INTRODUCTION

The world is witnessing transformative changes from the last quarter of the 20th century that many regard as paradigmatically different from the earlier phases. These changes are associated with a process called globalization. The process of globalization is gaining ground in such a way that very few states are left with any option other than opening up their economy and society to the impinging world. These developments have a special bearing on the developing countries of the world. The dominant discourse of globalization suggests swift changes integrating these societies into a world markedly different from the ways they were accustomed to or familiar with. They have made many states particularly in the developing world, redefine their role and create opportunities for the market, new technologies and hitherto unfamiliar interactions and exchanges, or face the danger of being left out. Hence, there has been a sweep of policy reforms in the developing countries. One after another, developing countries have begun to emulate the prescriptions of globalization such as the liberalization policy. How valid is this discourse?

It is undeniable that privatization and disinvestment policies are gaining importance in the formulation and expansion of public policy. The concept of political sovereignty is also undergoing changes, as states no longer find it easy to control all aspects of their life against external interactions and exchanges. All these trends are affecting the social relations and policies of the developing states. Emphasis on economic growth is also affecting developmental priorities. The question however is to what extent? Have the states been dislodged from their hitherto dear priorities or do they still define their agenda?

---

1 World Bank’s economic report, Integration with the Global Economy, 2000 shows that out of 145 states surveyed, the majority of states reflect an increased integration into the world economy across the board. The World Bank determines integration according to several indicators taken from 1987-1997: increase in trade in goods, growth in real trade, less growth in real GDP, gross private capital flows, and gross foreign direct investment. Approximately 87% of the countries surveyed have shown a significant rise of their trade in goods (calculated as 94 out of 108 countries with available data; 37 countries could not provide complete data for this indicator). See World Bank, Integration with the Global Economy, 2000, http://www.worldbank.org/data/wdi/pdfs/tab6_1.pdf.
While the phenomenon of globalization is traced back to earlier years it accelerated chiefly over the last three decades or so. Following the collapse of state socialism and the consolidation of capitalism worldwide, academic and public discussion on globalization has become more intense. The growing integration with the global economy is seen by most of the states as essential to safeguard their interests and those of their citizens. The increasing faith in the market economy has led to liberalizing their economies and society at large. There are many states such as China, Vietnam and Cuba that still describe themselves as socialist but have made major adjustments with the globalizing world that is breathing down their necks. Does it mean all the avenues of working out policies that societies regard as relevant to them, are slipping out of their hands?

Contrasting opinions are expressed regarding the consequences of this trend. Very few view globalization as a beneficial process to reorder the relations in the world. Many regard it as a process that will result in inequalities and poverty. Several others however feel that globalization is there with us to stay in one form or the other and it is necessary to come to terms with it.

The welfare state has been the public policy in a large part of the world after World War II. The contentious character of globalization towards welfare state is visible when it comes to public policy. There has not been adequate debate on the viability of welfare state under conditions of Globalization. The collapse of the socialist alternative and the changing character of the nation state both work with serious consequences on the concept of welfare state especially in developing countries.

India and Brazil are two large societies constituting a good part of the developing world. While small societies may not have much of an option against globalization, large societies are better testing grounds to measure the impact of globalization. Besides, they are also markedly different cultural universes and can provide a better differentiated field to study the impact of globalization. Both of them have embraced the democratic mode of governance; India after independence

---

and Brazil from 1980s. Above all both of them adopted the model of welfare state to engage with some of their central concerns. They can, therefore, be the great testing grounds to assess the impact of globalization on the welfare state.

In the decades following World War II all western democracies devised policies relating to income security and provided citizens with free or subsidized services in various spheres such as education, health, housing etc. The proportion of national products, allotted to these programs increased steadily for three decades from the end of the war. The opposition to the welfare state grew prominently when the industrial countries encountered economic stagnation, inflation and unemployment. The justification for such opposition included increasing costs of provisions due to technological development, “through the “explosion of expectations”, to the presumed adverse impact of welfare provisions on the work ethic.”

The idea of state assuming the responsibility for the well being of citizens through taxing and spending began to be contested.

Strong versions of globalization often explain it as a ‘techno-economic, naturalistic and inevitable force’, which affects the political powers, policy autonomy and public policy role of the state. Governments seem to have been brought under the influence of global capital so much that its institutional allies have no choice but to pursue social and economic policies compatible to the claims of globalization and the requirement of the international business classes. “Globalization is said to undermine ‘mature’ welfare states, particularly those with comprehensive state provision, and stall their development elsewhere.”

It is further established that “Globalization theory hinges on the present and future role of the nation state as a political entity.” Such a debate focuses on the constraints built on the sovereign states by international economic forces and agents and its resultant impact on the role of the state. Globalization is analyzed as having affected the capability of the states especially due to the progress in ‘alternative frameworks of community’, and compromising tendencies in the state’s previous

---

capacity 'to monopolize the construction of nations' or 'control many of the circumstances that spawn collective tendencies'. It has also been argued that a qualitative shift of power has taken place away from governments towards non-state actors; especially towards business and industry, and also IGOs and NGOs. Some accounts depict such changes as very enormous, as a result of which, 'the possibility of using state power as an instrument for promoting social justice' has become extremely limited.

Critics feel that today states are structurally dependent on global capital while TNCs have "unlimited freedom in choosing the most conducive, or profitable, terms and conditions for their investment and production operations. Since TNCs owe no allegiance to any state, they (re) locate wherever market advantage exists." Critics also highlight global structures of power and inequality and explain how globalization has created the accumulation of wealth by a few and marginalization of the many, both across and within countries. Many feel globalization entails a "sharp division between "core" states who share in the values and benefits of a global world economy and polity, and "marginalized" states, some of which are already branded "failed" states."

Globalization entails significant influence on social policy and as such, popular debates often discuss the appropriate mode of social policy vis-à-vis the politics of globalization. Traditionally social policy as a field of academic study gave importance to organization, delivery and consumption of welfare services at the national level. The focus now seems to have changed over to 'global' as "globalization 'disrupts' the "national" focus of attention." Such a trend has varied consequences.

Globalization is argued to have affected the political, economic and social foundations of the Keynesian welfare state, changed the dynamics of welfare state

---

7 See, Scholte, op. cit., pp.165-166.
8 Cited in, Yeates, op. cit., p.9.
9 Ibid., p.10.
10 Ibid.
11 Cited in, Ibid.
development and significantly restricted pursuance of a range of political strategies and policy options. Contemporary global political economy is said to have affected the regulation and taxations of corporations and as such the provision for comprehensive social protection becomes much more difficult for governments compared to what it was earlier.\textsuperscript{13}

It has been said "The premises of the welfare state and pension system, of income support, local government and infra structural policies, the power of organized labor, industry-wide collective bargaining, state expenditure, the fiscal system and ‘fair’ taxation—all this melts under the withering sun of globalization and becomes susceptible to (demands for) political moulding."\textsuperscript{14}

There are all kinds of dire premonitions. It has been argued that states will be powerless to make ‘real’ policy choices and governments will be increasingly forced to adopt similar economic, fiscal and social policies. "This is expected to entail the abandonment of comprehensive state welfare and redistributive policies and their replacement by deregulation, privatization and welfare residualisation worldwide, leading to some form of convergence."\textsuperscript{15}

It is said that the welfare states of the advanced industrial countries have become similar despite distinct national contexts and varied policies of divergent political parties. Such similarity is entailed due to the forces of globalization leaving them into a market-oriented welfare-state model. "In essence, it does not matter whether the national institutional contexts are conservative or social democratic, or if a leftist or rightist party is in power, the constraints have become so extreme that only market-conforming welfare state structures will be allowed."\textsuperscript{16}

It is further established that economic globalization, labor market flexibility, more complex patterns of family life and the dissolution of traditional class structure has created a need for a new welfare arrangements. The traditional goals of full employment, redistribution and vast and expensive universal services do not seem to

\textsuperscript{13} See, Yeates, op. cit., p.21.
\textsuperscript{15} Quoted in, Yeates, op. cit., p.22.
be viable. The justification for new welfare spending seems to be lying in investment in human capital and the enhancement of individual opportunities. “Welfare states are all driven in the same direction by imperatives of international competition.”\(^{17}\)

However globalization has also revolutionized the political systems across the world and the role of the state has become catalytic. The democratic transition across the world is considered to be one of such trends with the aspirations for good governance. Hence, it is necessary to review and assess the role of welfare state in this context. It is admitted that the core values of welfare state remain valid the world over, even today, given the problems that affect both rich and poor countries. There are numerous new and old problems including persistence of poverty and unfulfilled elementary needs, famines and widespread hunger, extensive neglect of the disadvantaged and the marginalized and worsening threats to our environment and to the sustainability of our economic and social lives.\(^{18}\) For the last thirty years and more so, in the last ten years the discourse of globalization has been gaining importance. As barriers of trade are lifted or minimized the goods are flowing freely, MNCs have entered all the countries in larger numbers promising better opportunities for developing and developed countries. The technological transformation associated with these trends has had a profound impact on the socio-economic and political spheres.

The consequences of this trend are too complex to be assessed. Admittedly, any attempt to downsize the role of state regarding political and socio-economic policies in developing countries may adversely affect the developmental programs. The heavy squeeze in the welfare functions of state would mean lessening and nullifying the provisions of social services and leaving the market to decide the fate of the less privileged and marginalized. Dismantling of social security measures may prove to be hazardous to the developmental functions of the states. The rising inequalities of unemployment, deterioration of health, educational facilities and the inability to address the issues of minorities may affect human development capabilities of many states.


Review of Literature

Often the discourse on globalization has revolved around the question as to whether it is old or new. The writings of several scholars such as Matthias Finger (1997), Roland Robertson (1992), Robert Gilpin (1987) and Vandana Shiva (1989) build up such a trajectory. However these scholars primarily look at globalization from a paradigm evolved to explain other developments such as modernity. Globalization can never be wholly reduced to perspectives evolved to explain other developments as they do not recognize the characteristics distinctive to globalization.

Anthony Giddens (1990), David Harvey (1989), Gilpin (1987), James Mittelman (1996) Mauro F. Guillen (2001), Paul Hirst and David Held (2002) consider globalization as a process distinctive, given its supra-territoriality, 'distanciation' and compression of space and time. They help us to see globalization as a distinct phenomenon which is quite recent and that it cannot be reduced to the earlier phases. However, they do not help us much, to analyse globalization as a highly differential process caught in the specific histories of discrete societies. The writings of Robert Nozick (1984), Milton Friedman (1962) and Friedrich Von Hayek (1991) have inaugurated and justified neo-liberalism and have been profoundly critical of the welfare state. While these writings are helpful to understand neo-liberal globalization, they do not provide resources to understand alternative ways of expressions of globalization.

Globalization is often linked to capitalism and imperialism as it is often argued that it has close affinity with imperialism. Immanuel Wallerstein (2004), Samir Amin (1997), David Harvey (2005), Ronald H. Chilcote (2002) and James Petras and Henry Veltmeyer (2001) invoke such a stance in their own distinctive ways. But such a perspective does not explain adequately or help us to act on social relations spawned by globalization. Several theorists of globalization take on their stance on one or the other understanding of globalization. There are Globalists, Internationalists and Transformationalists the distinctions highlighted by scholar such as Held (2004) and Chilcote (2002). A big problem with this distinction is the invocation of processes which are susceptible for reversal. Dani Rodrik (1997), G. Garrett (1999), Nicola Yeates (2001), Ramesh Mishra (1999), Jan Aart Scholte


The development of welfare state in India is profoundly caught in colonial legacies, the national movement and a dense conceptual discourse envisaging the future of an independent Indian polity. The writings of Bipan Chandra (1966), R. C. Dutt (1896), M. G. Ranade (1892), Dadabhai Naoroji (1896), Sumit Sarkar (1983), Francine R. Frankel (2005), Atul Kohli (2004), Kaushik Basu (2004) and Partha Chatterjee (1998) address these issues quite centrally. There are the writings of nationalist leaders, such as M. K. Gandhi (1927, 1938, 1947) Jawaharlal Nehru (1936, 1946, 1954, 1956) and B.R. Ambedkar (1943, 1945) in this regard. The views of Gandhi are further found in the writings of Stephen Murphy (1991), Francine Frankel (2004) and Partha Chatterjee (1998). The role of Ambedkar in the socio-
economic emancipation is highlighted in the writings of Hirendra Nath Mukerjee (1981) and Valerian Rodrigues (2005). The attempts by India to formulate planning as central to the crafting of the welfare state is brought out in the writings of Atul Kohli (2004), Francine Frankel (2005) and Sukhamoy Chakravarty (1987). The Constituent Assembly Debates and the Constitution of India were to provide a framework for the emerging welfare state in India. This can be seen in the Constituent Assembly Debates (1946) and in the work of scholars such as Granville Austin (1999). Nehru was the architect of the emerging welfare state par excellence and the following writings reflect his views in this regard. (Bhikhu Parekh, 1991; Hiren Mukerjee, 1986; S. R. Bakshi, 1988; Basu, 2004).

The planning process in India was contested and the early contestations came from the Gandhians. The Gandhian alternative to the emerging big welfare state in India is discussed in the writings of Partha Chatterjee (1993). The working of the welfare state in India is extensively commented on in the works of Baldev Raj Nayar (2001), Sukhamoy Chakravarty (1987), B. S. Minhas (1993), P. N. Dhar (1988), Uma Kapila (1987) and others. The various documents of the Planning Commission and the various official reviews on the economy have been very useful in this regard. One of the major sources of information and analysis on economic issues and their political implications has been the *Economic and Political Weekly* for over fifty years now.

Criticisms on India's welfare state both from the right and the left can be seen in the work of Amaresh Bagchi and John Kurian (2005), Myron Weiner (2002) Francine Frankel (2005) Jayati Ghosh (1997), Amit Bhaduri and Deepak Nayyar (1996). The impact of liberalization on Indian economy and society in general and on the welfare state in particular can be seen in the works of Amit Bhaduri and Deepak Nayyar (1996), Jayati Ghosh (1997) Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen (2002), Niraja Gopal Jayal (1999) and Jagdish Bhagwati (2004). Liberalization had a profound impact on Indian democracy and the works of Jayati Ghosh (1997), Rob Jenkins (1999) and Gail Omvedt (2003) have been very useful in estimating such an impact. Welfare project in India is closely associated with a cultural project which in a way has been affected by the process of liberalization. This is brought out in the works of Partha Chatterjee (1998) Guha- Thakurta (1998) and others.
In the context of liberalization Indian state has responded to the welfare regime in a complex way and this response is highlighted in such journals as *Economic and Political Weekly* and in a popular sense, in the magazine, *Frontline*. The broad trend in the writings in India reflects a critical outlook on the impact of liberalization on welfare measures. There has not been a sustained case made to demonstrate how welfare state can be envisaged under conditions of liberalization, although the works of scholars such as Amartya Sen (2001) are highly conducive in providing conceptual tools in this regard.

The historical antecedents of various regimes in Brazil since 1930 have been highlighted in such works as by Jose Maria Bello (1968) and Boris Fausto (1998). The deeply ambiguous legacies of the regime of Vargas which made remarkable attempts to define welfare state vis-à-vis the European welfare state, is looked into in the writings of Thomas Skidmore (1997), Atul Kohli (2004), James M. Malloy (1976), Pedro Cesar Lima de Farias (1998).

Military regimes that thrived in Brazil often took an ambivalent position towards welfare state as they did not want to antagonize big capital. The works of Thomas E. Skidmore (1988), Warner Baer (1973) and Atul Kohli (2004) go into this issue. The central features of democratic transition especially those of the regime of Cardoso, are explored in the writings of Dilip Loundo (2005), Jan Rocha (2000), Sonia Rocha (2001), Sonia Miriam Draibe (2002), Scott Mainwaring (1988) and Joao Resende- Santos (1990). However, most of these writings do not explain why and how the welfare state gets reinforced in Brazil under conditions of globalization. It is also argued in some of these writings that welfare state in Brazil never exists. As these writings situate welfare state within the standards of European welfare state, a study analyzing the distinct character of welfare state in Brazil is needed.

The globalization agenda in Brazil is worked out in the context of a vibrant democracy. Often commentators see democracy as a qualifier to the drive of globalization. The relationship between democracy, globalization and welfare is considered in the writings of Fernando H. Cardoso (1998), Dilip Loundo (2005), Atul Kohli (2004), Steven C. Topik (1987), Scott Mainwaring (1995) and Camille Goirand (2003). The response of big capital and large landed interests to the
sustained policy of welfare under globalization is highlighted in the writings of Jonathan Conning (2003), Nathaniel H. Leff (1968), Elisa P. Reis (1998), M. Malloy (1977) and Thomas Skidmore (1992). Brazil is deeply caught in structures of inequalities and the contending domains of multi ethnicity. The following writings explore these twin issues which have been and continue to be of central importance to welfare agenda in Brazil. (Anthony Pereira, 1997; Skidmore, 1997; Nathaniel Leff, 1982).

Welfare state cannot be simply shored up as it came to be construed in the post World War II period. In the context of globalization new ideas have been proposed in this direction from diverse perspectives. These ideas take the criticisms of the welfare state overboard to suggest alternatives in which globalization need not be seen inimically. The writings of John Rawls (1975), Ronald Dworkin (1999), Richard J. Arneson (1992), Amy Gutmann (1988) Iris Marion Young (1990) and Amartya Sen (2002) are highly useful in reformulating a welfare agenda for our times. Apart from such theoretical suggestions, several societies have mooted new policies and programmes for welfare without neglecting the role of the markets and freedom. The idea of workfare is one such platform at work. The following writings provide a critical understanding of these issues and their interconnections with the drive of globalization. (Sonia Draibe, 2002; Dilip Loundo, 2004; Rojas, 2004; Carol Graham, 1994; Anthony Giddens, 1998; Leila Patel, 2003).

Hypothesis
This study revolves around the following hypothesis:

1. There is no single, universal version of globalization but highly differentiated expressions of the same. Similarly there is no singular model of the welfare state but different societies have imparted their own nuances to it.

2. The welfare state has not collapsed under the impact of globalization but has taken on new forms.
Objectives of the Study

The study has been initiated with the following objectives in view:

1. To critically assess the various positions and understandings regarding globalization.
2. To study the forms of welfare state and the kind of justifications it invoked.
3. To estimate the impact of globalization on the welfare state and the responses of the latter.
4. To explore the evolution of the welfare state in India and estimate the impact of liberalization and globalization on it.
5. To trace the development of the welfare policy in Brazil and locate the response of the Brazilian state to globalization with regard to welfare policies.
6. To compare and contrast the responses of India and Brazil to welfare, globalization and the impact of the latter on the former.
7. To highlight alternative ways in which the welfare state project has been envisaged under conditions of globalization.
8. To compare the responses of the welfare state in Brazil and India with other developing societies.

Reasons for the Selection of India and Brazil

Both India and Brazil are emerging powers and are experiencing major policy shifts due to the impact of globalization. Both of them reflectively pursued welfarist policies alongside development. Both these societies are large and have embraced a democratic pattern of rule.

Both being democratic countries, they are expected to make careful moves in dismantling the protective state. Till 1980s Brazil like the major states of Latin America was known more for the autocratic rule and less for a democratic transfer of power. In 1985 Brazil underwent a democratic transition. Since then there has been a regulatory state based on popular legitimacy monitoring the functioning of various sectors. Against the backdrop of globalizing trends, Latin America displays contrasting systems between liberal states like Mexico and comparatively protectionist states like Brazil. However there have been few major strides with regard to privatization. The state of Brazil has refused to dismantle its public sector...
hurriedly. In India the government is the largest provider of primary education, health and rural development. Both India and Brazil can ill afford to dismantle the welfare state without taking a discerning look at the options as large portions of their population live in poverty and experience widespread inequalities. Brazil and India are not only large in size but are also made of multi-ethnic population and share several perceptions and issues in common.

They are also very different societies. Brazil freed itself, nominally though it was, from Portuguese colonial ties which lasted for nearly two hundred years. India went through a long period of colonial harnessing and freed itself from such a yoke through a long drawn mass movement which by and large remained peaceful. Brazil did not face major problems to network itself with European thinking while in India there was an active attempt to free India from colonial cultural underpinnings. India was, and continues to be, a multi-religious society with an overwhelming Hindu majority. In Brazil the vast majority of the population is Christian, at least from their moorings. India does not have any experience of military dictatorship while Brazil has been under long spells of military dictatorship.

Such a contrast can be further elaborated. But comparison between these two societies which are far different from each other can help us enormously to work out the similarities and differences with regard to the impact of globalization. Privatization is accelerating and it is affecting welfare activities of these states. It is well said that 'the economy is doing better but poverty is getting deeper'. A fairly large section of the people, are really not doing better. Globalization according to its key players is pronounced to be the 'key to social justice'. It requires that concrete issues of survival and human development, like health, education and rural development are addressed and the traditional values of human dignity, freedom, equity and justice are ensured through a regulative model of state. An analysis to that effect should also respond to political and public issues that bring to the fore the advantages of such a policy. The striking example of Cuba, a small state just 90 miles away from the US can be very significant in this regard. It effectively functions as an institutional welfare state despite all odds. With a community based structure of development it is attacking poverty despite the economic sanctions by the US. And today in the globalizing world it has the distinction of retaining its
policy postures well focused on egalitarian and democratic equations. The state with a regulative model has successfully monitored the welfare activities. Today Cuba stands out prominent in terms of its literacy rate. It has a network of national health system providing entirely free access to 100 per cent population better compared with the developed countries of the world. Equity and distributive justice are placed high in the country despite the influence of the market economy.

**Research Methodology**

The methodology of this study has two components:

i. A discursive component: The discursive component is worked through major writings on welfare state and globalization and the contentions that it has bred. While some of these writings have been of a general theoretical kind, the others pertain to the specific contexts of India and Brazil.

ii. Empirical component: Empirically it tries to establish the making of the welfare state, particularly in India and Brazil, and to see how it has been affected by globalization.

The discursive component of the study is spread across all the chapters and empirical evidences are integrally built up with argumentations and explanations.

The empirical component for India is culled out from various historical studies, national surveys and research reports. Relevant journals have been consulted wherever they have been found pertinent. Sometimes, news media reports have been very useful although they had to be critically processed.

For Brazil, there has been a painful search for primary material as resources were not easy to compile. However, several internet sites including that of the Brazilian embassy have been very useful. We have consulted all relevant documents of World Bank institutions and documents of the government of Brazil relevant to the purposes of this study. In this regard the libraries of Goa University, Jawaharlal Nehru University have proved very useful including their JSTOR facilities. We also obtained a good deal of literature from Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi and Institute for Social Economic Change (ISEC), Bangalore.
One of the modes we have adopted to counter-check information has been consultation with a number of scholars. Academicians in Goa University, Goa and Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, have been very generous in this regard.

Given our approach to the study, a great deal of historical and institutional information was imperative particularly on India and Brazil. While historical and comparative studies have been useful in this regard, we have often taken recourse to documentary evidence. Numerous internet sites have proved highly useful in this regard.

This study necessitated several visits to universities and institutions particularly those based in Delhi. In the course of this study we have painfully realized the difficulties of reaching out to sources of studies of a comparative nature of this kind.

**Chapterization**

The study is divided into five principal chapters:

**Chapter I - Contentious Domain of Globalization**

This chapter engages with the contemporary debate on globalization from diverse perspectives. It suggests that there is not a single version of globalization at work that can be welcomed or refuted, but diverse versions strongly embedded in the history and culture of different societies. Therefore there has not been a univocal response to globalization, but a highly differentiated one.

**Chapter II - The Welfare State and its Discontents**

In this chapter we explore the rise of the welfare state and its near universal acceptance in the post-World War II era. But the approach and the underlying principles governing welfare state remained deeply contentious. One of the most important theoretical developments in the post World War II era has been the critique of welfare state from several perspectives which have been discussed in this chapter. Some of these perspectives were to become political platforms as well. However, this chapter suggests that there is no universal blueprint of a welfare state
but different societies came to mark their own distinct welfare designs. Therefore globalization had a highly differential impact on the welfare state.

Chapter III - Welfare State in India

While the national movement in India is markedly inclined to craft an independent state in India, which is welfarist in character, the perspectives highly vary in this regard. This chapter explores the impact of nationalist discourse on the making of the welfare state in India and how the project of development in India came to be integrally bound with the project of welfare and the kind of tension that it inevitably came to get caught in. While India embraced the policy of liberalization, one of its big qualifiers has been the vibrant Indian democracy and this chapter demonstrates why the neo-liberal agenda in India cannot simply enthrone the market.

Chapter IV - Welfare State in Brazil

From 1930s we find a very conscious attempt in Brazil to craft a welfare state, in a context markedly different from that of India. By invoking nationalism the Brazilian state attempted to restructure the polity by redefining policies rather than uphold the interests of diverse classes and strata composing the highly fragmented and stratified Brazilian society. In the process however Brazil formulated an interesting policy of reproducing dominant social relations in that society. While the military regime that succeeded may have tilted in favour of one or the other class or strata, but it did not succeed in wholly dismantling these welfarist foundations. In recent years there has been a complex working of the relationship between constitutional democracy, globalization and welfarism in Brazil. Globalization has not undermined welfare, but has revamped it in several ways. This chapter explores these issues and suggests the possibility of continued reformulation of a form of welfare state under conditions of globalization.

Chapter V - Welfare State under Globalization: India and Brazil

In this chapter we explore the similarities and differences of the responses of Brazil and India towards the welfare state in the context of globalization. We also suggest that while welfare state has to be considered in the political and cultural context unique to them, there are also certain characteristics of the pursuits of
welfare which are universal in character. Comparisons beyond these states have helped to buttress such a position. We also critically engage in this chapter with some of the ideas that have been suggested to revamp welfare policies afresh in our times, particularly the work of Prof. Amartya Sen.