CONCLUSION

We often find accounts of globalization, which describe it as a universal phenomenon unmarked by particularities and cultural contexts. We have argued that such an understanding is far from true. It is much more a context bound, culturally sensitive project that is amenable to diverse kinds of expressions and formulations. Often, theoretical frameworks impart a specific understanding of globalization and suggest its trajectories. In this sense, there can be a liberal version of globalization or libertarian version; there could also be a Marxist version of globalization. Further, a critical engagement with this process can be done from such perspectives.

The process of globalization could be a highly staggered one and need not engulf the different dimensions of society. Besides, the nation-state does not necessarily cave in under the impact of globalization. If it does, then one would be subscribing to a highly reductive standpoint. In fact the state may assume diverse forms both under the impact of globalization and in response to it. Globalization often affects the cultural domain. But how much, in which direction and with what consequences are the issues not to be formally declared but empirically explored. Most of the societies have sustained a degree and quality of distinctiveness in spite of being deeply driven into the economic processes of globalization.

The neo-liberal project is closely bound up with the dominant version of globalization. Such a version closely associates globalization with liberalization, freedom and primacy of the market. While globalization is enormously bound up with the interests of large capital, the latter has had no cakewalk on the back of globalization. Nation-state and peoples movements have constantly contested the pace of globalization that is closely bound up with big capital. Many nation-states have been highly circumspect about globalization and their approach to it has been selective. The criticality of what to select, and not to is provided by the eventual articulation of societies and the articulations provided by their democracies.

While social policies like other sphere of socio-economic life are deeply affected by the imprint of globalization it cannot be suggested offhand that all social policies came to be undermined due to its impact. In fact many countries may regard
investigation in social policies, at least in some of them as better ways of engaging with globalization.

As with globalization, there are several versions of the welfare state possible. Historically, there have been distinctive versions of the welfare state: Bismarkian, new liberal and the socialist. All welfare states pursued certain universal concerns but they also pursued them differently. And all of them did not pursue the same things. Some of the most important planks of the welfare state have been education, health, employment, housing and social insurance. But several versions of the welfare state emphasized on other considerations. For instance, the Bismarkian kind of welfare state pursued social cohesion, while the Swedish version of the welfare state emphasized on care and support.

Certain interwar developments such as the Beveridge report and Keynesianism play a major role in laying down the rationale of the welfare state while, its philosophical underpinnings were deeply marked by new liberalism. However, it cannot be decisively said that all welfare states either accepted this rationale or a specific philosophical anchor.

Contemporary liberals have been by and large critical of the welfare state as they thought that welfare states attempt to dole out a particular version of the good, thereby endangering freedom of choice. The bitter critiques of the welfare state have been the neo-liberal scholars who have seen all kinds of ghosts, behind the welfare state. Marxists often have tended to see the welfare state as an attempt to deny the trajectory of class conflict and installing a specific hegemony in its place. But, existing welfare states have been much complex entities. They afforded their citizens, a degree of freedom that the laissez faire state could never provide. They have also brought to the fore the conception of the citizen and what he/she is entitled to. In fact welfare states nurtured modern democracies, and vice versa.

Globalization has affected the welfare state in numerous ways particularly in its association with liberalization. Under the impact of globalization, many states had to radically re-alter existing policy measures. Globalization also made it
impossible to sustain a range of policy measures primarily postulated within the framework of the nation-state.

Welfarism became the foundational principle of independent India. However, Indian state was also confronted with the task of promoting speedy development. Therefore, the development endeavour in India came to be entwined with the welfare endeavour. The context of the rise of welfare state, made a big difference to the nature of welfare state. The Indian nationalist discourse which formulated a conception of welfare state was directed against colonialism. This nationalist discourse however was not wholly uniform. There were several tendencies at work, two of them very notable- the Gandhian and Nehruvian. However, eventually the Nehruvian perspective triumphed and the foundation of the welfare state, were laid down even prior to independence through a conception of planning.

The constitution of India was to mark the framework of the welfare state in India particularly through the provisions of Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy. The planning process and the political mobilizations worked through the aegis of the Congress party were to provide concrete shape to the emerging welfare state in India. However, in the process of its development the welfare state in India also developed various cleavages and contradictions. The welfare state in India was built on a deeply hierarchical and ranked order of society and tended to cultivate the elite. However, segments of the subaltern classes were co-opted through the mechanism of diverse kinds of policies including welfare. One of the major policy pursuits in India broadly within the ambit of welfare state was the preferential policies pursued, in favor of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes. While they did not enable all or majority of the members of these communities to make substantial gains over the years, they surely succeeded in creating a stratum of elite among them. While this state upheld, several goals of the welfare state such as, mass education, health, working conditions, housing and shelter, and insurance as dear to it eventually, the substantial benefits of these measures accrued only to small segments of the population.
In the wake of liberalization, the framework of the Indian state has undergone dramatic changes. Hitherto the state had acted as the vanguard of development. But increasingly the state has shed a significant role that it had come to play in the substantial arena of Indian economy. There have also been major changes in the political domain. Regions and states have emerged as the major players in the context of liberalization. There has also been downgrading of ideological rigour; Indian cultural domain too has been subjected to the variegated impact of globalization.

From 1991 onwards, during the era of liberalization, India’s economic progress measured in terms of GDP growth has been very impressive. Through these years India has been clearly inserted closely into the global economy. However, India still persists with a vibrant democracy. While Indian culture may have been affected through globalization there is nothing to suggest that the cultural domain has significantly compromised with the onslaught of alien cultures. There has been some significant shift in certain areas of welfare policies, such as for instance towards agricultural subsidies. However, by and large, the Indian state has persisted with its welfare agenda and even has reinforced some dimensions of the social sector policies.

The welfare state emerged in Brazil under very different circumstances. Although Brazil was a colony it did not have to carry out a national struggle to liberate itself from Portugal. In fact, Brazil became one of the favoured haunts for European settlers as it became the largest destination for slave trade for about 400 years. The large farms dominated Brazilian countryside and the norms and ways of the life of elites were set in Europe.

Vargas *Estado Novo* was to bring about a radical transformation in the social relations by appealing to nationalist bonds and seeking to integrate the diverse sections of Brazilian population in the corporate life of Brazil. While he did not wholly succeed in such a venture, some of the policies that he inaugurated were to have a long term impact. Although military regimes succeeded him, Vargas’ long reign in power and some of the initiatives that he took could not be reversed even by the military regimes that succeeded him. One of the pioneering policy initiatives was
in the sphere of social insurance. But Vargas' regime also took major initiative with regard to health and in creating employment. In the 1980s, the basis of the welfare state in Brazil grounded in strong nationalist and corporatist ideology was attempted to be given a different focus by reforms initiated by Cardoso. He tried to base welfare policy of Brazil on rights. He also opened the Brazilian economy to the large-scale invasion of globalization. However at the same time, several welfarist objectives, were not turned down but were reinvigorated and given wider application. This period also inaugurated democratic transition in Brazil. In a way, Brazil has embodied democracy, market and welfare integrally in its pursuits.

The evidence culled out in this thesis suggests that the welfare state is far from singing its requiem under the impact of globalization. In fact, the welfare state has rebounded back in an entirely new guise and probably a more defensible guise. While some of the criticisms of the neo-liberals and conservatives with regard to welfare state seem reasonable, there is little to suggest, their total endorsement of the market. In fact, several welfare measures have much urgency under the condition of globalization as was earlier or even more.

This study argues that both India and Brazil have sustained a whole range of welfare measures even under conditions of globalization. However, there are also criticisms in these states, of a highly paternalistic bureaucratic state, dispensing goods to the population as a whole. The state itself and its policies had remained unaccountable before its very citizens for long. Therefore, while the welfare state persists in both these societies and several welfare programmes are continued under their aegis, the kind of welfare state that is required under conditions of globalization cannot be the one which came to predominate in the world in the name of welfare. There are many concerns that have become non-negotiable today such as freedom, democracy and pluralism. In the context of liberalization many states have begun to experiment with social safety nets which are primarily ad-hocist in nature and cannot lay down the long-term policies for societies particularly of the size of Brazil and India.

Both the Left and the Right level criticisms against the welfare state. From the left, socialists have traditionally seen the welfare state as helping shore up
market systems, buying off working class opposition to the state and ensuring an efficient use of capital. From the right, libertarians look at welfare states as unnecessary intrusion into individual liberty, creating welfare dependency, expanding state bureaucracy, curtailing economic freedom and prosperity.\(^1\) However, considerable theoretical stances on welfare state argue that it can modify the effects of market economies and reflect a coherent basis both for the effective functioning of the economy and for fairness and justice for all.\(^2\)

However above all such arguments, the argument that "not all people are strong" still becomes valid. It is the maximalist view-point of welfare state which considers that the welfare policy exists to take care of individuals-often in the form of "weak groups" and therefore everyone's liberty must be restricted through the intervention of the welfare state in order to bridge the gap between weaker and stronger.

It is appropriately said that democracies begin with welfare state. There has been great deal of job losses from permanent downsizing or liquidation in the context of liberalization and privatization. Privatization should be accompanied by sound economic policies that create conditions for employment generation. Hence there is still need to reiterate the objectives of the welfare state.

As Sen puts it across, it is very essential that internal freedom be granted by providing people the facilities for education, health and shelter which would remove the unfreedom from poverty and marginalisation. Both India and Brazil lag behind in securing this internal freedom. It is necessary that the state intervenes in resolving structural poverty whereas transitional poverty could be handled by safety nets.

One can say that there are still extant welfare states doing commendable work. South Africa seems to have taken a viable method by drawing from the Third World as well as the First World countries, in restructuring the welfare system towards a social development perspective. The democratically elected government in 1997 enunciated a national policy –White Paper for Social Welfare (Department

---


of Welfare and Population Development), 1997. It focused on social rights and equity to address past disparities. The allocation and distribution of resources were pursued and the partnership between the public sector and civil society was sought in order to promote individual, group and community empowerment. One of the significant thrusts was to make welfare ideals a part of the economic development, integral to political stability and social well being. The unique feature of the redesign of welfare system has been a consolidated partnership between the public and voluntary sector. The welfare system of the apartheid era provided extensive welfare measures for the whites, providing only a residual share to blacks. A great effort has gone in South Africa’s attempt to bring in new visionist developmental approach. A rigorous consultative process with governmental and non-governmental agencies has brought in a new consensus on the adoption of such a policy. Institutional responsibility lies in the national and provincial spheres of governments. Child care and primary health care are the local responsibilities.3

Amartya Sen says India’s failure to have an adequate public policy in educational and health matters can be of profound significance in assessing the limited success of Indian developmental efforts over the last half a century. A policy reform that concentrates just on liberalization and deregulation cannot deal with this part of past planning.” 4

There are many ideas concerning welfare that are in the public domain today. They do not endorse a basis for the welfare state that is grounded in a regulating regime or that constrains human choices beyond a principled minimum. Nobody wants today an all-knowing state. We have highlighted several ideas in the course of this study that are useful in constructing a reasonable alternative welfare regime under conditions of globalization. While they may not all add up to a comprehensive


4 Amartya Sen argues that education and health are valuable to the freedom of a person in various ways. In its intrinsic sense it have can educated and healthy population, which helps to enjoy have effective freedom, it will also enhance one’s personal role in order to achieve economic opportunities, Greater literacy and basic education can facilitate public discussion of social needs and encourage informed collective demands (for ex: health care and social security), the education facilities also can reduce child labour and also promotes empowerment and distributive role. Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen, India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995, p.16.
and consistent framework there is no doubt that we cannot go back to a dominant model of welfare state that came to be invoked universally in 1950s and 1960s.