

**THE NEW SOCIAL POLICIES IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE
DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP: AN INTERFACE PERSPECTIVE.**

Bryan R. Roberts
University of Texas at Austin

Paper for Workshop on Agency, Knowledge and Power: New Directions
Wageningen 14th-15th December, 2001.

Introduction

Social Policy in Latin America is at a crucial juncture as it decentralizes, becomes more flexible in its administration and includes actors other than central government in its implementation. An important means of understanding the significance of these changes is to look at them from the interface perspective that has been developed at Wageningen. Although this perspective has been mainly applied to rural development, it is equally applicable to the mainly urban issues of social policy implementation. The essence of the interface perspective is, as Long (1999: 21) puts it, "exploring how discrepancies of social interest, cultural interpretation, knowledge and power are mediated and perpetuated or transformed at critical points of confrontation and linkage." Confrontation and linkage are inevitable aspects of social policy implementation since government officials, medical and educational personnel must apply standard national policies locally and with at least the tacit cooperation of socially heterogeneous populations. Further, in social policy, the nature of the relationship between policy implementers and their target populations is as important to the success of social policy as is the content of the policy. The impact of social policies in education, health and job creation, for example, often depends as much on the active engagement of individuals and communities as on the material assistance that is provided. Such considerations also apply to other areas of policy implementation such as agricultural extension work. I shall argue, however, that focusing on relationships and interactions is an increasingly necessary tool in understanding the impact of social policies in Latin America. It is in the nature of these relationships rather than in the formal content of policies that the most dramatic changes have taken place in the last two decades.

Focusing as I do in this paper on how the nature of the relationships between officials and targeted populations affects social policy outcomes is not a new perspective. It has long informed European concerns with the nature of the welfare state and with the ways in which state-provided welfare can lead to social exclusion. Simmel's essay on the form of the then new relationship between the state and the poor emphasizes, for example, how it marginalizes and produces unequal citizenship. In the countries of Latin America, where welfare states never fully developed, clientelism characterized the administration of much of social policy. Thus, occupational groups strategically key to the maintenance of elite power during modernization were favored first in the extension of social security (Mesa Lago, 1978).

An interface approach enables us to look at these relationships in more detail and, importantly, as they are played out in the concrete situations where officials and community members negotiate over policy implementation. The poor may be managed from above and be unequal in power to officials, but as many studies have shown, the poor are also active in interpreting the rules to their advantage and in manipulating opportunities. This perspective is given a new salience by changes both in the overall nature of state-society relationship in Latin America and in the orientation of social policies. I shall argue that these changes have not only deepened planned intervention in social policy, but also require more participation by the population in such social policy

areas as education and vocational training, health and community development. The result is the multiplication of interface situations at which government agencies, NGOs, community organizations and people in the community come into contact and, at times, confrontation over social policy and at which they must negotiate outcomes.

In the current situation of Latin America, social policy analysis needs to put as much emphasis on how policy is implemented as on what that policy is. Differences over time and between countries in social security, health and education policies are, of course, also important topics of social policy analysis. What these latter studies lack, however, is a sense for the unintended consequences for policies that arise from the implementation process. They also lack a concern with the indirect consequences of social policies for citizenship and governance. What are the consequences of social policy for civic participation? Do social policies contribute to the enlargement or not of social rights? These indirect consequences may be as significant for the well being of a country as are the more commonly reported results of social policies -- levels of educational achievement or reduction in poverty and infant mortality.

These unintended and indirect consequences of social policies are best captured by case studies over time of the implementation process. The interface perspective is valuable because it sensitizes the analyst to the significance of the types of relationships that policy implementation creates between government, the NGO sector and members of the community. This analysis entails exploring the content of these relationships in terms of the differing social interests, interpretations, and information present in strategic interactions during policy implementation. Such an analysis will be a priority in the research project in which I am currently involved.¹ My aim in this paper, however, is first to document the changes in the social policy context in Latin America that makes the study of the implementation process particularly salient. Second, I consider the range of actors involved in social policy initiatives and look at the changing expectations and ideologies attending social policy. Lastly, I outline the forms of relationship that are developing in the social policy arena, which have unintended and indirect consequences for the relation of the state to civil society.

My broader aim is to integrate the discussion of citizenship with that of the nature of the state, of social policy and of community development (Roberts, 2001). These three issues have become central to the public agenda; but their discussion often occurs in isolation from each other. Community development innovations are discussed, but without references to overall social policy or to the nature of the state that implements it. Social policy is often conducted on sectoral (health, education, social security) lines and not as an integrated development policy. And the implications of social policy and community development both for citizen rights and for social equality are not fully

¹ This is a Ford Foundation funded project on self-sustaining community development in Argentina, Chile and Peru. The project consists in a research and training network that will carry out comparative research on community development initiatives in the capital city and in one provincial region of the three countries. The research will consist mainly in case studies of comparable policy initiatives in the areas of health, education, housing and job creation community based, charting their inception and progress and focussing on the relationships that develop within the community and between the different local and extra-local actors.

considered.

The Changing Context of Social Policy in Latin America

Both state-society relationships and social policy in Latin America have been fundamentally affected by the shift from the 1980s onwards from Import-Substituting economic regimes to ones that are more export oriented. This shift has been accompanied by debt crises that made many Latin American countries increasingly dependent on external financing and at terms set by the external financial agencies. A set of structural adjustment policies have been implemented in the region that consist in measures to increase fiscal discipline within countries, to de-regulate markets and to promote free trade. Country after country have privatized state owned or controlled industries, lowered tariffs on imports and opened their markets to external direct and indirect investment.

A reorganization of the state has accompanied these economic changes, which varied in its scope in the different countries of the region. In most Latin American countries, however, the direction of change has been similar --- de-concentrating administration and, to a lesser extent, decentralizing administrative control. Raczynski and Serrano (2001: 11-12) note the various meanings of decentralization in Chile -- political, financial and administrative -- pointing out that expectations of what decentralization can achieve not only outrun reality, but that the changes precede agreement among the actors in the process. Decentralization has, thus, become an arena rife with disagreement, conflict and negotiation. Under pressure from external financial agencies, Latin American central governments either reduced absolutely or relatively their administrative personnel. These reductions have been achieved by devolving responsibilities to lower-level authorities, such as provincial or municipal governments, by privatization and by sub-contracting government programs to NGOs or to 'in-house' temporary employees. An indication of the growth of the non-state public sector is the increase in employment in the not-for-profit sector, which in Brazil, added 344,149 jobs between 1991 and 1995 to employ 1,119,533 people (Landim and Beres, 1999). In contrast, Landim and Beres (1999: Tabela 4) show that state employment in the social areas grew less rapidly, adding some 293,000 for a total of 3,297,706 employees.

The downsizing of the role of central government has been ideologically justified in terms of the greater efficiency and flexibility that would result from reducing the central bureaucracy. The reform of the state has explicitly been seen as a necessary move from bureaucratic state administration to managerial state administration (Bresser Peyreira, 1999). The scope of the actual change has been less than that urged by its advocates, who included international agencies such as the World Bank, the IMF, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Agency for International Development. It has, however, affected the ways in which government officials at all levels see their roles. These are no longer to be confined to the administration of a limited number of social services according to set rules, but increasingly include a pro-active oversight of services administered by others. Though the direct control of central government may have lessened in certain areas of social policy, such as education, health and social security,

the range of central government intervention has increased as it has developed regulatory mechanisms to oversee lower level authorities. Also, central governments, often at the behest of the international agencies, introduce complementary programs to target populations that are not sufficiently served by the standard services administered by lower-level authorities.

In Brazil, the reform of the state has involved four key elements: (a) a reduction in size as a result of a transference of responsibilities; (b) a reduction in bureaucratic regulation, particularly of the market; (c) an increase in managerial capacity to make the implementation of government policies more effective and increase the fiscal independence of the state; and (d) an increase in governability through making the state more accessible to civil society (Barreto, 1998). Managerial public administration, Bresser Pereira and Cunill Grau (1998: 45-46) claim, is more effective because its use of the non-state public sector enables social services to be offered competitively, flexibly, and with a high degree of commitment to the interests of the recipients of the services. Reliance on the public non-state sector also increases the degree of societal control of state actions and of increasing the sensitivity of the state to the felt needs of citizens (ibid).

The reorganization of the state combines in the present economic context entails a new approach to social policy. External and internal constraints on state budgets mean that states throughout Latin America are under pressure to extend welfare in ways that are compatible with economic competitiveness in a global market. Also, as Huber et al (n.d.) emphasize, the traditional political parties proved unable to work with the range of social movements that generated considerable, but fragmented, popular participation. The model that is emerging is, consequently, similar to that of the liberal welfare regime. In this model, states cease to play such a dominant role in welfare provision. Instead, through policies of decentralization, welfare is provided through seeking cooperation and co-financing from local communities, through the aid of the non-profit sector, and through introducing market mechanisms such as educational vouchers (CEPAL, 1995). Ideologically, the new social policies are based on a rejection of the bureaucratic inflexibility of the 'old' social policies. In the CEPAL (1995) document, for instance, the previous systems of central government administered social security and education are portrayed as limited in scope, inefficiently and often clientelistically administered and favoring the middle classes and the incorporated working classes. The document calls for reducing the role of central government in delivering social policy and a greater reliance on the tripartite alliance of the market, the non-governmental sector and the local community. The new policies increase the number of actors involved in the implementation of social policy. In addition to a greater role for local government, there are public-private partnerships, the increase in the number of NGOs focused on technical assistance and service delivery and the recasting of community organizations to administer externally financed services.

Accompanying decentralization is an explicit policy of targeting populations in need. To remedy what has been seen as the inefficiency of universal welfare policies, which it is claimed have mainly benefited the middle classes, governments and international

agencies stress the need to target aid to the poor. This targeting has taken on two forms. One is a targeting of individuals and/or households on the basis of their income levels. Thus, programs in Chile, for example, provide income supplements to those people who can establish in an officially administered questionnaire that their income falls below a poverty line. Free meal programs in schools or in the community are also often similarly targeted. The second form is targeting communities for development aid. Here, too, poverty line criteria are used, but are based on the percentage of a population in a community that falls below a poverty line. The rationale for targeting communities rather than individuals is that extra value added is gained by being able to make use of unpaid or underpaid community cooperation in carrying out the programs. Thus communities provide unpaid or low paid labor to help improve housing, while the external agency provides the materials. Women are trained by externally financed specialists in childcare, but are then expected to provide their services for a nominal wage to the community. Targeting communities is also often done competitively. Communities are invited to bid for programs administered by local, provincial or national governments.

Important factors shaping the new social policies are the interconnected realities of fiscal austerity and existing commitments. In Argentina, Brazil and Chile, where the social services take approximately 60% of public expenditures, three quarters of social service expenditures are concentrated in fixed commitments for pensions, basic public education and basic public health. The amounts of 'flexible' public money available for innovative programs are small and must usually be found within the budgets of the existing Ministries. Indeed, most innovative programs undertaken by national or provincial governments are financed by loans from the international lending agencies. This situation means that decentralization and targeting rarely bring an integrated approach to community development. The different ministries in health, education, employment or housing, may promote new programs locally, but they tend to do it sectorally and with little coordination with each other. The internationally financed programs at the community level also tend to target specific groups, such as single-parent families, the handicapped, the old or adolescents, rather than promote an integrated community development. In all these examples, financial resources are evident constraints on the relationships that develop between external agencies and local populations.

The Range of Actors and Ideologies at Social Policy Interfaces

From the above account, we can derive some preliminary propositions about the nature and content of the key relationships that develop in social policy in Latin America. First, compared with the past, there is a proliferation of actors involved in the implementation of social policy. Second, there is a deepening of the reach of social policy at the individual and community level. Third, there is greater ideological heterogeneity present in the implementation of social policy.

The extent of the proliferation of actors involved in social policy varies between countries, depending on government commitment to private-public partnerships, to administrative decentralization and to working with NGOs and community organizations.

This variation can be analyzed in terms of institutional and political differences between countries, but other factors such as the size and regional complexity of the country are also important. Brazil has perhaps the most decentralized system of social policy and perhaps the greatest range of significant social actors in policy. These range from the various national ministries and programs, to the state and municipal level where NGOs are active and community representation in education and health policy-making is mandated by the constitution. In contrast, in Chile, a smaller and historically more centralized country, the national ministries and national programs are preponderant. Municipal governments have, relative to Brazil, little leeway, while NGOs are often co-opted to help administer national programs. In Mexico, the long dominance of the PRI has meant the relative absence of non-governmental actors in social policy. Mexico is, for example, one of the few countries in which job-retraining programs at the local level are administered by the government and not sub-contracted to NGOs.

Despite these variations, a common set of tendencies explain the current increase in the range and number of social policy actors in Latin America compared with the 1960s and 1970s. Foreign and national NGOs have increased rapidly in the 1980s and 1990s. The democratization of the region in this period is a factor explaining both that increase and the change in the character of NGO participation in social policy. Under authoritarian governments, non-state organizations were given little role in administering social policy. Foreign technical missions were a partial exception. Most NGOs were advocacy groups or groups seeking to promote demand-making at the local level. With democratization and a greater emphasis on downsizing the state and on free market development, NGOs have acquired new roles in administering state or foreign aid programs. Whereas under authoritarian regimes NGOs received support from abroad for their work in promoting community and individual rights, external support under democracy came in return for administering aid. In the face of scarce resources, neither governments nor external aid agencies have much interest in promoting demand making at the local level. To survive financially, NGOs increasingly take on the administration of programs in which role they are likely to have less interest than previously in promoting demand making (Bebbington and Farrington, 1993; Jelin, 1996; Nelson, 1996; Vivian, 1994).

Democratization has also increased dramatically the role of local government in social policy (Spink, 1999). Whereas in the 1960s and 1970s, municipal government was usually absent from the social policy field, without responsibility for health, education or welfare, by the 1990s, municipal governments had become major players in administering these areas of social policy. Fiscal austerity brings two further sets of actors in social policy – the private sector through public-private partnerships and local community organizations. In both cases, these are strategies for eking out scarce public funds to provide such services as job retraining or community-based caring for the young or the elderly.

The content of social policy has deepened in recent decades. More is offered, but also more is expected of the population. The reasons for these changes are familiar ones, but they bear repeating since they underlie the radically different interface situations of contemporary social policy. Urbanization combined with modernization and democracy

explains this deepening. Most Latin American populations live in large cities where the challenge of public health and public security is a severe one. They face labor markets in which relatively high levels of education are required for even modest jobs. In the 1960s and 1970s, the rapid growth of Latin America's cities was partly accomplished by the efforts of their inhabitants. These built the cities through self-help housing and often created their own jobs. Also, the rapidly expanding urban job markets provided adequate incomes for people even with low levels of education. In this context, the quality of public health, particularly preventative care, of public security and even of public education and job training were not priorities for government. Squatters installed their own sewage systems and lobbied to secure a public drinking supply. Also, as many of the studies of the period reported, low-income communities maintained their own system of public security.

By the 1990s, most of the large Latin American cities had become consolidated with few remaining spaces for invasion or self-help housing. Current housing problems in the large cities are those of the deterioration of low-income neighborhoods thirty or forty years on from when they were first built – what Peter Ward (2001) calls the third generation housing problem. These housing problems demand concerted social policies and are not susceptible to the self-help solutions of the 1960s and 1970s. The increase in the number of childless households, of single parent households and of single person households often means an increase in the number of households in a city, despite the sharp declines in fertility in this period. Renting becomes a more common form of establishing new households and, along with the declining proportions of extended families and nuclear families (two parents and children), contributes, it can be suggested, to an increase in social fragmentation at the community level (Roberts, 2001b).

Social fragmentation raises public security concerns at the neighborhood level. Urban labor markets in the 1990s have experienced increasingly difficulty in absorbing labor. Even in the informal economy, wages and conditions of work have worsened relative to the situation in the 1960s and 1970s. Formal employment has become more precarious contractually and in terms of social security coverage. All these changes demand of social policy a degree of intervention into the lives of the population that was not demanded before. The elderly who have no kin to support them become a social policy imperative, more so in some countries than in others. The urgency of job retraining in face of the changing demands of the labor market is an apparent public concern. Issues of public security at the neighborhood level, whether in terms of domestic violence or of street gangs are fiercely debated to an extent that was not the case in the earlier period of urbanization.

These changes are not simply a result of perceived or real social fragmentation and the increasing sophistication of urban labor markets and infrastructure. The politics of democracy and the work of advocacy groups have also made significant contributions to the greater salience of these social policy issues. Irrespective of the reasons for the broadening of social policy concerns, the result is not only more external intervention, but also that more is expected of the population. Social policy becomes a means of transforming individuals, households and communities as essential elements in national

development. In contrast with the situation of the 1960s in which low-income populations were largely outside public and social policy, the current situation is one in which public social policy concerns increasingly invade the private sphere of community and household.

The discourses used by the various actors in social policy are now significantly more heterogeneous than in the past. In the past, social policy was mainly perceived as an arm of modernization and little contested. Extending health, education and social welfare could be viewed as necessary and incontrovertible aspects of the modernization process. Latin American countries varied in the extent and depth of coverage in these services, depending on their stage in development, but all claimed full coverage as their goal. In the contemporary situation, social policy is viewed from a more divergent set of perspectives.

One of these sets stems from the diffusion of international models of social policy. Though there are some differences in emphasis, the main international lending agencies agree on a model of social policy, which includes decentralization, private-public partnerships, targeted programs and community participation. The discourse is also rights-oriented, emphasizing equal rights and the need to build a strong civil society through citizen participation. The programs sponsored by the agencies come with templates of the necessary steps in implementing programs, such as convoking neighborhood meetings, ensuring adequate representation of different community groups and following democratic procedures. These templates are applied to programs of different kinds -- for the elderly, for children, for adolescents, single-parent mothers, for improving housing etc. They are also applied in relatively standard form to different countries, and to urban as well as rural areas.

At the national government level, social policy today no less than in the past is identified with national projects of modernization, unification and of redressing regional inequalities – as a means to bring in culturally diverse and spatially remote groups into a culturally unified and politically centralized nation. These imperatives create a certain independence of purpose in face of the pressures from the external agencies. Chile, for example, pursued its own housing policy of subsidizing house building in face of World Bank disapproval and withdrawal of loans. Likewise, Brazil, while negotiating social policy loans with the World Bank, has followed its own particular mix of central regulation of social policy combined with local devolution of its implementation. Tempering managerial rationality, clientelism remains an important force in social policy in almost all Latin American countries. In the absence of strong national political parties and with the decentralization of social policy, the clientelistic use of social policy to establish a local political base has certainly not weakened in the contemporary period compared with the past.

International advocacy groups provide a somewhat different perspective on social policy (See Evans, 2000, Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Amongst groups advocating women's rights, the rights of children, indigenous rights, or human rights in general, the emphasis is on empowering local people to defend and advance their rights. This is what Appadurai

(2000) calls globalization ‘from below’. Globalization from below takes up the issue of the growth of citizenship organization and consciousness as a result of the activities of international organizations, of national and international NGOs and of increased access to information by community groups. As Jelin (1996) points out, the effectiveness of participation and of rights advocacy lies as much in the process itself, as in concrete changes in laws or dramatic shifts in the distribution of resources. The increase in public discourse about rights and about participation and the activities at the local level around these issues change the language of political debate. Governments and elites may still seek to impose policies from above, but they are constrained to do through the words and symbols that recognize citizens as participative and rights bearing. Emblematic of this in Latin America is the wide use of *Mesas de Concertación* (Roundtables for reaching agreement) in public policy. These meet at the local and national levels, stress participation by community representatives and serve as forum for airing public policies.

Though the relevant weight of these perspectives varies between countries, contemporary social policy in Latin America is characterized by the presence of all these elements. The implementation of social policy at the local level involves negotiation between these different perspectives.

The Forms of Relationship in Social Policy

Decentralization is producing a rethinking of the role of government in implementing social policies and a search for practices that could be disseminated widely as practical approaches to effective government. Judith Tendler’s Good Government in the Tropics analyzes successful local development programs in the state of Ceara in the Northeast of Brazil, showing that the positive results of these programs depend on the flexible and collaborative ways in which government officials relate to the local population. The focus of this rethinking is on successful cases rather than on policy failures or inadequacies on the grounds that the former can, at least, point the way to new and more general models of effective government (Spink, 2000). In this section, I want to focus on the processes of policy implementation rather than on policy results to signal some of the opportunities for and challenges to ‘good’ government that arise from the forms of relationships that are developing in the policy contexts described in previous sections.

On the positive side, two forms of relationship can be identified that promote successful innovation. These are what Evans (1996) labels complementarity and embeddedness. Complementarity occurs when both parties to policy implementation have a common interest in a successful outcome and when each can provide what the other needs, but does not have. Government can, for instance, provide the resources, including publicity that a community needs, but the resources and thus the national program will not be effective without local collaboration. Embeddedness -- relationships of trust between program implementers and community members -- bolsters the common interest between implementers and community, facilitating complementarity. In this situation, embeddedness creates a two-way channel of communication that facilitates the effective implementation of a program. Evans uses embeddedness as akin to social

capital, a set of relationships that can be drawn upon to facilitate coordinated action. The search for social capital is now a well established one in the literature, with its existence or creation being viewed as a key to community development (Durstun, 1999).

There is another aspect of embeddedness, which is as important as its social capital side. Embedded knowledge is practical knowledge about how things work in a given context. Having it, it can be argued, is essential to adapting standard programs to local circumstances. This is the goal of the policy innovations approach to local public management (Spink, 2000). In the various programs adopting this approach, a template approach to policy implementation is explicitly rejected in favor of identifying the range of innovative practices that work at the local level. The policy objective might be a general one, such as improving infant education; but the innovations approach focuses on innovative ways of achieving this objective in particular contexts. What characterizes the approach is its concern with the practicalities of communicating policies and of negotiating understandings of those policies amongst participants. From this perspective, successful innovation depends on embedded knowledge that can only be acquired when policy implementation is open to learning from experience.

Evans (1996) stresses that the successful synergy of complementarity and embeddedness depends on appropriate macro contexts that are conducive to collaboration over common goals. He warns that synergy is less likely when communities and nations are highly stratified, as is the case in most developing countries. Stratification creates a range of special interests that are likely to both impede communication and co-opt programs for particular rather than community-wide ends. This concern with stratification brings us back to some of the central issues raised by the Wageningen studies of interface situations and policy implementation – the inevitable discrepancies in perspective and in power that shape relations between actors and affect policy outcomes.

One of the major discrepancies derives from the notion of ‘good’ government itself. As promoted by International Agencies, good government has often been identified with best practices (Spink, 2000: 46). The ‘best practices’ approach seeks to establish a template for policy implementation that will achieve the best results in any situation. Best practices are evaluated by their objective results – scores in education, health coverage, or attendance at training sessions. Best practices are often detailed in elaborate manuals of procedures to follow in the implementation process including how to evaluate success at each stage. The form of the relationship that develops between government, NGOs, community organizations and community members tends to be rational-bureaucratic.

The best practices approach is widely diffused throughout Latin America as part of the reform of the state in managerial administrative directions. This approach emphasizes the instrumental and calculable content of citizenship rather than its rights content. External donors demand that the programs that they finance follow certain guidelines in terms of participation by beneficiaries. These will normally include prescriptions as to how to call consultative meetings with the community over priorities, such as advertising meetings widely in advance and surveys to determine the objective characteristics of target populations. Guidelines set out the number and sequence of evaluations to check

the number of beneficiaries and ascertain whether they are representative of the targeted population. Within state agencies, these practices are increasingly seen as being equivalent to good government, and they feature prominently in official descriptions of national development programs. The extent of citizenship is identified with the numbers that follow the appropriate procedures. The content of good citizenship becomes identified with polling community needs, high attendance levels at meetings and by completion rates at courses or of projects.

Spink (2000) describes the "audit" culture in which the inability to measure performance precisely is taken to mean that a program cannot have merit. That what is, as he puts it, is confused with what should be. Barreto (1998), discussing state reform in Brazil, uses examples drawn from the British health service to point to the difficulties involved in evaluating results by standardized measures of the number of successful outcomes. Major difficulties are the variations in the definition of success that arise from the different perspectives of the actors involved - the client, the professional, the organization, the finance ministry and so on. A major research challenge is identifying methods of ensuring accountability that involve both standardization and take account of this diversity of perspectives.

The rationalization process also reinforces a knowledge hierarchy in which community members need to buy in technical expertise in order to run their own programs. Thus, there has been a proliferation of technical NGOs in several countries, which consist in groupings of professionals who offer their services to local community organizations for a fee. Their role is providing technical advice on such matters as housing, rather than to promote community organization.

A second source of discrepancy arises from the competitive relationships that develop among participants in the new social policies. Fiscal austerity and the sectoral nature of social policy entail, as we noted, competition between spending ministries in the delivery of social policy, which results in lack of coordination at the local level and overlapping programs. Local governments, NGOs and community organizations compete for the scarce resources offered by higher levels of government or International Aid programs. Local governments in Argentina, for example, hire people to write grant applications to fund community development programs. In this situation, integrated and consistent community development strategies are difficult to achieve.

The competitive relationship in social policy is also an entrepreneurial one, and at all levels. Ministries compete for clients at the local level; NGOs compete for resources, but also for clients. Community leaders and their organizations seek out resources from different levels of government and from NGOs. This policy entrepreneurship undermines the capacity of local government to plan an equitable development strategy for the population that it governs, since some neighborhoods may benefit from externally funded social programs, while similar and adjacent neighborhoods have no such programs.

The competitive relationship can also reinforce the clientelistic relationship in social policy often seen as characteristic of the old social policy. The clientelistic relationship is

based on receiving welfare in return for political support. This political support is not confined to political parties, but can also promote administrative careers in government or the non-state public sector. The administration of the temporary employment program, *Plan Trabajar*, in Argentina is often closely linked to the Peronist party in the municipalities that it controls. Various studies have reported how the unemployed or underemployed receive work under the plan in return for attendance at party rallies and other political services. Since the new social policies are targeted, rather than based on universal rights, it is inevitable that they lend themselves to clientelistic manipulation on the part of both givers and receivers.

Targeting potentially affects the form of the social policy relationship between government and population in another way by fostering a relationship of social exclusion. Exclusion as classically defined by Simmel in 1908 (1971: 150-178) refers to a relationship of second-class citizenship. The poor are members of the society, but the aid that they receive from the state is not given to ensure their equality as citizens, but to maintain the social fabric. The aid they receive categorizes them as dependents and can contribute to social isolation. Individual targeting in social policy can, in practice, weaken the community bonds that can be important resources for the poor. An example is Fujimori's policy of replacing government support for communal soup kitchens in Lima by individual food packages targeted at the poorest. The soup kitchens had served the whole neighborhood and mobilized the unpaid help of the non-poor who often served as sources of practical help, advice and contacts for the very poor.

In monitoring these unintended and indirect consequences of the new social policies it is essential to follow the implementation process closely and in a variety of contexts. The mix of relationships that develop in social policy implementation – complementary, embedded, rational bureaucratic, competitive, clientelistic and exclusive – are likely to vary depending on the nature of the community, whether it is urban or rural and homogeneously poor or not. The mix will also depend on the particular organization of the state and its relation to the non-state public sector. However, each one of these six forms of relationship has their critical points of linkage and confrontation. There is the identification of the public services that government provides and what the community can contribute in the complementary relation. There are the situations in which information and favors are exchanged in the embedded relationship. The rational bureaucratic form has its moments at which participation is organized from above. There are the search procedures for clients and sponsors in the competitive form. Linkages are made clear at times of heightened political activity in the clientelistic form. They also are in the daily interactions of officials and beneficiaries in institutional settings, such as hospitals, welfare agencies, and schools.

Concluding Comments

The implication for social policy is the need to constantly monitor and debate what is happening at the local level, but to place this evaluation within the broader structure of social and institutional relationships in each region and country. Monitoring the results of

policies is a part of this exercise, but only a part. As important is seeing social policy as being also the experience of social policy in people's daily lives. For low-income people, this includes the diversity of forms of social relationship that policy implementation fosters, the increase in extra-local interventions and the confusion of conflicting ideologies. In this situation, government, both central and local, is more crucial than ever. It can do more good and it can also do more harm. Issues of citizenship and social policy become central to politics and to social change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appadurai, Arjun. 2000. "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination". *Public Culture*, 12(1): 119.
- Barreto, Maria Inês, 1998. "Las organizaciones sociales en la reforma del Estado brasileño" in Luis Bresser Pereira and Nuria Cunill (eds.). *Lo público no estatal en la reforma del Estado*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, pp. 115-155.
- Bebbington, A. and Farrington, J. 1993. "Governments, NGOs and Agricultural Development: Perspectives on Changing Inter-Organisational Relationships," *Journal of Development Studies*, 29 (2): 199-219.
- Bresser Pereira, Luis Carlos, 1999. "Managerial Public Administration: Strategy and Structure for a New State." In L. Bresser Pereira and P. Spink (eds.), *Reforming the State: Managerial Public Administration in Latin America*. Boulder, Co. and London: Lynne Rienner, pp. 1-14.
- Bresser Pereira, Luis Carlos and Nuria Cunill Grau (eds.), 1998. *Lo público no estatal en la reforma del Estado*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Comision Economica para America Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL) (1995) *Modelos de desarrollo, papel del estado y politicas sociales: nuevas tendencias en America Latina*. (Santiago: Cepal Document LC/R.1575).
- Durston, John, 1999. 'Building community social capital', *CEPAL Review vol. 69: 103-118*.
- Evans, Peter, 1996. "Government Action, Social Capital and Development: Reviewing the Evidence on Synergy." *World Development*, 24 (6): 1119-1132.
- Evans, Peter, 2000. "Fighting Marginalization with Transnational Networks: Counter-Hegemonic Globalization." *Contemporary Sociology*, 29 (1): 230-241.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. 1996. "¿Ciudadanía emergente o exclusión? Movimientos sociales y ONGs en los años noventa," in *Sociedad*. 8: 57-81.
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink, 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Landim, Leilah and Neide Beres, 1999. *As organizações sem fins lucrativos no Brasil: Ocupações, despesas e recursos*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade de Johns Hopkins/Instituto de estudos da Religião.
- Long, Norman, 1999. "The Multiple Optic of Interface Analysis." UNESCO Background Paper on Interface Analysis.
- Mesa-Lago, C. 1978. *Social Security in Latin America: Pressure Groups, Stratification and Inequality*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Nelson, Paul. 1995. *The World Bank and Non-Governmental Organizations: The Limits of Apolitical Development*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Raczynski, Dagmar and Claudia Serrano (eds.) 2001. *Decentralización: Nudos Críticos*. Santiago de Chile: CIEPLAN/Asesorías para el Desarrollo.
- Simmel, Georg, 1971 [c.1908]. *On Individuality and Social Forms*. Edited by Donald Levine, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spink, Peter, 1999. "Possibilities and Political Imperatives: Seventy Years of Administrative Reform in Latin America." In L. Bresser Pereira and P. Spink

- (eds.), *Reforming the State: Managerial Public Administration in Latin America*. Boulder, Co. and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Spink, Peter, 2000. "The rights approach to local public management: experiences from Brazil." *Revista da Administração de Empresas*, São Paulo.
- Tendler, Judith, 1997. *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Vivian, Jessica. 1994. "NGOs and Sustainable Development in Zimbabwe: No Magic Bullets," in *Development and Change*, 25: 167-193.