

CHANGING ROLE OF STATE IN ASIA II: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE (30-31 MAY 2014)

FRIDAY, 30 MAY 2014		
09:15 - 09:30	REGISTRATION	
09:30 - 10:00	OPENING REMARKS	
	Prasenjit DUARA <i>Director, Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore</i> Elizabeth J. PERRY <i>Harvard-Yenching Institute, USA</i>	
10:00 - 11:30	PANEL 1 : THE NEO-LIBERAL STATE AND AFTER	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Elizabeth J. PERRY , <i>Harvard-Yenching Institute, USA</i>	
10:00	Alvin Y. SO <i>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</i>	State Neoliberalism: China's Response to the 2008 Global Economic Crisis
10:30	Kurtuluş GEMICI <i>National University of Singapore</i>	State-Finance Nexus In Asia: From Developmental States to the Liberal Compact
11:00	QUESTION & ANSWER	
11:30 - 12:00	TEA BREAK	
12:00 - 13:00	PANEL 2 : STATE AND SOCIETY IN THE LAST DECADE	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Ho-fung HUNG , <i>The Johns Hopkins University, USA</i>	
12:00	Erik KUHONTA <i>McGill University, Canada</i>	The Changing State of Social Reform in Thailand: Democratic Governments and the Struggle for Equity
12:30	Kellee S. TSAI <i>Hong Kong University of Science & Technology</i>	Cosmopolitan Capitalism: Local State-Society Relations in China and India
13:00	QUESTION & ANSWER	
13:00 - 14:00	LUNCH	
14:00 - 15:30	PANEL 3 : RURAL TRANSFORMATIONS	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Mark W. FRAZIER , <i>The New School for Social Research, USA</i>	
14:00	Andrew WALKER <i>Australia National University</i>	Rural Asia's Modern Political Economy: A Comparative Consideration of Thailand And South Korea
14:30	John DONALDSON <i>Singapore Management University</i>	Agricultural Development, Welfare and Livelihoods in Rural China: Prospects and Probabilities from Hu to Xi
15:00	QUESTION & ANSWER	
15:30 - 16:00	TEA BREAK	
16:00 - 18:00	PANEL 4 : CHANGING CONTOURS OF PROTEST	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Akhil GUPTA , <i>University California-Los Angeles, USA</i>	
16:00	Manjusha NAIR <i>National University of Singapore</i>	Beyond Authoritarianism and Democracy: Land Acquisition and the Protests of Negotiation in China and India
16:30	Mark W. FRAZIER <i>The New School for Social Research, USA</i>	Varieties of State Capacity: State-Labor Relations in 20 th Century Mumbai and Shanghai
17:00	Sanjay RUPARELIA <i>The New School for Social Research, USA</i>	Demanding a Right to Basic Social Equality: Contesting the Law in India and China
17:30	QUESTION & ANSWER	
18:00	END OF DAY 1	
18:00	BUS TO WORKSHOP DINNER (For Speakers, Chairpersons & Invited Guests)	

SATURDAY, 31 MAY 2014		
09:45 - 10:00	REGISTRATION	
10:00 - 11:30	PANEL 5 : CHANGING MODELS OF DEVELOPMENT	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Prasenjit DUARA , <i>National University of Singapore</i>	
<i>10:00</i>	Elizabeth J. PERRY <i>Harvard-Yenching Institute, USA</i>	Higher Education in China and India: The Role of the State
<i>10:30</i>	Devesh KAPUR <i>University of Pennsylvania, USA</i>	
<i>11:00</i>	Prerna SINGH <i>Harvard University, USA</i>	Protecting the Health of the People: Comparing State Responses to Public Health Challenges in India and China
<i>11:00</i>	QUESTION & ANSWER	
11:30 – 12:00	TEA BREAK	
12:00 - 13:30	PANEL 6 : CHANGING MODELS OF WELFARE	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Andrew WALKER , <i>Australia National University</i>	
<i>12:00</i>	Nara DILLON <i>Harvard University, USA</i>	Welfare Reform in Asia, 1950-2010
<i>12:30</i>	Salim LAKHA <i>University of Melbourne</i>	Social Protection and the State in India: Meeting the Twin Challenges of Inclusion and Accountability
<i>13:00</i>	QUESTION & ANSWER	
13:30 – 14:30	LUNCH	
14:30 - 16:00	PANEL 7 : STATE FAILURES AND CONSEQUENCES	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Devesh KAPUR , <i>University of Pennsylvania, USA</i>	
<i>14:30</i>	Akhil GUPTA <i>University California-Los Angeles, USA</i>	Changing Forms of Corruption in India
<i>15:00</i>	Forrest ZHANG <i>Singapore Management University</i>	Local States as Brokers: Township Governments in the Post-Taxation Era
<i>15:30</i>	QUESTION & ANSWER	
16:00 - 16:30	TEA BREAK	
16:30 - 18:00	PANEL 8 : EMERGING PRIVATE-PUBLIC FORMS	
<i>Chairperson</i>	Alvin Y. SO , <i>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology</i>	
<i>16:30</i>	XIANG Biao <i>University of Oxford, UK</i>	Commercial Bureaucratism: The Middlemen for Outmigration and the Bureaucratic Logic in the Reconfiguration of the Chinese State
<i>17:00</i>	Johan LINDQUIST <i>Stockholm University, Sweden</i>	Recentring Indonesian Migration: Post-Neoliberal Reform And Colonial Genealogies
<i>17:30</i>	QUESTION & ANSWER	
18:00 - 18:30	CONCLUDING REMARKS	
18:30	END OF WORKSHOP	
18:30	BUS TO HOTEL	

State Neoliberalism: China's Response to the 2008 Global Economic Crisis

Alvin Y. SO

Division of Social Science , Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
soalvin@ust.hk

Global Economic Crisis is a period of turbulence, upheaval, and prolonged conflict; it is a period where states, classes, and ethnic groups try to re-define their relationship, to rethink their development model, and to re-set the rules governing their access to key resources of the world-economy. The aim of the paper is to examine the impact of the 2008 global economic crisis on China's development.

This paper argues that when the global economic crisis started to unfold in China in late 2008, it led to the consolidation of the hyper-growth model of "*state developmentalism*." The Chinese party-state quickly set up a massive US\$586 billion stimulus package, pump money into the state enterprises, and further strengthen the state sector at the expense of the private sector. However, when the global economic crisis spread from the developed countries to the emergent markets in 2012, the economies of the BRICs started to experience problems, e.g., India experienced falling rupee, higher inflation, softening growth, crippling budget deficits, and waning investor confidence in mid-2013. In China, too, the hidden problem of hyper-growth began to surface in 2012-13, and its state developmentalism model is said to reach its limit and outlived its usefulness. China's exports and imports also fell in mid-2013, as China was reportedly facing a massive excessive capacity, a residential property bubble, financial overleveraging, widespread nonperforming loans, the rapid rise of debt, and a credit squeeze.

These distress economic indicators have led the new leaders (Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang) to re-think China's model of development. Instead of continuing the old model of hyper-growth state developmentalism, this paper argues that China has adopted a new model of "*state neoliberalism*" in order to deal with the challenges of the global economic crisis. State neoliberalism model not only insists that there will be no more stimulus program to upstart the weakened economy; the party-state will also enforce market discipline to strengthen the fragile financial sector. In addition, the party-state will carry out structural reforms in the areas of the fiscal system, land use, monopolies, household registration, etc. The party-state will also open up important strategic industries in the state sector for private businesses and market forces as well as to induce more competition among businesses.

This paper will examine how China's march towards the direction of neoliberalism is different from the experience of the neoliberal state in the West. At the end, it will discuss the future prospect of this "*state neoliberalism*" model and whether this new model can help China to pull out of the global economic crisis unscathed.

Alvin Y. So received his PhD in Sociology at University California-Los Angeles, USA (UCLA). He has taught at University of Hong Kong and University of Hawaii at Manoa. At present, he is Chair Professor of the Division of Social Science at Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. His research interests include social class, development, and the transformation of Hong Kong and China. He is the author of *The South China Silk District* (SUNY 1986), *Social Change and Development* (Sage 1990), *East Asia and World Economy* (with Stephen Chiu, Sage 1995), *Hong Kong's Embattled Democracy* (Johns Hopkins 1999), *Class and Class Conflict in Post-Socialist China* (World Scientific 2013).

State-Finance Nexus in Asia: From Developmental States to the Liberal Compact

Kurtuluş GEMICI

Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore

kgemici@nus.edu.sg

The taming of finance capital and the control over financial funds were the defining elements of developmental states in Asia. Since the Asian financial crisis, an increasingly decentralised nexus between the state, private economic actors, and world financial markets replaced the developmental state that tightly controlled finance capital. This article analyses the causes of this transformation through a controlled comparison between Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan— with Singapore as the control case. While the financial sectors of South Korea and Taiwan have similarly become more autonomous and international, the rise of finance has been much more pronounced in South Korea as compared to Taiwan. This article explains this difference through the interaction of three variables: industrial structure, the political power of the business sector, and the timing of financial liberalisation. It will be shown that during the rapid industrialisation period, South Korea and Taiwan's differing industrial structures—diversified big businesses in South Korea and networks of small and medium enterprises in Taiwan—resulted in different levels of business sector political power and thus varying timings of financial liberalisation. Diversified big businesses in South Korea obtained political power and began exerting influence over policy-making at an earlier date than the business sector in Taiwan. As such, in Taiwan, both domestic and external financial liberalisation was more delayed and cautious, impeding the development of the finance sector despite the rise of finance across the globe.

Kurtuluş Gemici is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, whose research interests include economic sociology, economic development, political sociology, and contentious politics. In addition, he has an interest in applying sociological theory to the study of economic life, and has published analyses on key issues such as embeddedness and markets in leading social science journals. Currently, his research focuses on two projects. The first project is on the politics of international capital flows and capital mobility, and more specifically, how emerging and developing countries respond to financial opening and market liberalisation. The second project deals with the institutional foundations of money and credit, and in particular, why and how new financial practices emerge and become legitimised in capital markets.

The Changing State Of Social Reform In Thailand: Democratic Governments And The Struggle For Equity

Erik KUHONTA

Department of Political Science, McGill University, Canada
erik.kuhonta@mcgill.ca

Paper will center on the transformations of the Thai state after the financial crisis, focusing on how Thaksin Shinawatra sought to both streamline the bureaucracy and create a closer link between the executive and the populace. The result was a greater emphasis on social issues, but also a reaction by conservative elites, including many in the bureaucracy. The current outcome is a state that appears to be more socially-inclined, but that remains deeply contested. The paper will focus in particular on the Ministry of Public Health as a case study of the conflict within the state regarding its social orientation.

Erik Kuhonta grew up in Rome, Italy because of his parents' work at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations but visited his home country, the Philippines, throughout his childhood. He attended the University of Pennsylvania and graduated in 1995, worked at the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs in New York City right after college, and then taught English at Thongsook College in Bangkok, Thailand. In 1997, Erik began his graduate work at Princeton and received a PhD in politics in 2003. In 2003-04, he was a Shorenstein Fellow at the Asia-Pacific Research Center at Stanford University and for four months in 2004, he was a Visiting Fellow at the National University of Singapore. In January 2005, he became an Assistant Professor of Political Science at McGill University, Canada.

Cosmopolitan Capitalism: Local State-Society Relations in China and India

Kellee S. TSAI

Division of Social Science, Hong Kong University of Science & Technology
ktsai@ust.hk

“State-society relations” typically refers to the relationship between a Weberian nation-state and the citizens residing within its administratively defined and coercively enforced territorial borders. This paper departs from conventional usages of both state and society by focusing on the local state, on the one hand, and a less territorialized conception of society, on the other. The rationale for this dual definitional stretch—both downwards (local state) and outwards (transnational society)—has an empirical basis. First, the local government represents the day-to-day point of contact with “the state” for most people. Government offices, fees for service, and public goods are generally administered through local state channels even if they are mandated nationally. The local state represents the first point of accountability for most citizens, and non-citizens for that matter. Second, limiting the scope of “society” to populations currently residing within national borders unnecessarily excludes temporary migrants and diasporic communities who continue to identify with a locality. Their inclusion in a more expansive notion of society is justified by the possibility of return migration, remittances from abroad, and the formation of transnational native place networks. Transnational migrants represent potential human, financial, and social resources for local, as well as national development.

Theoretically, the paper extends Albert Hirshman’s classic categorical troika of “exit, voice, and loyalty (EVL)” to the literature on new transnationalism. EVL serves as a deceptively parsimonious heuristic for understanding the non-exclusive relationship among the three types of strategies for dealing with one’s immediate environment. Migration (exit) may not be permanent, but even when it is, remaining abroad does not preclude deep-rooted identity (local and/or national loyalty), or meaningful impact on homeland affairs (voice). For these reasons, the reflexive association of society with domestic groups is incomplete; as is the assumption that exit is motivated by national/state-level deficiencies.

Empirically, the paper demonstrates the logic of this dual definitional stretch of state-society relations by examining different expressions of “cosmopolitan capitalism” in three paired localities in China and India: 1) Zhejiang/Gujarat, 2) Zhongguancun/Bangalore, and 3) Guangdong/Kerala. The first pair of localities (Zhejiang and Gujarat) are the home bases of transnational networks of merchants who have developed highly reliable forms of cross-border informal finance, and in specialized industries, have gained a market share disproportionate to their populations. The second pair (Zhongguancun and Bangalore) is the Silicon Valley of China and India, respectively. Both have developed global reputations in the IT sector in a remarkably short period of time, and have also been held up by their national governments as exemplars for return migration. The third pair of cases (Guangdong and Kerala) are long-standing exporters of labor, whose localities have been shaped—albeit quite differently—by remittances and diasporic investment. Each sub-national paired case illustrates why the conventional state-society framework should be expanded to capture the nuances of (local) state and (transnational) society relations. In the absence of local state agency, outmigration, and diasporic re-investment, none of these localities would feature on the map of national leaders, social scientists, foreign investors, and journalists. The fact that they are known as cases of developmental success has everything to do with state-society relations, but not in the way conventionally understood.

Kellee S. Tsai is Professor and Head of the Division of Social Science. (She is currently on leave from Johns Hopkins University where she is Professor of Political Science.) Her publications include *State Capitalism, Institutional Adaptation, and the Chinese Miracle* (co-edited with Barry Naughton, Cambridge, forthcoming); *Capitalism without Democracy: The Private Sector in Contemporary China* (Cornell 2007), *Non-governmental Finance and Rural Industrialization in Wenzhou* (co-authored with Wang Xiaoyi in Chinese, Shanxi Economics Press, 2005); *Japan and China in the World Political Economy* (co-edited with Saadia Pekkanen, Routledge, 2004); *Back-Alley Banking: Private Entrepreneurs in China* (Cornell 2002), and several articles. Her current research involves the political economy of ethnic foreign direct investment and remittances in China and India, and her broader academic interests concern informal institutions and institutional change, political economy of development, political economy of contemporary China, and China in comparative perspective.

Rural Asia's Modern Political Economy: A Comparative Consideration of Thailand and South Korea

Andrew WALKER

Department of Political & Social Change, School of International, Political & Strategic Studies,
Australia National University
andrew.walker@anu.edu.au

As economies develop, governments often shift from taxing the rural economy to subsidising it. They do this in an attempt to address the politically hazardous income disparities that emerge between the agricultural sector and other more productive parts of the national economy. This transformation in the fiscal relationship between the state and the rural population has fundamentally important political implications, necessitating a complete rethinking of old models of peasant rebellion and resistance. Modern rural politics in Asia is a politics of assertive collaboration and competition for state subsidy. This paper provides a comparative exploration of these economic and political dynamics in two countries - Thailand and South Korea. It explores the historical and contemporary factors that have led created very different outcomes in the way Thailand and South Korea have managed this modern rural transition. South Korea has a small, productive and highly subsidised rural sector, with what appears to be a broad-based political consensus about the desirability of subsidy. In Thailand, a much larger percentage of the population relies on a relatively unproductive agricultural sector and there is ongoing political division about the channeling of state funds into rural areas.

Andrew Walker is the Acting Dean of the College of Asia and the Pacific at the Australian National University. Andrew has been working in mainland Southeast Asia since 1993 when he conducted PhD research on cross-border trading links between northern Thailand, northern Laos and southern China. For the past 15 years he has been working on issues of rural development, resource management and modernisation in northern Thailand. His latest book *Thailand's Political Peasants*, based on ethnographic fieldwork in Chiang Mai province, was published in 2012 by University of Wisconsin Press. Andrew is the co-founder of New Mandala, a widely read blog providing anecdote, analysis and new perspectives on mainland Southeast Asia.

Agricultural Development, Welfare and Livelihoods in Rural China: Prospects and Probabilities from Hu to Xi

John DONALDSON

School of Social Sciences, Singapore Management University
jdonaldson@smu.edu.sg

The administration of Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang represents a marked break from the aspirations of the Hu Jintao administration, particularly in regards to the approach to rural development. In early 2000s, the Hu-Wen administration established a comprehensive plan, the New Socialist Countryside (NSC), and included it into the 11th Five-Year-Plan as a top policy priority. The NSC focuses on increasing agricultural production as well as expanding rural welfare and social safety nets, providing a basic foundation for Xi Jinping and Li Keqiang's attempt to strengthen agricultural production while improving rural livelihoods. By contrast, Xi-Li administration launched the New-Type of Urbanization Plan (NTUP), a strategy also focuses rural people but heads to a different direction -- aiming to bring hundreds million rural people into urban areas and fundamentally alter the character of China's countryside. How has the policy package of the NSC transformed the economic landscape, social structure, and political relations in rural China? What impact will this package have on the coming NTUP? While the long-term impact may be too early to predict with certainty, the shift in policy approach suggests that Xi-Li's new approach emphasizes shifting rural people to cities through rapid urbanization. Examining the outcomes of the NSC and the foci of the NTUP, we argue that the latter may undermine important social and economic institutions that have stabilized rural China in the past decade and before. Thus, the Xi and Li administration's plans will likely exacerbate existing inequality, both between rural and urban China, as well as within urban China itself.

John Donaldson, Associate Professor of Political Science at Singapore Management University, is the author of *Small Works: Poverty and Economic Development in Southwestern China* (Cornell University Press, 2011). His research focuses on seeking effective solutions to rural poverty reduction around the world, local rural poverty reduction policies in China, the transformation of China's agrarian system, and central-provincial relations. Recently, he has extended his research on China's rural transformation by comparing it with that of India. His research has been published in such journals as *World Development*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Politics and Society*, *China Journal*, *China Quarterly* and *Journal of Contemporary China*. John has served as a faculty member at SMU since graduating in 2005 from George Washington University in Washington DC.

Beyond Authoritarianism and Democracy: Land Acquisition and the Protests of Negotiation in China and India

Manjusha NAIR

Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore
manjusha@nus.edu.sg

Protests against land acquisition in China and India unfold in similar ways, despite the divergent regime types. Protests target the local authorities that initiated the land seizures, and escalate into disruption and violence, drawing the attention of the central state. The state negotiates with the protesters, promises to redress the grievances that sparked the protests and punish the perpetrators responsible. Often these promises are not kept. Why this puzzling similarity in the protest trajectories in “authoritarian” China and “democratic” India? In this article, I argue that the answer rests in the state and rural society relations that emerged in China and India after the 1950s. The state development trajectory strongly favored the urban residents, while state legitimacy strongly depended on the rural dwellers. The subsequent rural re-organization created a triadic state-society structure, where the rural residents faced everyday subordination to the local bodies of governance, and symbolic superiority as the populist subjects of the central state. The protests against land acquisition, I contend, are *protests of negotiations* that are rooted in the above triadic structure. Through these long established ways of expressing dissent, the rural dwellers demand attention from the central state against the “predatory” local authorities, and are often pacified by better compensation packages and shares in neoliberal growth outcomes, much to the disappointment of social movement organizers in India. This article argues for seeing beyond the regime frames of authoritarianism and democracy to investigate market reforms and contentious politics in contemporary China and India.

Manjusha Nair is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the National University of Singapore. She obtained a PhD in sociology from Rutgers University in 2011. Her research interests include political sociology, political economy, labor and social movements, social inequalities and China and India. She has received fellowships from the Social Science Research Council (International Dissertation Research Fellowship) and the American Institute of Indian Studies (Junior Research Fellowship). Her articles have appeared in the *Journal of Historical Sociology* and *International Labor and Working Class History*.

**Varieties of State Capacity:
State-Labor Relations in 20th Century Mumbai and Shanghai**

Mark W. FRAZIER

Department of Politics, India China Institute (ICI), the New School for Social Research, USA
frazierm@newschool.edu

State capacity, in Asia and elsewhere, is often treated in linear or binary terms. A state is said to possess a high or low capacity to extract taxes, to be adaptive or not adaptive to domestic and international challenges, to be strong or weak in the provision of public goods. This paper suggests the need to view state capacity in more qualitative or categorical terms. The empirical focus is the formation of state capacities in urban Shanghai and Mumbai during the 1950s, and the legacy effects on state-led liberalization projects in the 1990s. Different forms of state capacity facilitated certain patterns of labor institutions and protest, while constraining others. This paper uses the concept of “state legibility” to explain variation in the forms of state capacity. Legibility, drawn from James C. Scott’s work on the high-modernist state, is also a relational process in which state officials, through their actions, policy styles, and rhetoric, make the state legible to those who are the targets of state projects. In their engagements with social groups, states reveal and invite connections with their “moving parts,” such as institutions, policies, and agents. From this process, state capacities emerge from the mutual engagements among those who sit on either side of a constructed and contested boundary between state and society.

Mark W. Frazier is Professor of Politics and Co-Academic Director of the India China Institute at The New School University in New York City. Frazier teaches and writes about the political economy of China, with a focus on labor movements and social policy. He has authored op-ed pieces and essays for *The New York Times*, *Daedalus*, *The Diplomat*, and *World Politics Review*. He is the author of *Socialist Insecurity: Pensions and the Politics of Uneven Development in China* (Cornell University Press 2010) and *The Making of the Chinese Industrial Workplace* (Cambridge University Press 2002). His scholarship has also appeared in journals such as *Studies in Comparative International Development*, and *The China Journal*.

Demanding a Right to Basic Social Equality: Contesting the Law in India and China

Sanjay RUPARELIA

Department of Politics, India China Institute (ICI), the New School for Social Research, USA
ruparels@newschool.edu

Since 2005, India has introduced a series of progressive social acts that legislate a right to various socioeconomic entitlements. These range from information, work, and education to forest conservation, food, and public service. Three features distinguish these acts: the explicit use of rights-based claims; the design of innovative governance mechanisms that seek to enhance the transparency, responsiveness, and accountability of the state; and the role played by social activists and activist judges in spearheading these pieces of legislation with the help of progressive party politicians.

This paper analyzes a key slow-burning stimulus of India's new rights-based welfare paradigm: the socially activist turn of its Supreme Court. I address two main questions. First, what explains the rise of progressive socioeconomic jurisprudence in India in the late 1970s? Following the prevailing scholarly consensus, I analyze the role of antecedent conditions and particular causal mechanisms to explain high judicial activism in India: deepening political fragmentation, endogenous judicial change, and the strategic political retreat of elected representatives. None of these factors can fully explain the timing, sequence, and focus of the social activist turn of the Indian Supreme Court in the late 1970s, however, which owed much to the rise of popular social formations during these years and their proliferation in the 1980s. Thus the complex interaction effects of several causal factors, whose weight has differed over time, provides a more convincing explanation. Second, what have been the achievements and failures of high judicial activism in India regarding socioeconomic rights? As many scholars persuasively demonstrate, its direct impact has been limited, while its pro-poor posture has been inconsistent. However, by focusing excessively on direct material consequences in the short-run, these studies discount the powerful long-term ramifications, many of which are symbolic and indirect, of the Indian Supreme Court's earlier progressive turn.

Sanjay Ruparelia is Assistant Professor of Politics at the New School for Social Research and a 2012-2013 visiting fellow in the Project on Democracy and Development at the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies. He was a Kellogg Institute visiting fellow in spring 2009. His longstanding research interests concern the rise and fall of the broader Indian left; the prospects and difficulties of power-sharing in federal parliamentary democracies; and the role of institutions, power, and judgment in politics. His more recent work investigates the nexus between India's new rights-based welfare paradigm and an innovative state-building experiment, which simultaneously aims to enhance the capacity of the state to see its citizens and yet to curb the dangers of authoritarian high modernism by allowing India's citizenry to see the state. Ruparelia's recent publications include *Divided We Govern: The Paradoxes of Power in Contemporary Indian Democracy* (Hurst/Oxford University Press, forthcoming); *Understanding India's New Political Economy: A Great Transformation?* edited with Sanjay Reddy, John Harriss, and Stuart Corbridge (Routledge: 2011); and "Growth, Reforms and Inequality: Comparing India and China," in Amiya K. Bagchi and Anthony P. D'Costa, eds., *Transformation and Development: The Political Economy of Transition in India and China* (Oxford University Press, 2012).

Higher Education Reform in China and India: The Role of the State

Elizabeth J. PERRY

Harvard-Yenching Institute, USA
eperry@gov.harvard.edu

Devesh KAPUR

Center of Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania, USA
dkapur@sas.upenn.edu

In recent years, political leaders in both China and India have emphasized the importance of higher education reform as a means of improving their countries' economic competitiveness. Both countries have experienced an impressive and unprecedented expansion in college enrollments while trying to balance the challenges of longstanding social and spatial inequalities coupled with newfound pressures for internationalization. Yet despite such commonalities, higher education reform in China and India has proceeded very differently. The dissimilarities are due to many factors, not least the historically different role of the state vis a vis education in the two Asian giants.

Elizabeth J. Perry is Henry Rosovsky Professor of Government at Harvard University and Director of the Harvard-Yenching Institute. Her research focuses on the history of the Chinese revolution and its connection to contemporary politics. Her most recent books are *Mao's Invisible Hand: The Political Foundations of Adaptive Governance in China* (Harvard University Press, 2011) and *Anyuan: Mining China's Revolutionary Tradition* (University of California Press, 2012).

Devesh Kapur is Madan Lal Sobti Associate Professor of Political Science, Director, Center for Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania and Non-Resident fellow at the Center for Global Development. His publications include *The World Bank: Its First Half Century*; and *Diaspora, Democracy and Development: The Impact of International Migration from India on India*.

Protecting the Health of the People: Comparing State Responses to Public Health Challenges in India and China

Prerna SINGH

Department of Government, Harvard University, USA
psingh@gov.harvard.edu

What are the factors that promote the capacity of a state to provide social welfare? In my forthcoming book, 'Collective identity and the Common good: Subnationalism and Social Development in India' I examined this question in the context of Indian states. In particular, I traced the stark variation in education and health outcomes across Indian states to historic differences in the strength of their regional or subnational identification (subnationalism). This paper represents an initial attempt at thinking through this question at the national level through a comparison of the Chinese and Indian state's abilities to deal with similar public health challenges focusing, in particular, on smallpox. The eradication of smallpox in India in 1975 is usually described as a heroic success story, which it certainly was, especially compared to India's record at controlling other diseases and the dismal state of public health more generally, but it looks much less glorious when juxtaposed with China, which eradicates smallpox almost 10 years earlier in 1965. Smallpox was endemic in both India and China and the two countries faced a similar epidemiological environment as large countries with high population density. China's ten year lead over India is surprising because of a number of reasons including the fact that China was characterized by lower levels of economic development and less developed institutions and infrastructure than India. In 1949 China inherited a state that had been ravaged by external invasions and civil war; as compared to India, which had a peaceful transition of power and inherited many (relatively well established and functioning) institutions from the colonial period, including the Indian Medical Service and the Department of Health and Sanitation. During 1950s and 1960s China went through far more tumultuous social and political times with the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution as compared with stable, Congress party dominance in India. One might think that China's lead in smallpox eradication can be attributed to its adoption of a Communist ideology which especially emphasizes the elimination of material deprivation. But other Communist countries in Eastern Europe and even Russia itself, did not make as significant gains in social welfare. Also, China's social welfare efforts predate the Communist revolution. The Qing, for example, made an ambitious attempt at food security through the public granary system. In addition, a large body of scholarship suggests that a democratic country with institutionalized rights for their citizens, like India should do a better job at social welfare provision than an authoritarian country such as China. Moreover, Indian leaders, especially Nehru whose vision had a defining impact on independent India were greatly influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideology and at least in the early decades, India was inspired by a broadly Socialist-inspired approach to economic growth and social development. Finally, China's lead may be seen as surprising in so far as it had minimal international support as compared to India, which received massive financial, logistical and technological assistance from the WHO. At this still very early stage, I hypothesize that the key factor that explains the difference in the timing of the eradication of smallpox between the two countries is the difference in the ability of the two states to reach out to and mobilize society. Mobilizational capacity has been theorized to be an important constituent dimension of state capacity. Michael Mann, for example, defines social power or infrastructural power precisely as the power of the state to penetrate and centrally coordinate the activities of society. Migdal's "state-in-society" framework; talks of the need for closing the state-society divide. What, one might then ask as a follow-up, is the cause for the difference in ability of the Chinese and Indian states to reach out to and mobilize society? I argue that these can be understood in terms of the ability of the state to effectively embed interventions in a shared social-cultural framework via specific institutions.

In China, this shared cultural framework included a shifting combination of Confucian norms; Buddhist values; rituals; traditions including literary, artistic and Traditional Chinese Medicine as well as nationalism. In China the state was able to reach out to the population both during Maoist and imperial periods by embedding smallpox interventions in a shared cultural framework, which included a shifting combination of Confucian norms; Buddhist values; rituals; traditions including literary, artistic and Traditional Chinese Medicine as well as nationalism. It was able to do this through institutions that served as a key link between state and society. During the Maoist period, these were the Communist party cadres while in the imperial period, this was the gentry. In India, on the other hand, during the pre-colonial, colonial and also the post-colonial periods, the state has had a difficult time reaching out to and mobilizing society because they have not had a linking institution or been able to construct or broadcast a shared-cultural framework that can bring together state and society. It is interesting to point out, in conclusion, that this way of thinking about state-society relations across India and China has a long and distinguished lineage going back to Hegel, Weber and most recently, Fukuyama who in his new work 'the Origins of Political Order' echoes the classic Hegelian insight that India is 'all society, no state' while China is 'all state, no society'. I hope to push this insight in a slightly different direction by suggesting that it is not necessarily the strength of the state vis-à-vis society but the forging of a link between the two which is critical, in particular, as regards success in initiatives to deal with public health challenges such as smallpox, which do at the end of the day, represent an intervention into the most intimate personal domain, one's own body.

Prerna Singh is Assistant Professor at the Department of Government at Harvard University. She is also a Faculty Associate at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs and the South Asia Initiative at Harvard and a Co-Director of the Brown-Harvard-MIT Joint Seminar on South Asian Politics.

Welfare Reform in Asia, 1950-2010

Nara DILLON

Department of Government, Harvard University, USA
ndillon@gov.harvard.edu

A new phase in welfare reform began in Asia in the late 1980s and then surged in the 2000s. In contrast to welfare state retrenchment reforms debated and enacted in Europe in this period, most of these Asian welfare reforms have created new benefits and covered new populations. This paper traces welfare reform legislation across the region over the last 60 years, showing increasing convergence in welfare policy, as well as an expanding role for the state in welfare provision. This contemporary surge in welfare reform reflects the policy legacies of the postwar period, as well as the changing impact of regional diffusion and international organizations. As a result, the limited welfare programs of the postwar period are being transformed into more comprehensive anti-poverty welfare states across much of the region.

Nara Dillon received her BA in history from William College and her PhD in political science from the University of California, Berkeley. From 2003 to 2007 she taught Chinese politics and comparative politics as an Assistant Professor at Bard College. Her interests include the politics of welfare, charity, and health care in China and the rest of the developing world. Her publications include *At the Crossroads of Empires: Middlemen, Social Networks, and Statebuilding in Republican Shanghai* (Stanford, 2008) and articles on gender, private charity, and welfare reform. She is currently researching the development of the Maoist welfare state from the 1940s to the 1960s, focusing on programs for workers and unemployed urbanit

Social Protection and the State in India: Meeting the Twin Challenges of Inclusion and Accountability

Salim LAKHA

University of Melbourne, Australia
salim@unimelb.edu.au

In the aftermath of the Asian Financial Crisis some observers of East Asia pronounced the demise of the developmental state. This view has more recently been challenged by scholars who argue that rather than the demise of the developmental state, the role of the state has been reconfigured in the post-Asian financial crisis period to meet new economic challenges and social demands. Of these, the provision of more inclusive social protection by the state has received significant consideration by certain commentators. In the face of the global financial crisis even some international financial institutions called for state intervention to protect the economically vulnerable sections of the population. It appears that the state's developmental role is still evolving.

This presentation will consider the role of the state in social protection and development in India with reference to a specific case study, that is, the rights-based Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) of 2005. The Act has attracted widespread attention from scholars interested in both social development and the shifting character of Indian political economy. There are two distinguishing features of MGNREGA: it guarantees employment as a legal right and through the provision for mandatory social audits by the beneficiaries of the scheme, it promises accountability from below. While in recent years the Indian state's intervention in development has been driven by a rights-based discourse, it is arguable whether the state has demonstrated a capacity to deliver effectively on its rights based programs like MGNREGA. Successive studies have shown that the results of MGNREGA have been mixed. This paper raises the question: What does the experience of MGNREGA reveal about the developmental role of the contemporary state in India? The paper cautions against viewing the state as a homogenous entity.

Salim Lakha is an Honorary Senior Fellow in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne. From 2001-2009 he was Coordinator of the Development Studies Program and in 2011 a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at Asia Research Institute (National University of Singapore). His research interests include globalization and development, transnational identities, and the Indian diaspora. His area of specialisation is India, and he has published on industrialisation, labour relations, and the economic and cultural aspects of globalisation. His current research project examines the capacity constraints and governance aspects of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme which was enacted in 2005. Dr Lakha was a joint guest editor of the Special Issue of the journal *South Asia* (2009) titled 'Democracy, Civil Society and Governance: Contemporary Challenges in India'.

Changing Forms of Corruption in India

Akhil GUPTA

Department of Anthropology, University California-Los Angeles, USA
akgupta@anthro.ucla.edu

The Anna Hazare movement has once again brought corruption to the forefront of public discussion and debate in India. Discussions of corruption in the public sphere tend to portray it as something that has always been present. Yet changes in the intensity of corruption are indexed by the idea that it is “increasing.” Notions of increasing corruption would appear to depend on a metric by which corruption is measured. However, such a metric does not exist. In fact, the most-widely used “measure” of corruption is a perceptions survey conducted by Transparency International, which by its very nature does not measure the phenomenon, but perceptions of the phenomenon by elite, transnational business people.

I argue that the nature, extent, reach, and domain of corruption have profoundly altered since the liberalization of the Indian economy in 1991. Thus, institutionally, corruption has not remained the same as before. However, understandings of corruption depend on the circulation of representations of corruption, as well as on the changing affective relations between citizens and the state. In other words, “corruption” is a complex sign which brings together institutional change, the circulation of representations, and the emotional attachment between people and the state.

I will try to delineate some of these linkages in the paper, and attempt to explain why corruption seems to be increasing for the middle-class “aam aadmi” (common person). India has a unique culture of corruption that mixes forms of corruption rarely seen together in other national contexts, affecting poor and rich alike, but in very different ways.

Akhil Gupta is Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Center for India and South Asia (CISA) at University California-Los Angeles, USA. He obtained his undergraduate degree in Mechanical Engineering from Western Michigan University, his Master's in Mechanical Engineering from MIT, and his PhD in Engineering-Economic Systems at Stanford University. He has taught at the University of Washington, Seattle (1987-89), and at Stanford University (1989-2006), and at UCLA (2006-present). He is the author of *Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India* (Duke Univ. Press, 1998), and editor of *Culture, Power, Place* (with James Ferguson; Duke Univ. Press, 1997), *Anthropological Locations* (with James Ferguson; Univ. of California Press, 1997), *Caste and Outcast* (Stanford Univ. Press, 2002), *The Anthropology of the State* (with Aradhana Sharma; Blackwell, 2006), and *The State in India After Liberalization* (with K. Sivaramakrishnan; Routledge, 2010). His most recent book, *Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India* (2012), published by Orient BlackSwan and Duke University Press, has been awarded the Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy Prize by the Association for Asian Studies (2014). Professor Gupta is currently doing long-term research on Business Process Outsourcing (BPOs) and call centers in Bangalore. His areas of interest are: BPOs and call centers, the state and development, infrastructure, anthropology of food, environmental anthropology, animality, space and place, history of anthropology, applied anthropology; India and South Asia.

Local States as Brokers: Township Governments in the Post-Taxation Era

Forrest ZHANG

School of Social Sciences, Singapore Management University
forrestzhang@smu.edu.sg

The abolition of all agricultural taxes in 2004 ushered in a new phase of relationship between township-level governments and the rural society. Scholars have described this change as a transition from an extractive state to a “floating” state, the fiscal and functional “hollowing-out” of townships, and the “corporatization” of grassroots governments. Integrating insights from these existing approaches, I propose here a new perspective that sees township governments’ primary role in rural society today as brokers, preoccupied with intermediating transactions between powerful external actors with resources and the local economy and population. All the key institutional forces that influence township officials’ behavior – the competitive cadre evaluation system, the revenue imperative, the self-interest of officials and their allies in the shadow state, and their reliance on campaign mobilization as a policy tool – either encourage or force them to engage in brokerage activities. The two most important types of brokerage by township governments are getting funded projects from upper-level governments and bringing business investments into the local economy. Their reduced managerial capacity and the new fiscal arrangement that aligns their interest with volume of transactions make these new broker states different from the developmental state once prevalent in rural China.

Forrest Zhang is Associate Professor of Sociology at School of Social Sciences, Singapore Management University. He received his undergraduate training at Fudan University in Shanghai and obtained his PhD in sociology from Yale University in 2004. He has been teaching at Singapore Management University’s School of Social Sciences since 2005. His current research focuses on two themes: the fate of petty commodity production (especially self-employment and family farming) in China’s transition to capitalism and the role of family in shaping people’s mobility processes. His work on rural China, which documents the rise of agrarian capitalism and analyzed its impact on family farming and the rural social structure, has appeared in the *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *Politics & Society*, and *China Journal*. His work on the role family in the social mobility processes has been published in the *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *World Development*, and *Sociology*.

Commercial Bureaucratism: The Middlemen for Outmigration and the Bureaucratic Logic in the Reconfiguration of the Chinese State

XIANG Biao

Institute of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Oxford, UK
biao.xiang@anthro.ox.ac.uk

The disappearance of the discourse of *guanliao zhuyi* (bureaucratism) in the 1990s is a curious aspect of the changing role of the Chinese state. One of the most frequently used terms by both the government and ordinary people since the 1950s, bureaucratism meant not only hierarchy and rigidity, but more important a structural alienation of state apparatus from the masses (Mao 1953; 1956). The disappearance of the term of course does not mean the end of the tension between centralized power and social life. Rather, the tension is now disguised by two developments. First, the bureaucratization of the state, as marked by the introduction of the civil service system in 1993, made the government legitimately bureaucratic. The state is now judged by its technical capacity of governance instead of its political intention of serving the People. Second, the marketization of some public services turned bureaucratic obstacles into business opportunities. It is more realistic for the people to pay to get their business done than to critique the state for alienating. But bureaucratization is also at odd with marketization. The emphasis of the rule of law and accountability prevents individual officials from seeking rent as freely as before (e.g. during the 1980s “dual track” era). The bureaucracy now has to work with supposedly independent business.

Drawing on earlier critiques of bureaucratism in the international as well as Chinese socialist traditions, this article calls attention to the bureaucratic logic in the reconfiguration of the Chinese state, a logic that became particularly prominent since 2003. The article does so by providing ethnographic glimpses of a special group: the middlemen in international labor outmigration who were active throughout the 2000s. They were commercial intermediaries but behaved like bureaucrats: they processed documents and navigated official procedures as their main business activities, and they reinforced instead of challenged bureaucratic power. The middlemen emerged in the early 2000s as a result of the bureaucracy-led marketization of the regulation of outmigration. The marketization was aimed at regulatory effectiveness and economic efficiency, as well as to cultivate a group of competent enterprises as a constituency loyal to the bureaucracy. The middlemen were not part of the constituency, but they turned out to be instrumental for the economic growth of the constituency. The middlemen created new opportunities for migration by “bending” or “blending” regulations without breaking them. For instance, licensed companies for international placement could deploy only the workers who had household registrations in the same place as where the companies were registered; a middleman may create official documents to satisfy this even though they could not change the workers’ household registrations. As an example of rule “blending”, a middleman may send anyone who paid RMB 40,000 (USD 6,000, which was the going rate in mid-2000s Liaoning province) to South Korea as intra-firm transfers. Intra-firm transfer was not subject to the migration quotas of the Korean government and would obtain visa easily, but the transfers must be employees of Korean firms sent to the headquarters for training. In order to do so, a middleman may blend bureaucratic rules across different domains and across countries. A middleman may persuade a vocational school to admit his/her recruits for short-term training and thus record them as students formally; the school would then supply the “students” to a Korean company in China as employees. The employment relation needed to be approved by the Foreign Services Corporation, a governmental arm that oversaw the employment of local staff by foreign companies in China. The middleman turned this otherwise cumbersome bureaucratic measure into a piece of evidence to convince the Korean bureaucracy that the workers were legitimate intra-firm transfers. The middleman had to make some private arrangements with the key personnel in the school, the Korean company and the local Foreign Services Corporation, but no rule was broken on the surface.

Successful middlemen must engineer the package meticulously and present all the documents flawless. They repeatedly stressed that “nothing is more important than authenticity”. All documents must be authentic, although they may not be truthful in terms of the social reality that they represented. Authenticity was essential because the bureaucratization of the state and the enhancement of its governing capacity made it almost impossible for fabricated documents to pass as genuine. It is through the monopoly of this documentary authenticity—a central means of circulation and exchange, without which market transaction could not sustain—that bureaucracy maintains its commanding position over the market. The middlemen constantly translated bureaucratic means of control (e.g. certificates, permits, authorization) into means of exchange. It must be stressed that the “translation” is different from selling the documents as content of exchange.

Lenin (1921) had attributed the Soviet bureaucratism to lack of market exchange, thus arguing for the replacement of war communism with state capitalism. Dilan (1957) posited socialist bureaucracy—the “new class”—against productive forces, and predicted that bureaucrats would seek to expand social control at the cost of material productivity. Clearly agreeing with both, Deng (1980) expected economic marketization and bureaucratic rationalization to contain bureaucratism. The 2000s however witnesses a new entanglement between commerce and bureaucracy. The notion of “commercial bureaucratism” wishes to capture this. As commerce is at least formally autonomous and bureaucracy professionalized, commercial bureaucratism differs from state-owned economy, local corporatism (Oi 1999; or “market socialism”, Lin 1995; “market communism”, Gore 1998), or outright corruption (“booty socialism” run by “bureau-preneurs”, Lu 2000).

The situation is still fluid and fast evolving. In the end of the 2000s the Ministry of Commerce attempted to marginalize the middlemen and absorb the entire international recruitment system into the bureaucracy in the name of protecting “the market order”. What is clear is that we should pay closer attention to bureaucracy and their societal counterparts when observing changes of the Chinese state.

XIANG Biao teaches Anthropology and Migration Studies at the University of Oxford, UK. He is the author of *Global Bodyshopping* (winner of the 2008 Anthony Leeds Prize), *Transcending Boundaries*, and *Return: Nationalizing transnational mobility in Asia* (co-edited with Brenda Yeoh and Mika Toyota). Among his many articles, one in *Pacific Affairs* was awarded the 2012 William L. Holland Prize. His forthcoming book *The Intermediary Trap* will be published by Princeton University Press.

Recentring Indonesian Migration: Post-Neoliberal Reform and Colonial Genealogies

Johan LINDQUIST

Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University, Sweden
johan.lindquist@socant.su.se

This paper considers the transformation of the Indonesian state since 1998 through a focus on the regulation of international labor migration. Following in the wake of the Asian economic crisis and the fall of Suharto there has been a dramatic increase in documented migration from Indonesia to countries such as Malaysia and Saudi Arabia. Notably, a large proportion of these migrants are women who work as domestic servants. The expanding migration industry has been characterized by the deregulation of the market for labor recruitment and increasing demands by the state for the documentation of the migration process, generally in the name of "protection" (*perlindungan*). This can be understood in relation to two phases of neoliberalization, namely the rolling back and rolling out of the state. In other words, there has been a growth of both market actors, notably labor recruitment agencies, and government bureaucracy devoted specifically to international migration. In this context various forms of informal brokers have become critical actors in both recruiting migrants and dealing with paperwork. This paper deals more specifically with the Indonesian state's current attempt, in collaboration with private labor recruitment agencies, to recentralize the market for international migration through the licensing of informal brokers and the creation of new forms of e-governance centered on databases. This suggests two separate genealogies, one leading back to the colonial era's concern with mediation in the context of indirect rule and the second the more recent transition to a post-neoliberal state. In conclusion, this paper will consider the relationship between these two historical perspectives in a comparative Asian perspective.

Johan Lindquist received his BA degree in Cultural Anthropology from Uppsala University in 1994, and his PhD degree in Social Anthropology from Stockholm University in 2002. Between 2002 and 2006 Lindquist was a postdoctoral fellow under the auspices of the Swedish School of Advanced Asia Pacific Studies (SSAAPS). He has been a visiting fellow at Harvard University during 1996-1997, 1999-2000, and the spring of 2002, and Cornell University from 2003-2004. In 2006 he was named Assistant Professor of Social Anthropology at Stockholm University. Lindquist's ongoing research focuses on the brokerage systems that are shaping contemporary transnational migrant mobility from Indonesia to countries across Asia and the Middle East. Since the 1997 Asian economic crisis there has been a dramatic increase in documented migration from Indonesia, particularly to Malaysia and Saudi Arabia. At the center of this transformation are a growing number of private recruitment agencies that become brokers between state authorities, employers abroad, and potential migrants in villages across Indonesia. Empirically, the project focuses on the activities and networks of agencies centered in the Indonesian capital Jakarta and the largely rural provinces of East and West Nusa Tenggara, both key sources of migrant labor. This shifts focus away from a primary concern with migrant experience towards the industry and infrastructure that channels migrant mobility. More generally, the empirical concern with migrant brokers offers a strategic methodological starting point for grasping how regulated systems of transnational circular migration are developing in Asia in the context of changing forms of globalization. Lindquist also develops these ideas in comparative terms through his ongoing collaboration with Xiang Biao of Oxford University and Brenda Yeoh of the National University of Singapore in the project "Opening the Black Box of Migration: Brokers and the Organization of Transnational Mobility," funded by STINT (The Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education) as an Institutional Grant for Younger Researchers.