethnic minority groups, to consolidate the action plan to push for strong legislation. More collaboration was found between the social service organisations and the advocacy groups, and social workers gained legal and human rights knowledge through these collaboration. The knowledge building through collaboration among different kinds of organizations facilitated the incorporation of provisions related to minority service development in the anti-racial discrimination legislation.

However, knowledge building on minority issues and the proactive involvement in minority services only restricted to social workers who have been working in minority services and have close contacts with ethnic minorities. In general, social workers could not receive substantive knowledge on minority rights and anti-racist social work practice as these areas are not covered by the compulsory social work education curriculum.

Policy and frontline services

Although policies and services for ethnic minorities could be found since late 1990s, the enactment of the RDO in 2008 has consolidated the government directives on anti-racial discrimination and racial equality. Such directives became more explicit and reflected in both policy and service levels:

> *In addition to compliance with the legal requirements, the Government has also been taking measures to promote racial equality with a view to ensuring that persons of different races have equal access to, and benefit from, resources and opportunities available in the society. This is achieved through public education and promotional activities, and strengthening support services to ethnic minorities (HKSAR government, 2010: 1)*

In general, the government has obligations under the current legislations to prohibit all forms of racial discrimination (HKSAR government 2010). Specifically on the influence on social services and social work, the RDO stipulates in detail what constitutes unlawful racial discrimination in the provisions of employment, education, provision of goods, facilities, services and premises.

In light of the two major directives on social services which are to promote racial equality and to ensure equal access to social welfare services for ethnic minorities, different government departments and bureaus have put forward dedicated services or reform current services to meet the needs of ethnic minorities on social integration. To the government, social integration ties strongly with education and employment.

> *We will step up the support services for ethnic minorities and new arrivals from the Mainland to facilitate their integration into the community, and to foster mutual*

understanding and respect within the community. On employment support, ethnic minorities and new arrivals may take courses specially designed for them by the ERB. They may also obtain employment services at special counters in the LD's job centres. In addition, the LD will organise more job fairs in different districts to help ethnic minorities and new arrivals find jobs (HKSAR government, 2011).

To enhance support for non-Chinese speaking (NCS) students to learn Chinese, the Education Bureau (EDB) has provided the Chinese Language Curriculum Second Language Learning Framework (Learning Framework) with supporting learning and teaching materials for secondary and primary schools ... In 2015-16, the Employees Retraining Board will offer 1 300 and 800 places in dedicated training courses for new arrivals and ethnic minorities respectively to enhance their employment opportunities (HKSAR government, 2015).

To facilitate social integration and access to community resources, the government funded the establishment of Support Service Centres and Sub-centres for ethnic minorities in various districts which are operated by social service organizations; various funding schemes were also established to sponsor a number of programmes for ethnic minorities including radio programmes, job training courses and language courses (GovHK, 2017). For non-dedicated services, interpretation service would be provided for ethnic minorities accessing general government services.

Anti-racist social work practice and its compliance in Hong Kong

The core directive for anti-racist social work practice is to eliminate racism in individual and institutional levels through addressing inequality, oppression and discrimination (Dominelli, 2008). Grounded from the concepts of racism and anti-racism in the UK, anti-racist social work started with an initiation to address discrimination and oppression towards black people under the white/black racial discourse in UK back in the 1960s (Keating, 2000).

As stated by Dominelli (1992: 74),

> … it has been black people, writing from a black perspective rooted in their experience of racism in Britain, that have begun to shift the eyes of white academics and social workers towards racism as a structural phenomenon.,,

The importance of upholding black identity is core to anti-racist social work practice. Rather than using social work practice to reconstruct the racial discourse and transform the black minorities to fit in the majority community; anti-racist social work adhere to the racial origin of the black minorities and confront the society in underpinning minorities' racial identity.

In order to reclaim the black presence in social work and the capacity of black community in social and political engagement, the power relationship under the racial hierarchy became the key point of struggle. Realizing how race relationship in causing oppression, anti-racist practice highly focused on identity politics (Weedon, 1987).

However solely focusing on the black identity in anti-racist practices has drawn criticisms as it would oversimplified racial oppression by seeing black community as a homogenous group and disregarded other forms of oppressions that happen within and among communities (Keating 2000; Singh 2013). Furthermore, black/white racial discourse was built upon past colonialism, contemporary migration and various forms of people's movements have complexed racial discourses. Oppressions no longer just determined by race, but may base on culture, religion, language and all other forms of identities (Rajan-Rakin, 2015). Anti-racist social work practices start to incorporate concepts of multiculturalism, postmodernism, class struggles, anti-xenophobia etc. (Singh, 2013; Rajan-Rakin, 2015) Contemporary migration leads to the localization of anti-racist social work practices; and the expansion of perspectives in anti-racist social work practices become crucial in addressing the ever-changing race relationships in the social and political environment of a specific society.

With the revisable nature of law and legislation in governing the standards of the society, legal frameworks are expected to reflect the ever-changing racial discourse of a society and the necessary duties and regulations to be enforced. Statutory provisions thus have significant influence on anti-racist social work practice as not only the legislation defines what is "race", the legal provisions also draw on specific protections need to put in place (Bhatti-Sinclair, 2011). Most importantly, the revisable nature of legislation denotes legislation should be responsive to the society's needs on racial protection. Such revision on legislation requires diverse public participation, especially the minorities, in reflecting their needs and concerns; and anti-racist social work practices would subsequently adhere to social expectations.

Case study: Social work on minority women against gender-based violence

Gender-based violence (GBV) has been identified as one of the most prevailing social problems for women; and women belonging to minority groups, indigenous women, refugee women, women migrants, including women migrant workers, women in poverty living in rural or remote communities etc. are particularly vulnerability to violence (The Women's Health Council, 2009; Gill, 2013). Unfortunately, minority and migrant women often possess limited knowledge on GBV and low initiation in help-seeking (The Women's Health Council, 2009; Tonsing, 2014; Leung and Rainlily, 2015). In 2013, the Social Welfare Department of the HKSAR recorded a total of 3836 complaints of domestic violence of which 180 (4.7%) pertained to victims of ethnic minority background.

Similar to overseas experiences, minority women face different forms of barriers when it comes to reporting and seeking help of the violence experiences. These barriers range from their

understanding towards available services and perceptions towards GBV, as well as the limitation of social work provision and the government in dedicating services for minority women against GBV (Kapai, 2015; Baig, 2016).

The ability of minority women to recognize GBV and to take action against it largely depends on the knowledge towards GBV acquired through interacting with the dominant society which provides alternative perspectives on religion, culture and gender role expectations (Baig 2016). With increasing number of ethnic minorities and seeing minority women were lacking opportunities on social integration, social service organizations developed dedicated service for minority women in order to facilitate their understanding and integration towards the Hong Kong society. However, these services were mainly on skills training such as cookery, language and parenting; services targeting gender equality and empowerment are very few.

Coincide with Balchin's (2003) claimed that mainstream local organizations may hold particular perceptions towards minority women's suppression which may not be aligning minority women's perception, social workers expressed that they may attribute gender inequality and even GBV experienced by minority women to their minority culture and did not have sufficient knowledge to understand and make judgements. And even for those social workers from organizations on GBV, they expressed difficulties in promoting women's rights to the minority communities because minority women hold very different perceptions of gender and rights, and the present approach of the workers educating the general local public is not applicable to minority women (Baig, 2016).

On a more macro level, the government's focus on education and employment as major forms of social integration has hindered the agenda of gender equality in race equality discussions. Gender hierarchy in minority communities and female exclusivity on the making of integration policy have been particularly salient. It is found that not only the integration policy discussion and implementation lack gender perspective, the composition of HKSAR government's advisory bodies and consultative platforms also have a low minority women representation (Baig, 2016). Of the 74 agenda discussion items within the advisory bodies on race relations from July 2004 to January 2016, 28 concerned the integration and cultural preservation for minorities, 20 concerned the legislation against racial discrimination and the implementation of the legislation, and others focused mainly on education and employment situations of the minorities (Race Relations Unit, 2016).

Challenges on anti-racist social work under neoliberalism

Contemporary anti-racist social work practices challenge the previous black/white racial discourse to incorporate different forms of discriminations based on race, religion, culture, and language; and also acknowledge intersectionality through recognizing multiple identities minorities' possess. Such expansion of scopes and provisions on anti-racist social work practices was due to the continuous evaluation on the racial situation of the society through the

involvement of minority communities and those who are oppressed. However, with the growing influence of neoliberalism in social work and social welfare, the core ideologies of anti-racist social work practices have been largely undermined.

The most influential feature of neoliberalism on social welfare and services is replacing welfare with workfare (Steger, 2010). With the HKSAR government heavily emphasized education and employment of ethnic minorities in its integration policy and race agenda, the necessity of language learning and acquiring a job in Hong Kong society become the major directive for social integration of ethnic minorities (Wong, 2016). Such work-based integration directive not only limits the development of diverse services for ethnic minorities, but also hinders ethnic minorities in social and political participation.

As the funding/resources allocation for services ethnic minorities develop alongside with the government policy focus, most of the resources for dedicated services for ethnic minorities fall to language courses and employment enhancement services (Baig 2016). And as competitive governance through injecting competition into service is one of the core features of neoliberalism, other service needs and development could not get sufficient attention and resources from the government and the social service organizations. The above case study demonstrated the needs of minority women on social empowerment instead of solely on economic empowerment, especially when facing gender discrimination and inequality. However, under the current racial integration directive, interventions against intersectional discriminations within the minority communities have been limited.

Apart from dedicated services for ethnic minorities, general services provided by the government and public bodies should also be accessible by ethnic minorities. To ensure accessibility, the government has launched interpretation services when ethnic minorities need to access non-dedicated services. However identifying language as the only barrier for ethnic minorities in accessing services oversimplified racial influences. The case above showed that for minority women to seek help on GBV related situations, not only they need to know the existence of services, but also their cultural and religious backgrounds are well understood by the social workers. However, under neoliberalism, the government tends to establish basic services accessible for all, disregard of specific identity (Singh 2013). Such oversimplification on racial characteristics indeed may attribute to institutional racism as the government could not provide 'appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin' (Macpherson 1999, 28).

The large influence of statutory provisions on social work and social services further limits the development of racial equality. The government is not obliged to any proactive duty to promote racial equality under the minimalist sense of anti-racism of the government. Interventions on anti-racism tend to be service-based projects rather than advocating for rights as that would post possible challenges on the government's minimalist responsibility. And under the same rationale, the appointments of members in the advisory bodies on race relations were also mainly made

according to members' agreement to the government's directives. This coincides with scholars' claim on neoliberalism depoliticized social work (Lam and Blyth 2014).

Conclusion

The development of anti-racist social work practices under the statutory provisions of the policies and legislations in Hong Kong demonstrated the strong influence of neoliberalism. Such influence not only limited the protection provisions of anti-racial discrimination, but also hindered the social and political participation of ethnic minorities and ignored other rights protections as the diverse characteristics of minority communities were not being recognized.

Unlike the development of anti-racist social work practices in UK which was initiated by the Black social workers, social work and social services on race equality and integration were initiated by local Chinese social workers rather than ethnic minority themselves. Although local Chinese social workers tried to incorporate the views from minority communities, the lack of direct involvement of minorities in the construction of anti-racist social work practices and race policy limits the understanding of diversity within the minority communities.

In order to account for intersectional discriminations within the minority communities and between majority and minority communities, it is necessary to facilitate minority participation in social work and policy constructions. However, under neoliberalism, racial equality and integration work focus heavily on education and employment, together with the depoliticization of social work; enhancing social and political participation of ethnic minorities become more challenging. Thus to push for acute changes, it is important to have more minority social workers who can bring in minority voices to the services and social work practices directly, and gradually engage the minority communities to fully participate in social and political affairs.

Reflective Questions:

1. What are the impacts of neo-liberalism on racism and anti-racism in the context of Hong Kong?
2. How can we empower minority participate in social work and policy construction? What is to be done?
3. What is the strength as well as weakness of the Legal Approach of Racial Discrimination Act for social work practices in Hong Kong?

References

Baig, R. B. (2012). From Colony to Special Administrative Region: Ethnic Minorities' Participation in the Making of Legislation against Racial Discrimination in Hong Kong. *Social Transformations in Chinese Societies*, 8(2), pp. 173-200.

Baig, R. B. (2016). The power to change: Muslim women's rights movement and the resistance towards gender-based violence. *China Journal of Social Work*, 9(3), pp. 200-217.

Balchin, C. (2003). With Her Feet on the Ground: Women, Religion and Development in Muslim Communities. *Society for International Development,* 46(4), pp. 39–49.

Bhatti-Sinclair, K. (2011). *Anti-racist practice in social work*. Basingstoke ; New York : Palgrave Macmillan.

Bickley, G. (2005). Early beginnings of British community (1841-1898). In Chu, C. Y. Y. (eds.) *Foreign communities in Hong Kong, 1840s-1950*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brynes, A. and Chan, J. (1993). *Public law and human rights: A Hong Kong sourcebook*. Singapore: Butterworths Asia.

Census and Statistics Department. (2007). *2006 Population by-census thematic report – ethnic minorities*. Hong Kong: the Department.

Dominelli, L. (1992) An uncaring profession? An examination of racism in social work, in: P. Braham, A.
RattansiI & R. Skellington (Eds) *Racism and Antiracism*, pp. 164-178 (London, Sage Publications).

Dominelli, L. (2008). *Anti-racist Social Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, A. K. (2013). Intersecting Inequalities: Implications for Addressing Violence against Black and Minority Ethnic Women in the United Kingdom. Chap. 9 in N. Lombard and L. McMillan

(Eds) *Violence against Women: Current Theory and Practice in Domestic Abuse, Sexual Violence and Exploitation*, pp. 141–158. London: Jessica Kingsley.

GovHK. (2017). *Embracing Social Inclusion*. [Online] Available at: https://www.gov.hk/en/residents/housing/securityassistance/socialsecurity/SocialInclusion.htm [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

Gregorian, R. (2002). *The British Army, the Gurkhas and Cold War strategy in the Far East, 1947-1954*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor (1998). The Need for Legislation on Racial Discrimination. Submission to LegCo Panel on Home Affairs September 1998. LegCo Paper No. CB(2)313/98-99(01). Available at https://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/panels/ha/papers/p313e01.pdf [Accessed 29 March 2019]

HKSAR Chief Executive. (2006). *Big Market, Small Government*. [Online] Available at: http://www.ceo.gov.hk/archive/2012/eng/press/oped.htm [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

HKSAR Government. (2010). *Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality.* [Online] Available at: *http://www.cmab.gov.hk/doc/en/documents/policy_responsibilities/the_rights_of_the_individuals /agpre/adm_guidelines.pdf* [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

HKSAR Government. (2011). *Policy Address 2011-2012.* [Online] Available at: https://www.policyaddress.gov.hk/11-12/eng/p100.html [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

HKSAR Government. (2015). *Policy Address 2015.* [Online] Available at: https://www.policyaddress.gov.hk/2015/eng/p129.html [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

Kapai, K. (2015). *Status of Ethnic Minorities in Hong Kong 1997–2014*. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong.

Keating, F. (2000). Anti-racist perspectives: What are the gains for social work? *Social Work Education*, 19(1), pp. 77-87.

Lam, C. W. and Blyth, E. (2012). Re-engagement and negotiation in a changing political and economic context: social work in Hong Kong. *British Journal of Social Work*. 44, pp. 44-62.

Lam, C. L. and Tse, H. K. (2013). Adversity and resistance: neoliberal social services and social work in Hong Kong. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 1(2), pp. 267–71.

Lam, J. (2015), 10 August 2015. Hong Kong's laissez-faire economic policy is 'outdated', says CY Leung. *SCMP*, [Online]. Available at: http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-

kong/politics/article/1848097/citys-laissez-faire-economic-policy-outdated-says-cy-leung [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

Leung, L. C. and Rainlily. (2015). *The effectiveness of the "WE Stand Programme for Female Migrant Workers and Ethnic Minority Women": a research report*. Hong Kong: Rainlily.

Macpherson, W. (1999). *The Stephen Lawrence inquiry: Report of an inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny*. London: HMSO.

Ng, K. C. (1999). Minority groups racially targeted. *SCMP*.

Patel, P., and H. Siddiqui. (2010). Shrinking Secular Spaces: Asian Women at the Intersect of Race, Religion and Gender. Chap. 4 in Thiara, R. K. and Gill, A. K. (Eds) *Violence against Women in South Asian Communities: Issues for Policy and Practice*, pp. 102–127. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Plüss, C. (2005). Migrants from India and their relations with British and Chinese residents. In Chu, C. Y. Y. (Eds.), *Foreign communities in Hong Kong, 1840s-1950*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Race Relations Unit. 2016. *Meetings of the Committee on the Promotion of Racial Harmony*. Hong
Kong: HKSAR Government. Available at:
http://www.had.gov.hk/rru/english/aboutus/aboutus_cprh.html. [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017].

Rajan-Rakin, S. (2015). Anti-racist social work in a 'post-race society'? Interrogating the amorphous 'other'. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 3(2), pp. 207–20.

Schloss, G. (2000). Laws needed to fight racism. *SCMP*, [Online]. Available at:
http://www.scmp.com/article/307021/laws-needed-fight-racism [Accessed on 20 Nov. 2017]

Singh, G. (2013). Rethinking anti-racist social work in a liberal age. Chap. 1 in Lavalette, M. and Penketh, L. (Eds) *Race, Racism and Social Work: Contemporary Issues and Debates*, pp. 17-31. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Steger, M. B. (2010). *Neoliberalism : A Very Short Introduction*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Tang, K. L. (2000). Asian crisis, social welfare and policy responses: Hong Kong and Korea compared. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 20(5/6), pp. 49-71.

The Women's Health Council. (2009). *Translating Pain into Action: A Study of Gender-Based Violence and Minority Ethnic Women in Ireland.* Available at:
https://www.womensaid.ie/download/pdf/whc_gender_based_violence.pdf. [Accessed 20 Nov. 2017]

Tonsing, J. C. (2014). Conceptualizing Partner Abuse among South Asian Women in Hong Kong.
Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 25(3), pp. 281–289.

Wong, V. (2016). Government sees help for Hong Kong's ethnic-minority students as a priority. *SCMP*. [Online] Available at:
http://www.scmp.com/comment/letters/article/2018646/government-sees-help-hong-kongs-ethnic-minority-students-priority [Accessed on 20 Nov. 2017]

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

White, B. S. (1994). *Turbans and traders: Hong Kong's Indian communities*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Wong, C. K. (2008). Squaring the Welfare Circle in Hong Kong: Lessons for Governance in Social Policy. *Asian Survey*, 48(2) (March/April 2008), pp. 323-342.

Xiao, W. (2001). *One country, two systems – an account of the drafting of the Hong Kong Basic Law*. China: Peking University Press.