

Transformation of Welfare State, New Solidarity and Families in Davos Period

A Critical Approach to Conceptual Positioning of Family Policy During Recent Transformation of Developing Welfare Regimes

• Emre Tefvik ÇAMPINARI*

Abstract

Welfare state which historically corresponds to an original structure belonging to the period after the Second World War has been in transition in developing countries and in “Mediterranean welfare regime” countries. In this study, it is claimed that social policy has two functions, when the welfare state approach developed during Keynesian consensus is considered. First of these functions is the economical function related to the “fictitious commodities” approach of Polanyi, second one on the other hand is the social function which is defined by considering the citizenship definition of Marshall and the fact that welfare state is a nation building project belonging to post-war period.

The final period in world economic order symbolized by “Davos dilemma” has left the assumptions of the post-war welfare state – especially patriarchal family – invalid, economically constraining welfare states, and creating a pressure towards a new definition of social solidarity. In the mentioned countries, family policy is accepted as a “familialism” concept like in corporatist welfare states and a “quasi policy” is formed which is defined through indefinite values. This approach is in contradiction with economical requirements of the Davos period and it is also in contradiction with its own aims creating a dichotomy of “decline of family values” and “expansion of individual rights” in favor of the second. The reason behind the fact that not even a life style based on forming a nuclear family with two parents is demanded by young people is explained with “over-commoditized daily life” and “operation of market in favor of single consumer.” It is also declared that a “moral regulation” aiming to regulate individual family lives instead of the welfare regime is bound to fail.

Key words: social policy, family policy, globalization, welfare state, welfare regime

Özet

Refah Devletinin Dönüşümü, Yeni Dayanışma ve Davos Döneminde Aileler

Tarihsel açıdan II. Dünya Savaşı sonrası döneme ait özgün bir yapıya karşılık gelen refah devleti, gelişmekte olan ülkelerde ve “Akdeniz refah rejimi” ülkelerinde hızlı bir değişim içindedir. Bu çalışmada, Keynezyen uzlaşma döneminde gelişmiş refah devleti anlayışı dikkate alındığında sosyal politikanın iki işlevi olduğu öne sürülmektedir. Bu işlevlerden birincisi Polanyi'nin “sanal metalar” yaklaşımı ile ilişkilendirilen iktisadi işlevi, ikincisi ise Marshall'ın vatandaşlık tanımı ve refah devletinin savaş sonrası döneme ait bir ulus inşası projesi olduğu gerçeği de göz önüne alınarak tanımlanan sosyal işlevidir.

Dünya iktisadi düzeninde “Davos ikilemi” ile sembolize edilen son dönem başta ataerkil aile olmak üzere savaş sonrası refah devletinin dayandığı varsayımları geçersiz kılmakta, iktisadi olarak refah devletlerini kısıtlamakta, değişim içerisinde olan refah rejimlerini yeni bir sosyal dayanışma tanımına itmektir. Bu refah rejimlerinde aile politikası, korporatist refah devletlerindeki gibi, “aileselcilik” kavramı olarak kabul görmekte ve belirsiz değerler üzerinden tanımlanan bir tür “politika benzeri” (“quasi policy”) oluşturulmaktadır. Bu yaklaşım hem Davos döneminin iktisadi gereklilikleri ile uyumsuzluk ortaya koymakta hem de liberal bir ekonomik düzende “ailevi değerlerin zayıflaması” ve “bireysel özgürlüklerde aşırı yükseliş” dikotomisini ikincisi lehine yaratarak kendi amaçları ile çelişmektedir. İki ebeveynli çekirdek aile oluşturulmasına dayalı bir hayatın dahi yeni kuşak tarafından rağbet görmemesi ise “gündelik hayatın aşırı metalaşması” ve “piyasanın tek tüketici lehine işlemesi” ile ifade edilmekte ve refah rejimi yerine bireysel aile hayatlarını düzenlemeyi amaçlayan bir “moral regülasyon” başarısızlığa mahkûm olduğu belirtilmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: sosyal politika, aile politikası, küreselleşme, refah devleti, refah rejimi

* T.C. Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Uzman Yardımcısı

"When Bismarck promoted his first social-insurance schemes, he had to battle on two fronts: on one side against the liberals, who preferred market solutions, and on the other side against conservatives who sponsored the guilt-model of familiarism."

Gøsta Esping-Andersen

(The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism, 1990, Polity Press, p.59)

While the birth of social policy is accepted as the 1880s with the start of obligatory pension scheme for workers in Bismarck Germany, the conception of comparative social policy dates back to 1960s. In recent years, rapid transitions in welfare regimes of developing countries and "Mediterranean welfare regime" countries have been subject to discussion as well as changes in their economic, political and social structures due to the concurrent rapid transformation and integration in global market. Before analyzing this fact and its relationship with family policy, defining main concepts seems essential. The content of the main concepts will determine the scope of discussion based on the position of family in welfare regime and the impact of family policy within social policy.

First of all, it should be emphasized that welfare state and welfare regime are entirely different concepts. There are three different units which provide welfare in a society: family, market and the state. Welfare regime refers to how welfare is distributed among these three units. Welfare state on the other hand, refers to an authentic structure in the history and it defines an approach brought up after the Second World War.

In welfare state studies, the definition of citizenship and rights by T.H. Marshall is a milestone. Marshall (1950) distinguishes between civil, political and social aspects of citizenship in his

definition made during the beginning of the golden age of the welfare state. The civil element consists of rights that are necessary for individual freedom. While Marshall means participation in the administration with the political element, the social element refers to a broader list of rights. Marshall's definition is the result of history rather than logic. (Marshall, 1950) Marshall's definition is also crucial considering the method in classification of rights. Therefore, regarding the civil rights, it is often referred to as the "generation of rights." As a matter of fact, as the society progresses, "layers of civil rights" appear throughout the history. Social policy was a phenomenon that appeared at a stage of history where class struggles were on the rise and economic re-organization of society was requiring new rights for new social classes.

According to one of its aspects, social policy refers to a series of policies based on the intervention of the state in the social problems which arise from class struggles. According to Hegel, every state takes cautions to protect and perpetuate its existence. This is a right as well as a necessity. With this aspect, social policy is a multidisciplinary subject which provides facilities to proceed with satisfying the social needs of the individuals that form a society. (Őenkal, 2005; 25-26) The concept of "social policy" is put forth first by Wilhelm Riehl in the midst of the 19th century. The theoretical framework of social policy was first raised by the German social scientist Otto von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst in his work "Sozialpolitik" which was written in 1911. From the point of a different definition, social policy is a field of study which entails the economic, political, socio-legal and sociological examination of the ways in which central and local governmental policies affect the lives of individuals and communities (Collins Dictionary of Sociology, 2000; 576). Some theorists emphasize the rapprochement-oriented point of social policy and claim that the state should

legitimate the liberal economic system while providing the capital accumulation. Other radical analyses brought forward in the second half of the twentieth century evaluate the social policy as a control mechanism regarding not only the class struggles but also ethnical, sexual and other social conflicts. According to Koray (2005) there has been an expansion in the scope of social policy, and social policy – with its broader meaning – is a policy that targets different segments of society and different social problems, aiming to provide social citizenship, social equity and social justice. (Koray, 2005; 28)

However, social policy does not require a welfare state and these two concepts are also different. Esping-Andersen (1996) draws attention to the post-war discussions of welfare state and emphasizes that welfare state was more than developing the concurrent social policies. From an economical aspect, the fact that income and employment security was a civic right, it was a deliberate action to recede from orthodoxy of pure market. From an ethical aspect, welfare state promised a universal and classless justice and human solidarity; it was a sign of hope for those who were called to make a sacrifice for common property during the war efforts. Welfare state was an affirmation of the liberal democracy against dual threat of Bolshevism and fascism (Esping-Andersen, 1996). As it is stated in the Esping-Andersen's analysis, welfare state is definitely a "nation building political project."

Post-war welfare state was a historical, authentic structure for building and strengthening liberal welfare state. It contributed to the development of liberal welfare state in two ways. First one was to maintain a high level of solidarity throughout the whole society and create a "supraclass equity" reminiscent of Marshall's description of citizenship development. Second one was to technically correct the market deficiencies.

There are three main theories that interpret the market deficiencies. These are: "imperfect competition", "market failure" and "information failure". (Esping-Andersen, 1996)

When welfare state approach developed during Keynesian consensus age is considered, it can be concluded that social policy has two functions. First of these functions is the economical function. This function can be explained by the "fictitious commodities" approach of Polanyi. According to Polanyi, land, labor and money are fictitious commodities, because these three elements are not originally produced by and for the market and their supplies are not controlled by market forces. To be available for the capital, their supplies according to time and quality should be regulated and organized. Second function of social policy on the other hand is the social function which is defined by considering the citizenship definition of Marshall and the fact that welfare state is a nation building project belonging to post-war period.

Welfare regimes and welfare states have been subject to classifications since the inception of comparative social policy in the 1960s according to different criteria. When we consider the comparative welfare studies and welfare state classifications, Leibfried comes up with a new welfare state classification with a broad perspective: four welfare state types based on the European Union member states. First one is the "Scandinavian" welfare state which is also described as "labor-oriented society" model. Employment right and social citizenship is institutionalized in the Scandinavian type of welfare state. The "Bismarck model" is also known as "institutionalized welfare model." This model focuses on restitution of leaves from labor market. On the other hand, the "Anglo-Saxon" model is a "residualist" model." The state encourages and supports individuals for entrance to labor markets. However, education and improvement in individual skills are responsibilities of individuals rather than

the state. Finally, the “Latin rim” welfare states are denoted with the term “rudimental welfare state” and they are considered as institutionally less developed welfare states surviving with promises. (Leibfried, 1999; 139-143)

“The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism” of Gøsta Esping-Andersen has an older date compared to Leibfried classification. Nevertheless, one of the most universally acclaimed classifications is the one that Gøsta Esping-Andersen (1990) came up with in this work. The three welfare states disclosed in this work are; “liberal,” “conservative” (“corporatist”) and “social democratic” welfare states. In “liberal” welfare state, the principal is to strengthen the market and the entrance to the market by providing a minimum income or contributing to special welfare programs. US, Canada and Australia are indicated as typical liberal welfare states. On the other hand, “conservative” welfare states are encountered in the countries which have historically corporatist structures where class differences and occupational decompositions are major determinants of the welfare applications. Social rights are mostly connected to status. In this model, traditional family structure is promoted, thus child care services and family-oriented social work are limited. Today, the welfare states of Germany, France, Austria and Italy are categorically conservative welfare states. And finally, “social democratic” welfare state is the one in which social rights are institutionalized and widespread, social needs are mostly obtained from out of the market. (Esping-Andersen, 1990; 26-33)

Esping-Andersen’s tripartite typology is strongly criticized by some writers because of the fact that the weight of state applications is exaggerated. Based on this criticism, another type of welfare regime is brought up as “Mediterranean welfare” which has important characteristics based on women activity on welfare distribution and in which women’s unpaid work is a crucial determinant.

Moreno (2001) says that often the term ‘familialist’ has been used with a cliché pejorative connotation. According to this term, the family has been viewed as a pre-modern patriarchal institution where men exercised a discretionary power over family members. Moreno criticizes this approach and argues that this approach is too simplistic to explain the Mediterranean welfare model and it hinders to understand the role of family in the advanced industrial society. (Moreno, 2001)

Reflecting his welfare state tripartite typology, Esping-Andersen argues for a parallel family policy typology (Kammerman, 2003):

- The Nordic family policy regime (located in the social democratic welfare state regime), unique in its emphasis on a strong governmental role, stresses gender equity, child well-being, high rates of female employment and the reconciliation of work and family life, and minimizes the roles of the market, and to a lesser extent, the family.

- The Continental European family policy regime (located in the conservative welfare state regime) stresses the role of the traditional family, minimizes female labor force participation and provides less direct investment in children.

- The Anglo-American (“liberal”) family policy regime, stresses market solutions and responses to high rates of female employment, work/family tensions and other child/women/family issues.

“Family policy” is defined by Baker (2003) in “International Encyclopedia of Family & Marriage” as follows: “All social and economic policies affect families, but the term “family policy” usually refers to social programs, laws, and public directives designed to promote and enhance marriage, reproduction, and raising children. Family policy also ensures child protection and child and spousal support and attempts to resolve conflicts between work and family. The state usually initiates such policies, but employers or voluntary organizations

may also establish them. Legislatures and governments that create laws and policy, as well as the agencies mandated and financed to enforce them, such as child welfare agencies, will be referred to as the state. This entry focuses on policies and social programs initiated by governments. It investigates how academics have studied these policies and how they have explained variations among nations.” However, this definition is based on how the concept of family policy is conceded rather than being accepted as a component of social policy and treats family irrelevant of its role in welfare regime. Family policy is a result of social rights and a component of social policy, and it has required new functions and conceptual broadenings during the recent transformation of welfare states. First of all, the attributes of the transformation of welfare state and the global environment forcing welfare states to transform should be made clear.

Two decades ago, “the convergence theory” was a dominant approach in comparative welfare studies. It projected a convergence in the structures of welfare states as a result of economical development and socio-economical convergence of countries that have also converging economies which were mixed economies as a result of industrialization. Kleinman (2002) argues that the convergence approach regarding welfare states has appeared again, however this time with a different meaning. Anyhow, the underlying reason behind the convergence of welfare states is globalization and global economic pressures. (Kleinman, 2002) This convergence is the result of the fact that there is no alternative for nation states to adapt to global economy; it is not the old approach requiring that welfare states and civil rights are inevitable.

In recent years, the late-industrialized and developing countries have been subject to a rapid economic and social transition. The social policies

and welfare regimes of these countries also indicate a rapid transition. The new phase of world market and economic order creates a pressure for an adaptation in economic, political and social areas by invalidating some paradigms of the last century. For instance, developed countries were the ones which have huge competitive advantage and economies of scale in industrial production. These countries had the power to change the trading rates of agricultural products against developing countries and they also determined the trade rates of industrial goods. Today, these countries are described as post-industrial countries. These post-industrial countries have managerial, organizational and marketing economies of scale. On the other hand, yesterday’s less developed “agricultural production countries” are becoming the industrial workshops of the world based on industrial know-how, FII and other capital transfers. Consequently, yesterday’s “infant industries thesis” is questionable today in a world where geographical distinction determines the economic relations less and where industrial countries’ oligopolistic market power leaves its place to a new post-industrial economic hegemony.

At the 2007 World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland the important point was the paradoxical nature of world politics and economics described as “Davos dilemma.” Financial Times columnist Martin Wolf (2007) draws attention to this fact with these words: “This year’s ‘Davos dilemma’ - the contrast between the world’s favorable economics and troublesome politics - is clear enough. But its resolution is not. A range of possible outcomes, from the perverse and catastrophic to the uncomfortable and even benign, is conceivable. The outcome is not inevitable.” The concept “Davos dilemma” refers to this fact: for decades, it’s been conventional wisdom that political instability was a threat on the global economy which could create an inconsistency -and this was the Thomas

Friedman thesis. There needed to be stability in order to have a steady economic growth; the Davos dilemma is that it's no longer true.

Roughly defined as the contrast between today's benign global economics and malign global politics, Davos dilemma is treated as a problematic state of current world economic and political order which could be subject to many outcomes or solutions. However, Davos dilemma is a spectacle of the global restructuring of economic structures that is not integrated with the global market and structural harmonization of post-industrial world and developing economies according to the 21st century roles. Davos dilemma denotes a broader meaning in terms of globalization and social context; it is an expression defining the current phase in the political history and a new age in economic life of world's developing countries and states. Thomas Friedman speaks about profound "democratizations" of technology, finance and information while introducing the characteristics of globalization in his work "Lexus and the Olive Tree" which is perceived as the "Llibre Vermell" of globalization. Friedman brings forward "Golden Arches Theory of Conflict Prevention" requiring that countries that have made strong economic ties with one another have too much to lose to ever go to war with one another. (Friedman, 1999) According to the global conditions and the political environment subject to discussion, Davos dilemma is the specific expression of the clash of nation states inherited from cold war period and global hegemonic structures of the current economic stage; whereas "Lexus and the Olive Tree" is a caricatured symbol of the general clash of "nation state" and "neo-liberal pressure for elasticity and re-structuring."

In this stage, the clash of nation state and global capital leaves all post-war political & economical organizations under impression. This clash also constrains the meaning and scope of concepts, and approaches developed simultaneously with the

development of nation states. This pressure creates concrete, visible and technical results as well as conceptual and ideological changes. For instance, expanding the aggregate demand and providing social development by public expenditures and budget deficits was the strategy of Keynesian consensus age. However this mentioned application is very difficult today as the budget deficits are chastened by rapid capital outflows and threatened by serious economic crisis triggered by capital withdrawals from the financial systems of these industrializing countries. On the other hand, global decision making units related to international capital are making efforts to restructure the nation-state structures which resist integration with global market and international division of labor throughout the world. The image of this restructuring is a new war environment for the countries which insist on cold war roles, and it is a political instability for the countries which have primitive, irregular financial and economic structures based on corruption and nepotism. The word "Davos," as the title of this text, refers to this new economic hegemony and global restructuring.

During this rapid transition throughout the world, the most changing political structure that is also most subject to discussion is "welfare state", and consequently the concept which is subject to re-definition is "social solidarity". When these expressions are considered, it can be concluded that Davos dilemma refers to a period of transformation when political decision making units become economic decision units. This brings weakening of the state in welfare regime leaving its old responsibilities to market and family. In this point, these questions become crucial: Is the global restructuring stage eliminating the social solidarity or exerting a pressure to re-define the social solidarity and to create new solidarity forms? Are the welfare states in transition following the same path with the post-industrialist welfare states or are

they creating new welfare regime typologies and conditions? Esping-Andersen (1996) answers the second question negatively. He argues that developing countries are creating hard liberal adaptation strategies and the welfare regimes are a mixed version of the European welfare regimes. However, developing countries can take advantage of low labor wages and they should create more value added occupations and because of this fact, some developing countries are heeding education and development of human capital.

In Davos period, a significant pressure towards a rapid fundamental transformation takes place throughout the economical, political and social order of the whole world; there is also a strong pressure on the units that form the welfare regimes towards a rapid transformation. This foregoing fact is mostly valid for the welfare states of developing countries and the European welfare states which are characterized as Latin rim in Leibfried (1999) classification. Furthermore, this pressure is providing a crucial attribute and determinant of the current state in developing countries' welfare states which have not completed their internal evolution. There is a historical developmental gap between the welfare states of these developing countries and the Western European and Scandinavian welfare states. There are noteworthy technical problems and confusions in the social policies of these welfare states which we could call "welfare states in transition," besides the problems of the societies in transition. There are conceptual deviations especially in the family policies as a segment of the social policies of these welfare states in transition, and there is indefiniteness about the ultimate and intermediary targets, policy tools and monitoring criterion of these policies.

Till the midst of the 1990s, the family policies of Anglo-Saxon and corporatist welfare regimes have been subject to increasing criticism. In these countries' social policy institutions that are

responsible from the family policy making, there has been a general tendency to interpret the aim of family policy as protecting traditional family structure and promoting the traditional family values. This tendency is observed most significantly throughout the welfare states in transition and developing countries. In these countries, some rapid changes in social life and family life are being evaluated as the "decline of the family," "threatened traditional family structure" and "erosion in the traditional family values." As the reasons of these changes, "explosion of social rights" and "excess of freedom at the expense of obligations to family as an institution and obligations regarding the family" are brought up. There is even a tendency to comment on the reason of "decline of the family" as social values imported from developed Western European and Northern American societies and the degeneration as a result of social interaction with these societies. However, this approach is creating a dichotomy between "decline of family values" and "expansion of individual rights" in favor of second. In market conditions where individual competition is increased and more individualist life styles are provided to young people, new generation prefers more freedom and less state intervention in individual life.

As a result of this "decline of the family," the solution developed as a public administration reflex, however, is a paradoxical protection of an institution from the individuals. Ironically, this institution is a solidarity form which is formed by individuals; developed by individuals; established through the values, expectations and choices of individuals. This is a "quasi policy" administrative reflex. This pretended family policy can not be taken into account as a real policy in a contemporary liberal state regardless of the developmental stage of welfare state and social policy. Because, for instance, the state could apply a decreasing interest rate strategy or other incentives for investors.

However, punishing the entrepreneurs that do not make production investments in certain geographic regions could not be an economical or developmental policy. Similarly, the state applies quotas and tariffs for imported goods, but it is not an industrial protection policy in today's world to conduct campaigns for consumption of domestically produced goods and services and judge the morality of purchasing imported goods. What makes an administrative practice a "policy" is the assumption that individuals will make their judgment freely and respond to change logically. Furthermore, a "policy" uses a certain number of concrete administrative tools to achieve some final and intermediary goals; it determines some indicators for monitoring and controlling the outputs of this policy; finally it overviews the targets and tools if it is necessary. Introducing any prohibitions and legal liabilities, or mentoring individuals and inculcating right, wrong and undesired behaviors into individuals are not "policies" but "regulations." This approach has been subject to substantial and continuing criticism and the mentioned approach is called "moral regulation." Rodger (1995) states that this distinction between family policy and moral regulation may well represent competing welfare strategies for dealing with family and childcare issues as we approach the 21st century: the former appears to be anchored firmly in an approach to social welfare which emphasizes continuing state intervention to affect the conditions of existence of family life while the latter is concerned pre-eminently with encouraging conventional family relationships based on two parents in order to better facilitate increased family and market provision of social care. (Rodger, 1995)

The reasons and characteristics of the recent social transition perceived as "decline of the family" are also misinterpreted as well as its "quasi policy" cure. Apart from the extended family which is desired and found ideal in some developing

countries, even any inclination for nuclear family structure is at a low level. Definitely, the reason of this precarious circumstance is the concrete economic and social factors. As a fundamental unit of welfare regime, Davos period has two main effects on the families in these countries. These effects could be denoted as "pressure towards structural transition" and "fundamental change of daily life." First of all, increased battle of life, vital competition and absence of social support belonging to Keynesian consensus age have given rise to revoking the traditional nuclear family with "male breadwinner" which was the basic assumption of the post-war welfare state in 1948. In introductory sociology literature, it is a famous expression that the productive identity of family is a bygone fact. Nevertheless, individual industrial relations of production have strong ties with each other and interact continuously. The result of relations of production perceived and experienced by individuals is a high-level individualistic competitive climate. Secondly, a significant effect of market has appeared throughout these societies in transition. The effect on individual life style is the choices formed as a result of a market mechanism "operating in favor of single consumer." That means it is the market itself which encourages and provides individualistic life styles, not the deviation from traditional culture. The result of this fact is nothing but an "over-commoditized daily life." For instance, in the advertisements of some products, it is possible to observe slogans emphasizing individual freedom, being independent, acquiring originality, etc. Marketed commodity is not only the physical products or services but commoditized shadow personalities and original daily lives. In this situation, an individual is becoming a "super homos economicus" reducing some perceived social values to daily preferences, and lives of individuals are becoming similar.

There is another contradiction about this so-called family policy which is described as the

quasi policy. The main motive underlying the criticized moral regulation is the “decline of family.” This approach is valid for urban middle class family. However, socially excluded segment of society which needs an explicit family policy and family support in developing countries are usually lower class families. Gillies (2005) argues that family has been used an ideological tool by politicians for many years and recent policy initiatives are seeking to shape and control the practices of parents. Discourses of support in family policy derive from this notion of obligated freedom, with interventions aimed at enforcing parenting norms and values. Underlying this approach is the conviction that virtuous middle class culture (rather than middle class resources) cultivates self-sufficient, self-sustaining communities. Hence the policy ‘support’ offered to parents is limited, highly conditional and directed towards a wider goal of cultural governance or ‘inclusion.’

On the other hand, the family as well as welfare regime as a whole is facing with a transformation in developing countries. First of all, in these countries the assumption of patriarchal family is changing as in the West European and North American families and new family forms appear. Other changes in demographic structures are also observed. Rapid urbanization and immigration to cities take place. Birth rates are decreasing because of changing industrial patterns; for instance family based agricultural production is decreasing. For rural families, need for having more children to secure the future of elder persons is also not valid today.

Life of urban families and youth also change. When the Mediterranean welfare regime is considered, Moreno (2004) defines a women generation which continues to take responsibilities of unpaid house work and join labor market at the same time. According to Moreno (2004), the older cohort of women, now aged between 40 and 64, who could only undertake demanding professional

activities in the labor market if they were prepared to combine them with traditional unpaid caring work in households, typifies the “superwomen.” Moreno adds that younger generations of women seem more reluctant to take on both family care and full-time paid work, resulting in lower fertility and a need for more social provision. As a result of superwomen, Mediterranean families have historically functioned as an effective (though informal) ‘shock absorber’ across a whole range of policy areas such as social care, unemployment assistance, housing, or social assistance. However, as superwomen began to disappear from the stage, new social risks have appeared most of which crosscut family life (care for children and elderly, young unemployed or young working parents). Moreno (2001) argues that emerging life patterns of an individualistic and self-centered nature imported from a ‘neo-liberal’ conception of social life are a main cause for the gradual disappearance of committed superwomen to both family and profession. For younger generations, love and affection do not mechanically translate into lifetime commitments for marriage and family as used to be the case with the ‘male breadwinner’ model of welfare capitalism. An individualization of lifestyles and a prioritization of professional concerns by women have resulted, among other causes, in a sharp decline in fertility rates and in worrying demographic prospects for Southern European countries. The solution is clear for Moreno (2001): “Among the various reforms for offsetting the impact of the gradual disappearance of superwomen in Mediterranean welfare, a quantum-leap achievement in family reorganization would be the carrying out by men of their equal share of household responsibilities. This would also bring about an objective alliance between working mothers and fathers for a more committed support from state intervention.”

Welfare states in transition should have vital

family policy preliminaries in the changing world order. In social policy literature, “familialism” refers to leaving a significant amount of welfare services to families as a responsibility. Another related concept; “de-familization” is an expression of undertaking the responsibility of welfare services by other institutions and decrease the dependence of individuals to families in terms of welfare. First of all, the required family policy should be women-oriented and target de-familization for women instead of familialism. That means, the state should undertake the responsibilities of women and provide substantial support activities for socially excluded families. Secondly, policy making should accept the changing family roles in favor of women instead of intervention in family roles and promote the traditional patriarchal family. Because, rapid increase in global competition directly affects the composition of labor market of developing countries and this fact brings the commoditization of women labor and changing family structures. And finally, it should target a rapid development in human capital. This means, new social problems and risk should be undertaken like struggle with child labor, support for migrated families etc. Otherwise, decline of family-based lives and disappearance of “superwomen” with wordings of Moreno is unavoidable.

Esping-Andersen argues for the centrality of family policy to any discussion of welfare state regimes. (Kamerman, 2003) In describing his “new” family policy for the “new” welfare states, he stresses:

- The need to accept and respond to new family forms, especially single parent and dual earner families;
- The rising employment rates of women, especially mothers of young children and the centrality of maternal employment to the economic well-being of children and their families;

- The significance of the quality of childhood for child development and for later youth and adult development;
- The need for policies that minimize child poverty and the social exclusion of children and that help reconcile work and family life;
- The centrality of gender equity in family policies.

He states that an effective family policy must be child-centered, women-friendly, and must be regarded as a social investment.

Conceptual fallacies of family policy in developing welfare states formed under the influence of traditional assumptions have contradicting effects with the requirements of contemporary social policy and they are inclined to fail. The assumption that family values are going to be protected and loyalty to family will continue as a result of family dependency is unfounded. A valid family policy that is consistent with the changing economic conditions and labor decomposition of developing countries should emphasize tangible family support instead of state intervention in understanding of family and promoting values that are not clearly defined.

REFERENCES:

- Baker, Maureen (2003): “Family Policy”, International Encyclopedia of Marriage & Family, 2003, MacMillan Reference Series, pp. 616-621
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990): “The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism”, 1990, Cambridge, Polity Press, p. 59, pp. 26-33
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1999): “Social Risks and Welfare States”, Social Foundations of Post-Industrial Economies, Chapter 3, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp.32-46
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1996): “After the Golden Age? Welfare States Dilemmas in a Global Economy”, Welfare States in Transition: National Adaptations in Global Economies, Sage Publications, 1996, pp. 1-31

- Friedman, Thomas (2000): "The Lexus and the Olive Tree - Understanding Globalization", Anchor, 2000, New York
- Gillies Val (2005): "Meeting parents' needs? Discourses of 'support' and inclusion in family policy", Critical Social Policy, Sage Publications, 2005, 25th Issue, p.70
- Jary, David & Jary Julia (2000): Collins Dictionary of Sociology, 2000, Harper Collins Publishers
- Kammerman, Sheila B. (2003): "Welfare States, Family Policies, and Early Childhood Education, Care, and Family Support: Options for the Central and Eastern European (CEE) and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Countries", Prepared for the Consultation Meeting on Family Support Policy in Central and Eastern Europe, Organized by the Council of Europe and UNESCO, September 3-5, 2003, Budapest, Hungary
- Kleinman Mark (2002): "Crisis? What Crisis? Continuity and Change in European Welfare States", "A European Welfare State? European Social Policy in Context, 2002, Palgrave MacMillan, Hampshire
- Koray Meryem (2005): "Sosyal Politika", 2005, Ankara, İmge Kitabevi, pp.132-183
- Leibfried Stephan (1993): "Towards a European Welfare State?", New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe, ed. C. Jones, Routledge, London, 1993, pp.139-143
- Marshall, Thomas Humphrey (1950): "Citizenship and Social Class", 1950, States and Societies, Pluto Press, London, 1992, pp.248-260
- Moreno Luis (2001): "'Superwomen' and Mediterranean Welfare", Paper prepared for the ISA RC 19 Conference "Old and New Social Inequalities: What Challenges for Welfare States?" University of Oviedo, Spain, 6-9 September 2001
- Moreno Luis (2004): "Spain's transition to new risks: a farewell to 'superwomen'", "New Risks, New Welfare: The Transformation of the European Welfare State", 2004, Oxford University Press, pp.133-157
- Rodger John (1995): "Family Policy of Moral Regulation?" Critical Social Policy, Sage Publications, 1995, 43rd Issue, p. 5
- Şenkal Abdülkadir (2005): "Küreselleşme Sürecinde Sosyal Politika", Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım, 2005, İstanbul
- Wolf, Martin (2007): "A divided world of economic success and political turmoil", Financial Times, Jan.30.2007