

Conceptual introduction to the postgraduate

1. Human development

The problem of development

The human development approach is a way of addressing the relationship between processes of economic and social change that helps to highlight the breadth of the field of problems that this relationship entails, and the enormous restrictions implied by the views that limit it to a process of material accumulation. Indeed, the classical view of economic theory and an important part of social theory historically focused on development as the evolution of material production; in the identification of "successful" historical sequences of economic growth and in the subordination of parallel social and political processes to economic change as secondary elements, eventually subordinated to the latter. The result has been, as is known, a large dose of one-dimensional concern for development, restricted to isolating and controlling the logics of the material accumulation process.

The human development approach, born from the growing awareness of the limitations inherent in points of view characterized by a univocal, mechanical, and partial understanding of economic change, emphasizes, on the contrary, upon the complex and multiple nature of these processes. To the irreducibility of development to its dimension of material change, the human development approach adds a double sensitivity for the social dimension. At the same time, it emphasizes the ethical need not to separate the process of economic growth from its impact on people's well-being, and on the intersubjective and dynamic character of the notions of well-being. In this way, it reintroduces society and the individual as a human being in the field of understanding economic development, thus taking up the central thread of the historical discussion about the forms and consequences of social change.

Indeed, the nature of economic development and its relations with the processes of social change have been at the center of the concerns of global economic, social and political theories since the 18th century. Different approaches tried to account for the relationships between the change in the mode of articulation of productive relations, the changes in the social structure and the strategies of the public powers to manage to guide such processes of change with respect to objectives of accumulation of territorial power or reduction of social conflict. A strong optimism of the time associated the convergence of economic growth, technological progress and social, political and cultural changes, phenomena that the Western nineteenth century unified in an admiring gaze and did not hesitate to qualify positively as "modernization" and "progress".

Very early on, however, such processes began to be observed more closely and with a critical spirit, to the extent that they were associated with problems of a new nature that did not seem likely to be resolved by the very dynamics of economic and social change. Modern economic theories were born to account for the characteristics and conditions of material change; modern sociology was born to understand the transformations of social ties that this change brought with

it; and modern political science quickly positioned itself on the path of generating theories capable of diagnosing the appropriate way of approaching these processes by "the prince". "Development" was thus raised, historically, at the same time as a phenomenon that awaited to be fully elucidated, as a process that had to be governed and as a problem that had to be solved.

The 20th century was particularly rich in approaches to this problem, to the extent that a progressively global economic "system" generated growth crisis processes with strong social and political impacts. The financial crisis of the 1930s marks an important turning point for the postulates of classical economic theory and the optimism that it exuded about the capacity of the "system" to tend towards equilibrium and regeneration. Classically exorcised as being responsible for the obstacles to modern economic development in the 18th and 19th centuries, the State returns as an instrument and as a strategy to develop a balancing, healing and reorienting intervention of the dynamics of development. The dual role of thinker and designer of public policies of John Maynard Keynes, gave his critique of classical economic theory a refounding character of modern economic thought¹, to the extent that it explained why markets did not correct themselves without regulation. public, highlighting the role that the government played in the economy.

After the Second World War, the last echo of the chain of tragedies that unleashed the crisis of the '30s, the remarkable economic growth of the Western world as a whole and the balancing role of the development of the social policies of the "welfare state" acted as foundations of a new systemic optimism about the association between economic development and cultural modernization understood as "progress". Full employment as a "natural" effect of the Fordist modalities of productive structuring and as an objective of public policy; the virtuous association between productivity and wages; and the expansion of a social security system based on a collectivization of the risks of active life; were undoubtedly key to creating that virtuous circle that linked growth and well-being².

The crisis of the 1970s, a fiscal crisis of the State combined with a crisis of profitability of the capitalist company, brought about a critical review of the assumptions of economic development and its positive link with social change. The diagnosis of the causes of the crisis and its

¹ See TOWNSEND, Peter: "From Universalism to Safety Nets: The Rise and Fallo f Keynesian Influence on Social Development"; en MKANDAWIRE, Thandika (editor): *Social Policy in a Development Context*; New York, UNRISD – Palgrave, 2004.

² Ver ESPING-ANDERSEN, Gøsta: *Los tres mundos del Estado de Bienestar*, Valencia, Edicions Alfons el Magnànim – Generalitat Valenciana, 1993.

Public policy recommendations, which rapidly acquired hegemony through new and powerful coalitions of political, intellectual and business elites, associated the problems of economic growth with the role of the State and national and global regulation models. The politically neoconservative and economically neoclassical diagnosis that is usually identified with the polyvalent term "neoliberalism" was at the base of a set of reform strategies that profoundly affected the relationship between growth and welfare. Changes in business growth strategies, the new type of employment produced by post-Fordist production processes, the forms of deregulation of the State, the globalization of competition due to the growing integration of markets, the growing hegemony of grassroots global actors and its effects on the logic of global markets and the reduction of the systemic intensity of social protection, among other changes, tended to "unhook" economic growth from the collective production of well-being.

The new directly proportional relationship between economic growth, the increase in inequality and poverty; as well as the greater awareness about the perverse relationship between growth and environmental impact were seen, in principle, as an inevitable but undesired consequence of the new economic orientations adopted. A debate, initially muted and increasingly strident with the passage of time and the "secularization" of trends, began to mark the inadequacy of the renewed unidimensionality of the economic theories proposed in the face of the phenomena of social disintegration and the growing gap between countries and, within countries, between different sectors, that the growth modalities implemented seemed not to stop producing. The global expansion of the economic system, together with the important changes in the conformation of political power at the world level, which occurred between the mid-1980s and the beginning of the following decade, tended to obscure the intensity of its negative effects and its insufficiencies, relativizing them. As a result, the "fine tuning" of the great reforms of those years, were going to be able to solve in the short or medium term.

Slowly, however, new approaches based on these shortcomings began to populate the field of reflection on development. Towards the end of the 1980s, the approaches of "adjustment with a human face" (UNICEF, 1987)³ and "sustainable development" (ONU, 1987)⁴ are attempts to review contemporary strategies, adopting new ones that will meet the challenge address deficits or insufficiencies in economic growth. Poverty and environmental problems are put back on the agenda of development theory, drawing attention to the limits and consequences of the prevailing approach. A few years later, in 1990, the United Nations unveiled its proposal to change the theories of development in favor of "human development". The new concept elaborated by Mahbub ul Haq, with

³ Cornia, G., Jolly, R., Stewart, F., Human Face Adjustment, UNICEF-SigloXXI, Madrid, 1987.⁴ ONU, Brundtland Report, Our Common Future, This is a report prepared by a committee of specialists from several countries, chaired by Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland. This is the first document that incorporates the term "sustainable development", defined as the one that meets the needs of the present without compromising those of future generations.

Amartya Sen's contributions consists of expanding people's opportunities and options to achieve a more democratic and participatory development. The generation of human capabilities is the support from which people can have access to those opportunities and options, and be actors in their own development. Human development is the result of a complex process that incorporates social, economic, demographic, political, environmental and cultural factors, in which the different social actors actively and committedly participate. Consequently, it is a product of wills and social co-responsibilities.

The new paradigm, although it incorporates the classic theories of economic development, intends to turn the center of attention towards the well-being of people, highlighting both the relevance of the ends and the means so such well-being can be achieved. In this sense, it enriches the concept of economic development understood unidimensionally as a process of material expansion, by including the consideration of the expansion of human capacities as a means that provides better conditions to expand the exercise of their freedom and the possibilities of participating.⁵

Later, in 1994, the United Nations Development Program, in its Human Development Report, enriched the concept of "human development", incorporating the term "sustainable", defining it as "a development that not only provokes economic growth but that it also equitably distributes its benefits, regenerating the environment instead of destroying it, promoting the autonomy of people instead of marginalizing them; development that prioritizes the poor, expands their choices and opportunities, and provides for their participation in decisions that affect their lives"⁶.

The problem of development in Latin America

The limitations and insufficiencies of neo-liberal thought acquired particular relevance in the field of peripheral countries, those whose development logics depended on asymmetric articulations with the global "center". As is known, the quality of development has had an enormous centrality as a historical problem for Latin America, as a logical consequence of the relatively subordinate place occupied by the economies of the region and its States in the logic of global political and economic exchange defined by actors of greater importance. And as a natural consequence of the particular difficulties of the capitalist structuring of national economies. As Víctor Tokman, a veteran observer of these processes⁷, has suggested, in the concern of the leading and intellectual sectors of Latin America, the complementary problems of guaranteeing economic development and qualifying it based on its social impacts have traditionally been at the center of the debate about the desirable models and

⁵ PNUD, Human Development Report, 1990, New York.

⁶ PNUD: *Human Development Report*, 1994 (Prefacio); New York.

⁷ TOKMAN, Víctor: *A voice on the way. Employment and equity in Latin America: 40 years of searching*; Santiago de Chile, Fund of Economic Culture, 2004.

economic and social policy possibilities for the region.

Indeed, the problem of development in the region has traditionally been twofold. A key aspect, similar to the problem of economic growth in the central countries, has been to elucidate what is the best way to guarantee processes of capitalist accumulation centered on the national territory and sustainable in the medium and long term. A no minor problem, subsidiary to the nature of the social structure of the region and the way in which the transition from the colonial world to the world of independent republics took place, has been that of finding a type of development that is particularly rapid and effective in reducing the socioeconomic fragmentation and the structural inequalities that characterize the region. These two discussions – these two aspects of the same discussion – have dominated, in different ways, the debate about development in Latin America⁸.

The 20th century was the privileged theater of these discussions, to the extent that the region had to face the consequences (and generate exit strategies) of the two global crises mentioned above, the one in 1930s and the other in the 1970s. Both crises highlighted for Latin America, albeit in different ways, the problem of the endogenous limits of growth strategies and their external limits. The double game of the narrow margins of option of the dependent economies and the needs of rapid and large impacts towards the interior, shows the singular complexity of the problem of development in the Region.

The crisis of 1929-30 implied a brutal brake on the classic model of Latin American growth, by which capitalist accumulation took place in the areas of production and marketing of raw materials; and the development strategy was perceived as the logical and desirable effect of international specialization. The crisis of the model was combined with increasingly important criticisms about the limited and partial degree to which said strategy contributed to resolving the historical fragmentation of Latin American societies into urban sectors "beneficiaries" of modernization and rural sectors relegated from such processes or only marginally associated with it. Many of these diagnoses adopted coherence and systematicity from the work of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC) of the United Nations. ECLAC dedicated the center of its diagnostic concerns and recommendations of public policies to the "problem of development"; to the particular obstacles that the Latin American socioeconomic structure had for economic growth and its mode of insertion in the global economy; and to the unique problematic faces that the relationship between economic change and sociocultural change adopted for Latin America.

The self-centered development model, which emerged as a desirable strategy in the four decades after the 1929-30 crisis, thus had an important burden of relative social responsibility. The objective of development could not be only the gross growth of the economies, but the way this

⁸ THORP, Rosemary: *Progress, Poverty and Exclusion. An Economic History of Latin America in the 20th Century*; Washington D.C., IDB, 1998.

growth it contributed to physically and socially integrating the “nations” in the making. The obstacles and limitations to growth were beginning to be perceived from the point of view of their social consequences, as evidenced by the classic debate about “marginality” in the region⁹, a subsidiary of the no less classic polemic development “versus” dependency¹⁰. These debates clearly centered the discussion on the problem of the quality of development, advancing along a route similar to the one that the human development approach would later take. The debate showed concern for elucidating the probability of a “sustainable” and “inclusive” impact of economic growth: one capable of overcoming the limits and conditions that global economic asymmetry imposed on Latin American development; and at the same time capable of integrating the mass of floating population that the rural economies expelled and the urban economies seemed unable to absorb with the necessary speed.

This period marked the first boom in the region of studies on the problem of development. Based on ECLAC's diagnoses and recommendations, public policies were designed to develop local modes of economic integration, market expansion, integrated industrial networks and modern labor markets. Latin American “developmentalism” tackled for the first time complex problems such as the possession and use of land in pre-capitalist regimes, the fragmentation of local industry and its subordinate association to transnational capital, the concentration of income, consumption patterns, the integration of new sectors into the labor market, etc. Demographic problems, living conditions, health, housing, education, among others, found a place among the more strictly economic issues addressed by ECLAC, incorporating for the first time a multidimensional vision of development.

The general way of dealing with these problems was, parallel to the rise of the role of the State in the central countries, a trust placed in the Latin American State as an allocator of resources and as an organization capable of functioning as an interface between the contemporary world and the future world to which the region was on its way. The global ideological polarization that turned Latin America into the battlefield of the so-called “Cold War” overshadowed the search for development models appropriate to the singularity of the socioeconomic structure and the global position of the region, greatly reducing the margin of political options for the countries of the region and associating development theory with a political convergence of the region with the western countryside and with the hegemonic actor of the continent. The search for a “Latin American way” of approaching development remained, however, the central element of local development theories.

The crisis of the 1970s in the central countries, in one hand, produced a series of rearrangements in the global economy that would appear in Latin America as the exhaustion of the substitutive model and as a fiscal crisis,

⁹ NUN, José: *Marginality and social exclusion*; Buenos Aires, Fund of Economic Culture, 2001.

¹⁰ CARDOSO, Fernando Enrique y FALETTO, Enzo: *Dependence and development in America Latina*; México, Siglo XXI, 1969.

particularly foreign debt, and this resulted in a worsening of growth problems during the 1980s, considered a "lost decade". As is known, the abandonment of the self-centered development strategy led by the State and the search for alternatives in a specialized reintegration into the global economy, brought back, quite brutally, the unresolved elements of the dilemma of Latin American development. As is known, the unexpected end of the Cold War transformed the strong hegemonic effect that the neoliberal diagnosis had had in the central countries into a global one. The so-called "Washington Consensus" projected, directly or through an important part of the multilateral economic organizations, its diagnosis on the peripheral economies. "Peripheral neoliberalism" founded on premises of neoclassical economics and strongly critical of previous development strategies resulted in a set of economic and social policy reforms that, partly due to the enthusiasm of local political coalitions, partly due to the lack of fiscal alternatives, ended up consolidating a hegemonic mode of "exit from the crisis".

In Latin America, however, the return to growth in the post-debt crisis proved more vulnerable to instabilities in the global economy and even more austere in terms of the qualitative effects of material product growth on the relative well-being of the population. An even more dramatic trade-off than that of the central countries was quickly registered between growth and quality of employment, quickly showing the limitations of the new strategies to become successful ways of combating poverty and inequality. It is important to acknowledge the contribution made at the beginning of the 1990s by ECLAC in its book "Productive Transformation with Equity", based on the contribution of Fernando Fajnsylber, in which, as a result of the effects in Latin America of the 1980s, proposes a change in the economic, social and political structure of the Region, aiming to consolidate and give meaning to democracy, through the construction of a more equitable scenario. The proposal, unlike the one implemented in follow-up to the neoliberals, aimed to produce a change in productivity, via the application of knowledge and innovation.¹¹

The path, however, was different, and the changes produced were singular; particularly regarding the role of the state and markets. Even in situations of economic growth at unprecedented rates in decades, such as those that characterized the first five years of the 21st century, the social impacts showed ambiguous evidence, when not clearly negative, about the capacity of the growth model to face the historical problems of the region and surpass previous historical models in terms of impact. The difficulty tended to become more acute due to the coincidence of the neoliberal strategy with the consolidation process of the democratic systems that the end of the Cold War made it difficult to inaugurate. The "return of the development dilemma" clearly marks the persistence of the central historical problem of the region.

¹¹ CEPAL, Productive transformation with equity, CEPAL books, Santiago, March, 1990.

In some countries, this "return of the dilemma" is presented again as evidence of the insufficiency of growth strategies with respect to the levels and intensity of poverty and inequality. In others, such as Argentina, it draws attention again to the delicate macroeconomic balance that, in peripheral economies, is at the base of economic growth that is sufficiently intense and balanced to produce reasonable doses of social integration. In all cases, invariably, the limits of the neoliberal strategy draw attention to the non-automatic and non-linear nature of the relationship between economic growth and social welfare.

This aspect is all the more important since the time is characterized by an "explosion of rights" that come to add to the classic construction of citizenship of Western capitalism around the notions of civil, political and social rights. Historically, the problem of individual rights limited by an authoritarian state in the theater of a low-intensity political war lasting more than forty years. To the debt of historical construction of civil, political and social rights was added, in addition, the flourishing of new generations of rights based on detections of vulnerabilities and categorical risks that contributed to further broaden the range of objectives inseparable from a development strategy. one-dimensional economic.

The problem of development and the human development approach

The human development approach came, in this sense, to alleviate an important need for dialogue in our region with points of view that are both particularistic (aware of the differences in environments and trajectories) and deontological (aware of the ethical choices that underlie public policy models). The curricular trajectory that this Master's program proposes is based on the conviction that the central elements of the human development approach are of great importance to continue the construction of a more intelligent and conscious vision of the problems inherent in Latin American development.

In this context, the works of Amartya Sen¹² and the field of problems that they help to open up, recast concerns about the plurality of dimensions of development, refocusing the problem on the instrumental nature of economic growth to obtain forms of well-being. which Sen identifies as "freedom". For Sen, development models must be sensitive at the same time to the singularity of environments and trajectories; and the subjectivity inherent in well-being. The theories of development, from this point of view, must be reviewed and controlled according to its contribution to the construction of human freedoms, understood as the

¹² SEN, Amartya: *Development as Freedom*; New York, Anchor, 2000.

result of subjectively and intersubjectively satisfactory performances, dependent on objective capabilities and opportunities.

From a similar point of view, the classical theories of development, understood as the growth of volumes of monetarily measurable products, are confronted with a theory of freedom based on Immanuel Kant's legendary categorical imperative, which turns monetary income and economic growth into means for the expansion of freedoms. The emphasis on "human development" is deduced as opposed to "economic development" in the broad sense; and the importance of a dissidence that is far from being a nominal preference.

The approach has at least three fundamental consequences in terms of development theory¹³: an important change of focus on the central concerns of development theories; the return of interest in the creative capacity of social subjects (or "agency"); and a renewed attention to ethics underlying social arrangements.

The change of focus imports a turn of attention from the results of economic development in terms of monetary products towards the detection of results in terms of the expansion of freedoms. It is a "people-centered" paradigm that replaces the different aspects of utilitarian objectivism as well as the approaches centered on exclusively subjective rationalities. Among other consequences, this implies a new attention both to the plural ethical field in which welfare considerations are played, and to its non-material dimensions.

The interest in the creative dimension of the subjects (or "agency") calls attention to the subjective, active and transformative character of the actors, which is irreducible to a classical analysis in terms of individuals maximizing objective profits. This means, among other things, that there may be gaps between "preferences" and "well-being" at the level of individual options; that inequality (as the effective distribution of power between and within groups) is a central element and not a collateral effect of development; and that the existence of altruistic objectives for certain actions is possible, as well as interest in the exercise of collective responsibility for certain actions.

The procedural considerations of Sen's theory, finally, imply the search for more information and a broader rationale for the evaluation of development objectives: a type of evaluation that Alkire calls "consequential". This implies introducing the consideration of the extension or contraction of rights against alternative courses of action for public policies; understand the importance of "human security" (the prevention of freedom contractions); and a "comparative approach to justice" that allows social arrangements to be ranked according to their degree of justice or their "space for injustice".

¹³ ALKIRE, Sabina: "Development. A misconceived theory can kill"; en MORRIS, C.: *Amartya Sen: Contemporary Philosophy in Focus*; Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Subsequent evolutions of the human development paradigm opened a new agenda in development studies, gradually and progressively addressing aspects hitherto not systematically questioned by development theories.

This paradigm, constantly evolving and rethinking, provides a central site for the analysis and generation of responses to the challenges posed by the interaction between economy, society and politics. In this sense, the state is the central actor, as guarantor of rights and manager of actions aimed at promoting growth, and therefore the main subject of study of human development. But it is also of interest to review the effectiveness and efficiency of the state regarding the establishment and application of regulatory and procedural frameworks that regulate markets and social relations. By the way, due to the new globalization, the degrees of autonomy of national states have been limited, promoting, on the one hand, the construction of areas of regional integration, and on the other, granting a strategic role to local governments.

Likewise, the profound changes in the global economic and political structure caused important transformations in the social structure and in the means that the different actors find to defend or promote their interests and rights. The role of political parties, traditional corporations, and the emergence of social movements give the actor's perspective a unique place in the analysis of the phenomena of Latin America in recent years. These complex processes are the subject of views from human development, and this is corroborated by the issues addressed by the latest Human Development Reports, at the global and regional levels.

The human development paradigm aims to structure, at the political level, the analyzes and proposals aimed at promoting the link between political systems and regimes and the free determination of individuals, as well as their participation in public policy processes; the renewed interest in public health and education as basic thresholds in capacity development; respect for the environment understood as a dimension of freedom and law; and the new focus on poverty as a systemic and inter-subjective problem that combines vulnerabilities with opportunities, an approach that overcomes the one-dimensionality of classical care targeting. But in addition, the perspective of capabilities and functionalities, applied to public policy, incorporates in a renewed way the consideration about the conditions and complexities that different public policy initiatives have for their implementation and to achieve the desired results.

The human development approach and concern for the quality of public policies

The human development paradigm, in addition to proposing a different view of key development problems, pays particular attention to the problem of its potential realization through public policies. The

postgraduate program proposed here, consequently, bases an important part of the curriculum on the perception of the urgency that the production of professionals aware of the possibilities and limits of state organizations and networks has, particularly in the case of Argentina. public-private institutions.

The Program's proposal has the particularity of offering in this strategic dimension an approach at the theoretical level, at the meso or intermediate level concepts, and at the analytical and instrumental levels. In the first place, it offers students a reflection on the foundations of political philosophy, its historical evolution and current debates, full of tensions that in many cases recognize a long tradition of ruptures and redefinition of analysis categories. This view aims to be enriched through the paths and transformations that gave rise to the constitution of citizenship, and its reflection in public policies, through responses to demands for economic, social and cultural rights, and the redefinition and expansion of civil and political. Precisely, the complexity of modern societies and the challenges that this imposes on public policy will be addressed from the program, delving into the most relevant sociocultural concepts for public policy, in the Latin American and Argentine context, going through its historicity and the recent changes.

This conceptual framework is subsequently approached from the human development paradigm and its main concepts and categories of analysis, analyzing its reflection in public policies. Finally, the proposal gathers the important advances in terms of the understanding of management problems that the approaches of sociology and neo-institutionalist political science implied. These approaches have highlighted the historical nature and the sociocultural foundations of the political practices that explain the results of public policies, elaborating a theory of institutional capacities to account for the arrangements that allow improving these results and the processes of a supposed political and social change.

From this point of view, improving the quality of public policy implies a process of institutional change that transcends the one-dimensionality of a concern for organizational effectiveness-efficiency, framing itself in a medium- and long-term institutional construction inseparable from human development. Improving the quality of policies is, in this sense, the construction of a State oriented towards the production of effective results in terms of the well-being of citizens, guarantor and producer of development understood as a process of political, social and cultural democratization. This type of institutional construction as a strategy to improve public policies will be called here "state capacity building".

State capacity, within the framework of democratic political systems, can be understood as the ability of government agencies to obtain socially relevant results through public policies. Given the constraints inherent in any context and the political nature of public issues, what is "socially relevant" is constantly being defined and redefined through the interaction of individuals, groups, and organizations with

different interests, ideologies, and (above all) endowments of power resources. State capacity, then, is put into play when state management instances receive, generate, select, prioritize and respond to demands that are expressed as public problems, coming from actors constituted in the political arena, or from broad groups that dispersed or sporadic manage to express their demands. For that reason, state capacity is at the same time an attribute of the state bureaucratic organization and an attribute of the political system¹⁴.

This dimension of public policies is incorporated into the Program through the subjects "Politics and public policy processes" and "State capacities", "Budget and financing of public policies" and "Planning, management and evaluation of programs and projects. They assume the distinction between administrative capacity and political capacity. The first, referred to the resources of the State (material, technical and human) recognizes that without a minimum development of these instruments, which depend on technical knowledge, good practices and appropriate financing, any government would find strong obstacles to try ways of improvement of public management. However, this alone is not a sufficient condition for state capacity if its political capacity is not addressed, understood as the ability and possibility of problematizing the demands of population groups, making decisions that represent, express and positively combine the interests thereof. Political capacity, the basis of state legitimacy and particularly scarce in Argentina¹⁵, thus depends on formal and informal practices and modalities of resource management and relationship between the State and existing political and social actors. It appears in cooperative or competitive management practices; as well as in the possibility of creating strategic consensus or "State policies" in key areas of development, instead of possibilistic and particularistic relationships.

The proposal finally integrates the conceptual, organizational and instrumental dimensions of public policies, through the analysis of a set of sectoral initiatives, which will be critically studied from the perspective of the human development paradigm, considering in a comparative way regional and Argentine programmatic actions.

¹⁵ See REPETTO, Fabián; y ANDRENACCI, Luciano: "Citizenship and state capacity. Dilemmas in the reconstruction of Argentine social policy"; en ANDRENACCI, Luciano (compiler): *Social policy problems in contemporary Argentina*; Buenos Aires, UNGS-Editorial Prometeo, 2006