

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
Introduction	1
1 Economic Constitutionalism and Social Inclusion:	
Transforming Liberalism	9
The new welfare governance	9
Market citizenship, welfare and economic constitutionalism	15
Linking markets to welfare	19
Ordo liberalism and the social market	21
New Liberalism, property and liberal subjects	26
Welfare, inclusion and economic constitutionalism	30
2 Capability, Freedom and the Third Way	34
Introduction	34
The new social democracy: risk or capability?	37
Capability paradigm	41
Complex equality and the new welfare governance	45
Freedom and republicanism	50
Capability, inclusion and equality	53
3 The Illiberal Politics of Neo Liberal	
Welfare Contractualism	56
Welfare contractualism and the new welfare governance	56
Liberal foundations of illiberal social policies	60
Neo liberal contractualism and anti-politics: the role of active agency	63
Towards a democratic contractualism	72
Systemic coercion and the capability approach	74
Democratic foundation of law and contractualism	77
4 Contractualism and Transnational Welfare Governance	81
Transnational welfare governance and contractualism	81
Chain of contract and the new welfare governance	87
Participation, reflexive regulation, and contractualism	93
Contractualism, welfare governance and state transformation	100

5	The New Regulatory State and the Social Market in Korea	103
	Economic crisis and a Korean third way	103
	Creating a new regulatory state	107
	Regulating economic order	110
	Social inclusion and tripartite dialogue in the regulatory state	112
	New social policies and the social market economy	118
	Social market, regulation and statecraft	124
6	Statecraft and Social Contracts: A Populist Market Citizenship in Thailand	126
	Neo liberal populism as statecraft: Thailand's new social contracts	126
	Neo liberal populism: from market reform to statecraft	128
	Thailand: the strategies of populist governance	133
	Statecraft, social contracts and new entrepreneurial capacities	138
	Towards authoritarian statism?	142
7	The New Politics of Inclusion	146
	Statecraft and ideas of welfare	146
	The 'social question' and the social democratic grammar of politics	154
	A new social question?	158
	Social capital and neo liberal sociability	161
	Inclusion and social democratic politics: new pathways	165
	<i>Notes</i>	169
	<i>References</i>	175
	<i>Index</i>	189

Introduction

As I write this, the 2005 G8 Summit at Gleneagles – with a supporting cast of ageing rock stars and celebrities – claimed a frontal assault on African poverty. Crocodile tears, or the end of neo liberalism? Stripped to its bare essentials it is this question that prompted this study. The G8 Summit is but one illustration of an intriguing dilemma. On the one hand there is a new social agenda with an enhanced focus – discernable even within the ramparts of neo liberalism such as the World Bank and other international financial institutions – on such issues as poverty and welfare; then, on the other hand, this new ethos, often couched in a new political language of inclusion and cognate governance structures, is framed within the boundaries set by the market model which has dominated politics and policy over the last three decades in advanced industrial as well as newly industrializing countries.

Therefore, the critical problem posed in this volume is: do these new social policies and programmes present a fundamental challenge to the neo liberal model? Or, rather, are they merely an attempt to develop new forms of regulatory governance to entrench programmes of economic reform? It is neither crocodile tears nor the end of neo liberalism. Rather, I argue that these forms of social governance provide a logic and rationale for developing a new social policy agenda arising from core elements of the neo liberal market model. Yet, this cannot be simply written off as a ‘warmed-up’ version of neo liberalism. The new social politics provide a terrain of engagement for social issues, one which is different from the postwar social democratic model – what we call ‘social constitutionalism’. In this sense it provides the language and regulatory space for the socialization of the market, and it is this regulatory space that is the focus of this study.

This volume explores this new social politics through the frameworks of welfare governance that attempt to constitute what Gilbert (2002) calls an ‘enabling state’. These forms of social regulation, however, differ from the hard-edged neo liberalism of privatization and the retrenchment of welfare services that marked the first phase of neo liberalism. It is this more recent socialization of the market model and its distinctive political language and institutions – not the programmes of market reform – that is likely to be the distinctive feature of neo liberal politics

in the early twenty-first century. This signifies a fundamental transformation of the 'idea of welfare' that underpinned the postwar social settlement in industrial democracies of the western world – a social settlement which framed welfare in terms of its function as a means of compensation or redistribution to redress the vagaries and inequalities created by the operation of market forces. The terms of engagement of the postwar 'social question' which hinged on the negotiation between the competing logic of market and social solidarity has now been replaced by a new emphasis on social policy in the enabling of greater or heightened economic participation. In order to explore the nature of these policy thrusts towards a social politics of inclusion, the study examines its relationship to the market model, scrutinizing some of its justificatory principles and assumptions, and identifying the political forces and coalitions that underpin the strategies of inclusion. But at the same time we need to situate this social politics within the wider context of the transformation of the idea of welfare from earlier social democratic notions of social protection. Third way politics – or, better, strategies of statecraft – represent a move towards the socialization of the neo liberal market model.

Different manifestations of these 'third ways' are identified in the New Labour social policies of the UK as well as in the populist social contracts in Thailand, the welfare programmes in Korea or the social agenda of Lula in Brazil or Kirchner in Argentina. All these statecraft projects seek to reconcile a commitment to market reform with the politics of inclusion.

But the most important outcome of this new socialized neo liberalism is that it delineates new institutional arenas within the state for deliberation and engagement over social policy. Importantly, this argument suggests that the politics of inclusion cannot simply be reduced to the neo liberal model. In fact, as we see in our case studies of Thailand and Korea, it has its own internal political logic that brings it into conflict with various aspects of neo liberalism. But the thread that runs through these variegated third way projects is a reconstruction of citizenship as a 'market citizenship' which, in contrast to the social citizenship of the postwar welfare state, seeks to enable participation and inclusion within the economic order.

In this context a key proposition advanced in this volume is that this emerging form of welfare governance reflects a new constitutional order described as an 'economic constitutionalism' which, unlike social constitutionalism, privileges the pursuit of economic and market order, and fosters a notion of welfare as market citizenship. This form of 'economic

constitutionalism' is not confined merely to formal legal practices, but also pertains to the broader set of state–society relations as well as to the guiding normative principles of the political order. In other words, it reconstitutes the state and what sparked my interest in this research project was the recognition that social policy – far from evaporating within this reconstituted state – continued to play a crucial role. But herein lies the challenge. Whilst social policy continues to play a role within economic constitutionalism, a fundamental transformation is occurring in the nature of the social question, that is, the analysis, understanding and response to the social inequalities created by capitalist market in these various forms of 'economic constitutionalism'.

Economic constitutionalism frames the social question in a manner that incorporates the 'social' within the 'economic' realm in the form of a 'market citizenship'. For example, this is illustrated in the development of various 'asset-based' forms of social policy that are seen as strengthening the entrepreneurial endowments and capabilities of citizens for participation within the economic order. Asset-based policies of this kind exemplify a normative framing of welfare, thereby entailing the creation of a very different mode of social association geared towards inclusion and participation within the sphere of the market. At the same time these strategies of inclusion, characteristic of economic constitutionalism, are not mere functional responses to changed economic circumstances; they are also distinctly political projects of statecraft that reshapes the relationship between political community and the state. In this context that social policy becomes a vital instrument of this statecraft of inclusion, and facilitates a social contract that articulates a new relationship between citizen and the state by transforming the means and purposes of public action.

The social policies examined in this book are not aiming to push back the state, but rather the achievement of some measure of internal transformation within the state. Paradoxically, these policies devote as much attention to the economic regulation of markets as they do to social policy concerns. Therefore, insofar as social governance constitutes an essential element of the new regulatory state, neo liberalism reshapes the institutional architecture of the state. Though neo liberalism is often identified in terms of the retreat and withdrawal of the state from the allocation of social and material goods, I propose that its more profound impact lies in the way it entrenches new forms of social and economic regulation of the market.

Finally, a guiding motif in this book is the way in which political liberalism itself is being transformed by the politics of social inclusion. As

we argue, a significant consequence of this new social policy rationale is that social institutions and their governance are depoliticized in a way that limits the conflict and negotiation of social interests that formed such a crucial element of social constitutionalism in the earlier era. This earlier model of social constitutionalism was sustained by the politics of negotiation and conflict of social interests that in turn hinged on the dualism between the market and the social sphere. Welfare was at the heart of this often conflictual and contradictory logic of the market and social solidarity. But this politics of social conflict or, more broadly, a politics of interest, is absent in the new economic constitutionalism that has come to dominate both the industrialized and newly industrializing countries.

And this is clearly evident in the fact that by reshaping welfare along the lines of policies of social inclusion, the new welfare governance situates liberal subjects in terms of their capacity for inclusion within the economic mainstream not in terms of the political standing of citizens. Inclusion suggests a very different structure of social claim making because claim making within the new strategies of inclusion is based on the possession and management of those endowments or capacities needed to participate and compete within the productive sphere of the economy. All this serves to reinforce an anti pluralist strand of liberalism that is at the core of economic constitutionalism.

The book is structured as follows. As a preamble to the substantive issues surrounding the new set of social contracts evident in the contemporary phase of neo liberalism, the opening chapter examines the relationship between the new welfare governance and the market. These new ideas of welfare and markets are explored through an analysis of two strands of liberalism: the *ordo* liberal movement and the early twentieth-century New Liberalism. Both forms of liberalism have one distinctive feature in common with contemporary forms of welfare governance in that they both seek to create liberal subjects who are embedded in the productive sphere of the economy. Equally, both strands of liberalism understand property rights as an inherently social and juridical process, rather than a spontaneous creation of market forces. The market is socialized, but in a manner different from the social democratic logic of social constitutionalism.

In Chapter 2 the study moves on to explore the distinctive normative foundations of the politics of social inclusion. If there is one key word that captures this new socialization of the market in various third way programmes it is 'capability'. Capability, it is argued, becomes a key term within the various forms of social democratic third way programmes

because it enables the reconciliation of a liberal conception of individual autonomy with a social commitment to equality. However, the notion of capability as used in the new social democratic literature is presented largely as a descriptive rather than as an analytical category. I use the work of Amartya Sen to explore a more analytical and normative notion of capability that is especially interesting because of its many similarities with some of the philosophical thrust of the New Liberals. Based on Sen's capability paradigm, the study explores how third way programmes reframe equality from a notion of a 'simple equality' to that of 'complex equality' where equality can be mapped through multiple dimensions of capability. In turn, this reframing signifies a normative shift from a resource-oriented perspective, characteristic of old social democracy, to a notion of equality as the enhancement of the capabilities of individuals to pursue diverse ends.

Equally important is the fact that there has been a dramatic change in the delivery and governance of social policy, as well as in changes in the policy and practice of the welfare state in advanced industrial societies. But it is at the level of governance that these changes are most pronounced, and these governance arrangements are subject to critical scrutiny in Chapter 3. At the heart of these governance changes is the organization of social policy around modes of contractual governance. Welfare now becomes an organized set of contractual relationships, and the notion of contractualism itself signifies a restructuring of the relationship between state and citizen, as well as a reshaping of the basis of membership of the political community. From a social policy perspective this amounts to not only a change in delivery mechanisms of benefits or entitlements, but also directs our attention to a more fundamental reshaping of the state and society in the direction of conditional citizenship that ties citizenship to market participation. While this contractual governance subjects citizens to often stringent procedural controls these procedures and the broader governance arrangements are placed outside the framework of democratic control and judicial review. But is neo liberalism contractualism the only alternative? I suggest an alternative of democratic contractualism based on Habermas's work on law and democracy.

Contractualism, an equally significant dimension of the new global social policy, is explored in Chapter 4, which examines the governance of transnational social policy, especially in the emphasis that has come to be placed on the social agenda of poverty reduction. This rediscovery of poverty by the global community differs from the earlier 'Washington Consensus' approach in that it identifies poverty reduction as a primary

objective of global public policy. But what is important in these new policy strategies is the contractual framework through which the social agenda is implemented. Contractual governance of global social standards has become a strategy of regulatory governance that seeks to influence the conduct of agents at various levels of governance. The new social standards are premised on meeting certain obligations so that, even at the transnational level, claims associated with welfarism are contingent on the prior and continuing performance of certain obligations and not simply based on the membership of the political community.

But this mode of contractual governance seeks to ensure not only that stakeholders be consulted, but also that their deliberations and participation are seen as vital in establishing the legitimacy of programmes and policies. All forms of contractualism – be it the transnational social policy or New Labour’s social programmes in the UK – attempt to enrol clients in deliberative policy making. Indeed, much of welfare contractualism is about setting out the procedures for this participation rather than mandating specific policy outcomes. But the point is this: new forms of participation are ‘problem oriented’ and located in institutional arenas outside the formal representative structures of political society.

Transnational social policy is one form of ‘third way’ politics, but equally significant third way trajectories can be discerned in statecraft projects under way in newly industrializing countries because these states confront social issues raised by economic restructuring. Illustrative of this trend is the emergence of the statecraft of the social market in South Korea, the subject of Chapter 5. South Korea, hit hard by the Asian economic crisis of 1997–98, has responded by placing an increased emphasis on social policies and expenditure. It is argued in this chapter that these policies were formulated in the context of a regulatory state that not only established procedures and institutions of economic governance, but also sought to establish forms of social regulation, best understood in terms of the development of an innovative social market model.

The essence of this social market model was the push to establish market imperatives at the heart of social policy. In this way, it sought to establish a form of welfare governance that was different from a notion of welfare as the amelioration of market forces through various redistributive mechanisms characteristic of the postwar European welfare state. At the same time this emerging social market model also differs from the various forms of East Asian productivism that made social policy an ancillary to the operation of economic forces. I argue that the

Korean social market model then, represents a distinctive 'third way' attempt to socialize the market in the context of transition from the developmental to the regulatory state.

Chapter 6 is devoted to an analysis of the dynamics of yet another 'third way' alternative in newly industrializing countries – namely the neo liberal populism manifest in Thailand. This chapter demonstrates how the new welfare governance has come to be reflected in the distinctive populist politics evident with the election of the Thaksin Shinawatra government which has radically transformed the political system in Thailand. There is little doubt that Thaksin fits the populist bill on several counts: he relies on personal leadership, his political message constantly invokes the idea of the Thai people, explicitly appeals to a notion of – albeit soft – Thai nationalism, relies on a broad cross class constituency, and on keeping his coalition together through the introduction of a range of new social contracts. This particular market model of Thaksin denotes a specific form of neo liberal populism similar to that found in Latin American countries. Neo liberal populism, however, is not simply limited to redefining social policy within a broader economic frame. It also illustrates a much more broad-based effort to reshape the internal architecture of the state as well as using welfare to rearticulate the fundamental relationships of state and society. Neo liberal populism is a form of statecraft.

The concluding chapter takes up the key questions of the relationship between the new politics of inclusion and changing forms of statecraft by examining how the new welfare governance fundamentally alters the nature and purpose of public authority or stateness. The broader point is that the idea of state transformation enables a more meaningful and theoretically defensible way of understanding the political dynamics of social policies in a neo liberal context. In particular, the collapse of the social democratic model and the developmental state has altered the context of welfare governance in both advanced industrial and newly industrializing countries. To this end, we examine social inclusion as a particular model of social association defined in terms of access to market participation. This model differs from those models of social association framed in terms of material relations of conflict based on the centrality of class and its struggles for recognition and representation. In contrast to this social democratic grammar of politics the new politics of inclusion exemplifies the 'new social question' of neo liberalism.

'... to develop a middle way of economic life which will preserve the liberty, the initiative and (what we are so rich in) the idiosyncrasy of the individual in a framework serving the public good and seeking equality of contentment amongst all ...'

John Maynard Keynes

Index

- active agency 63–72
- adequacy of options 73
- agency freedom 44–5, 49
- anti-politics 63–72, 152
- Asian economic crisis 82, 103–7, 162
- asset conversion 29, 140–1, 152
- Australia
 - Reference Group on Welfare Reform 70
 - social coalition 69–70
 - welfare reform 58–9, 63–4
- authoritarian statism 142–5
- autonomy 57, 59
 - individual 74–7, 78–80
 - loss of 71–2
 - procedural 74
 - public 78
- Bank of Korea 110–12
- Brazil
 - Party of Brazilian Social Democracy 11
 - Workers Party 11–12
- Bretton, Woods 109
- Brown, Gordon 58
- capability 34–55, 36, 41–5, 53–4
 - and systemic coercion 74–7
 - see also* Sen, Amartya
- capability equality 42
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique 11–12
- chain of contract 86, 87–93
- Chavez, Hugo 9
- citizenship 15
 - market 10, 15–19, 24–5, 28, 62, 83
 - private 97
 - social 13, 19–20
- civic association 98, 160
- civil society 69–71
 - re-traditionalizing of 70
- clients 96
- coercion 72–4
 - systemic 74–7
- commodities 48–9
- communities of interest 153
- community 20, 62, 160
- competitive corporatism 117
- complex equality 36, 45–50
- Comprehensive Development Framework 87, 92
- conditions of choice 76
- conforming conduct 22, 23, 82
- contextualization 77
- contractual governance 85
- contractualism 59, 60–3, 93–100
 - democratic 72–4
 - democratic foundation 77–80
 - neo-liberal 63–72
 - and state transformation 100–2
 - and transnational welfare governance 81–6
 - welfare 56–9, 68, 69, 71–2
- culturalist nationalism 135–6
- Da Silva, Lula 9, 11, 12
- deformalization of law 71–2
- democratic contractualism 72–4
- democratic proceduralism 79
- depoliticization 69–71
- Development Assistance Cooperation 12
- developmental state 109
- developmentalism 28
- difference 45–8
- distributive policies 131
- diswelfare 147
- economic capability 39
- economic constitutionalism 10, 15–19, 20–2, 30–3, 83, 151
- economic dependency 65–9
- effective freedom 51, 52
- embedded autonomy 108
- empowerment 100–2
- enabling state 139, 147
- enterprise associations 23, 98

- enterprise welfare 118
equality 42, 45–8, 53–5
 complex 36, 45–50
 plurality of spaces 43
 simple 43
European Union, Economic
 Partnership Agreements 91
- factionalism 131
Fox, Vincente 129
freedom 34–55, 44–5, 50–3
 effective 51, 52
 negative 45, 51
 positive 45, 51
 republican 52
Friendly Societies 70
Fujimori, Alberto 129
functionings 43–4
- General Agreement on Trade and
 Services 92–3
Giddens, Anthony 34–5
globalization 40
governance project 132
governed markets 108
grammar of politics 154–8
- Habermas, Jürgen 78–9
Howard, John 69–70
Huyn, Roh Moo 105
hybrid public organizations 100
- idea of welfare 153
identity politics 136
illiberalism 60–3
inclusion 20, 30–3, 53–5, 117,
 146–68
 and social democratic politics
 165–8
individual autonomy 74–7, 78–80
individualized service delivery 59
 see also contractualism
industrial era 66
international financial institutions
 9, 83
International Monetary Fund 89–90
- Jung, Kim Dae 104, 106, 112,
 124–5, 149
- Keynesianism 159
Kirchner, Nestor 9
Korea 103–25
 Bank of Korea 110–12
 chaebols 104–5
 creation of new regulatory
 state 107–10
 Employment Insurance Scheme 119
 Financial Supervisory Commission
 111
 Minimum Living Standards
 Guarantee Law 120
 Ministry of Health and Welfare
 117
 productive welfare 106
 regulation of economic order
 110–12
 social inclusion and tripartite
 dialogue 112–18
 social policies and social market
 economy 118–24
 social welfare programmes 104
 social market, regulation and
 statecraft 124–5
Korean Confederation of Trade
 Unions 114
Korean Tripartite Commission
 113–15, 123
- labour market reform 66–7
law
 deformalization of 71–2
 democratic foundation 77–80
learning society 29
Leekpai, Chuan 135
legitimacy function 25
liberal socialism 51
liberalism, thinness of 62
- manufactured risk 41
market citizenship 2, 3, 10, 15–19,
 24–7, 28, 62, 83
markets, linking to welfare 19–21
Menem, Carlos 129
meta regulation 84, 89
Millennium Account 87
Millennium Challenge Account 90
mobilization of bias 85,
 151, 152

- moral sociology 35, 65
 Muller-Armack, Alfred 23–4

 negative welfare 64
 neo-liberal contractualism 63–72
 neo-liberal populism 127, 128–33
 neo-liberal sociability 161–4
 neo-liberalism
 socialization of 13
 New Liberalism 20, 21, 26–30
 new pluralism 146–7
 new social democracy 34
 newly industrializing countries
 157–8
 notion of precaution 18

 One Tambon project 140
 ordo liberalism 20, 21–6
 ownership 92

 participation 93–100
 paternalism 65–9
 People's Bank of Thailand 139
 pluralism
 of circumstances 45–8
 of ends 48–50
 of spaces 43
 politics
 of distribution and identity 54
 grammar of 154–8
 identity 136
 pro-poor 146
 populism 126, 127, 128–33
 populist governance 133–8
 positive risk management 41
 positive welfare 64
 Post-Washington Consensus 81,
 90, 163
 poverty 83
 poverty reduction 81
 Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
 12, 85, 87–93
 principles underlying 88
 pre-poor growth 81
 primary goods 46
 private citizenship 97
 privatization 96–7, 137
 pro-poor politics 146
 pro-poor strategies 25, 89

 see also transnational welfare
 governance
 problem solvers 94
 procedural autonomy 74
 proceduralism 112
 process conditionality 89–90
 productive welfare 106, 118,
 121, 122
 productivist welfare 125
 property ownership 26–30
 prudentialism 18
 public autonomy 78

 reflexive modernization 35
 reflexive regulation 93–100
 regulatory state 109–10
 republicanism 50–3
 responsibility 160
 responsible agency 58, 69, 75
 rollback neo-liberalism 130
 Rubin, Robert 133

 Schmitt, Carl 78
 Sen, Amartya 36, 42–5
 see also capability
 Shinawatra, Thaksin 11, 12, 126
 simple equality 43
 Singapore Central Provident Fund
 28
 social association 158–61
 social capability 39
 social capital 14, 20, 161–4
 social citizenship 13, 19–20
 social coalition 70
 social conduct 25
 regulation of 65
 social constitutionalism 10, 156
 social contracts 138–42
 social democracy 37–41, 105, 154–8
 and inclusion 165–8
 social dialogue 115–16
 social exclusion 14
 social inclusion 13, 84, 112–18
 social integrationist model 14
 Social Investment Fund 91, 133
 social investment state 37, 38
 social market 124–5
 economy 23, 118–24
 model 104

- social policy 10, 82–3
- social question 154–61
- social requisites 26
- social rights 97
- social safety 82
- stakeholders 86, 94
- state transformation 100–2
- statecraft 32, 124–5, 138–42, 146–54
- statehood 108–9
- stateness 16, 108–9
- Stiglitz, Joseph 82
- systemic coercion 74–7

- technology of public action 110
- Thailand 126–45
 - asset conversion programmes 29
 - authoritarian statism 142–5
 - Constitutional Court 135
 - Election Commission 135
 - Electricity Generating Authority 137
 - National Counter Corruption Commission 135
 - neo-liberal populism 127, 128–33
 - populist governance 133–8
 - privatization 137
 - social contracts 126–8
 - statecraft and social contracts 138–42
 - asset conversion programmes 140–1
 - health scheme 141–2
 - One Tambon project 140
 - People's Bank 139–40
 - Village Fund 139
 - Thai Rak Thai 126, 132
- Thailand Social Investment Fund 95
- Thatcherism 157
- third way 11, 17, 34–55, 154
- Toledo, Alejandro 129
- transnational welfare governance 81–102
 - and contractualism 81–6
- tripartite dialogue 112–18

- UK
 - Field Report on welfare reform 63
 - New Labour 11, 16, 29, 58, 147, 149
 - New Liberalism 20, 21, 26–30
 - unemployment 82
 - Uribe, Alvaro 129
 - US, Millennium Challenge Account 90
 - utility 47

- Village Fund 139

- Washington Consensus 9, 81, 132, 146
- welfare 15–19, 30–3, 146–54
 - dependency 66–9
 - enterprise 118
 - idea of 153
 - linking to markets 19–21
 - negative 64
 - positive 64
 - productive 106, 118, 121, 122
 - productivist 125
 - worlds of 165
- welfare contractualism 56–9, 68, 69
 - case management 72
 - and marginalization of rights 71–2
 - see also* neo-liberal contractualism
- welfare governance 9–15, 45–50
 - chain of contract 86, 87–93
 - and state transformation 100–2
 - transnational 81–102
 - and welfare contractualism 56–9
- welfare reform
 - Australia 58–9, 63–4
 - UK 63
- well-being 47
- Weyland, Kurt Gerhard 129–30
- Wisconsin workfare experiment 58, 59
- workfare 58, 59, 60, 67, 97
- World Bank 113, 162
 - Development Report (2001) 29
 - Miracle Report* 163–4
 - Poverty Reduction Program 15
 - Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 12, 85, 87–93
 - Social Investment Fund 91, 133
- World Social Forum 9
- worlds of welfare 165